



Mayfield, Phase 1 EIA Addendum, Volume 1

November 2021

Contents

Summary	3
1. EIA Addendum	8

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 1 New Street Square, London, EC4A 3HQ, United Kingdom.

Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom affiliate of Deloitte NSE LLP, a member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"). DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL and Deloitte NSE LLP do not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more about our global network of member firms. Real Estate Services regulated by RICS.

© 2021 Deloitte LLP. All rights reserved.

Summary

Approved Planning Permission 124972/FO/2019 is subject to an amendment via a Variation of Condition (S.73) application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as set out in this EIA Addendum and this submission as a whole. This requires the approved documents, including the EIA, to be reviewed and updated in order to reflect the current design in revised documentation as necessary.

In summary, the project is currently under construction and changes are sought to the final design of the park, including changes to park levels, flood compensation areas, tree planting, drainage, remediation and phasing of the development. These changes have been discussed in detail and agreed with statutory and non-statutory consultees by virtue of discharge of planning conditions and are set out in detail within Section 1 of this EIA Addendum, supporting additional technical appendices, Planning Statement Addendum and updated drawings.

No changes are proposed to the buildings that are covered by the original EIA, including Plots O (Office 1 – ‘The Poulton’), Plot N (multi-storey car park) and Plot M (Office 2 – ‘The Republic’). These buildings were approved under two separate applications; 124972/FO/2019 (Plots O, N and Park plus enabling works for phase 1) 125248/FO/2019 (Plot M). The application relating to plot M remains unaffected by the changes set out in this application and the amendments solely relate to design development of the park areas.

The EIA that supported both above applications was updated during the determination of those applications with a further EIA Addendum dated December 2019, which sat alongside the original EIA dated October 2019. The two EIA documents combined form the Original EIA, referenced herein. The originally approved EIA is appended to this Addendum for completeness. The Variation of Condition application requires the EIA Addendum to be read alongside that Original EIA.

It should be noted that this EIA Addendum utilises the same baseline information that was established in the Original EIA dated December 2019. It is important that any revisions to a scheme that was supported by an EIA is consistent in its approach to the established baseline and assessing the scheme against that original context.

The table below sets out a summary of the Original EIA and how the approved chapters are impacted by the changes summarised above and described and assessed further in the body of this EIA Addendum.

EIA Chapter	Changes to information
Introduction Chapters: Introduction, EIA Methodology, Site and Development Description, Consideration of Alternatives	Updates are set out within this EIA Addendum to reflect the changes in the park design, river channel and delivery strategy. Whilst amendments have been made to these elements of the delivery as described in this Statement, the broad description of development is unaffected by this change. No change to EIA Methodology, site description and consideration of alternatives sections as set out in the Original EIA.
<u>Construction Management and Phasing</u> Original technical Appendices – Plot O Construction Management Plot (Appendix 5.1) and Plot N Construction	Changes are now proposed in relation to the phasing and delivery of the park, with the enabling works comprising site investigation, remediation, removal of onsite structures, river channel works and site re-profiling now taking place in one phase. The details set out in the approved remediation strategy (see Chapter 9) are reflected within the CMP regarding control of contamination, as are the details around close working with the River Medlock (see Chapter 10). This provides the necessary mitigation for the potentially significant

EIA Chapter	Changes to information
Management Plan (Appendix 5.2) Additional appendices – Enabling Works - Construction Management Plan (Appendix 5.1A), Park Construction Management Plan (Appendix 5.2A)	adverse effects that may be experienced in those topic areas, which is also confirmed in those chapter updates set out in this EIA Addendum.
<u>Noise and Vibration</u> Original technical Appendices – Noise and Vibration Assessment (Appendix 6.1) Additional appendices – None.	Updated with a qualitative statement as set out in Section 1 of this ES Addendum to reflect the impact of potential increases in the intensity of vehicle movements during the construction phase, with the delivery of the park now taking place in one phase. There would be no perceptible change to the operational phase of development. The EIA Addendum (paragraphs 1.34-1.37) reflects this assessment and confirms that there is a negligible (non-significant) change to conclusion of the ES Chapter or supporting technical appendices regarding noise and vibration and impact on sensitive receptors.
<u>Traffic and Transport</u> Technical Appendices: Transport Statement and Framework Travel Plan (Appendix 7.1 and 7.2) Additional appendices – None.	Updated with a qualitative statement as set out in Section 1 of this ES Addendum to reflect the impact of the vehicle movements on the local highway network during the construction phase that will now take place over a shorter period. This results in a slight increase in construction traffic during the peak construction year. The increase is not considered significant and therefore, there are no changes to the conclusions of the original 2019 ES in relation to construction effects for traffic and transport. There would be no changes to the operational phase of the proposed development, with the quantum of development and number of car parking spaces remaining consistent with the approved development. This ES Addendum (paragraphs 1.38-1.49) reflects this assessment and confirms that there are no significant changes to the conclusions of the Transport Chapter in the original 2019 ES, in terms of cumulative or residual impacts, or the supporting technical appendices.
<u>Air Quality</u> Original technical Appendices – Air Quality Assessment (Appendix 8.1) Additional appendices – None.	Updated with a qualitative statement as set out in Section 1 of this ES Addendum to reflect the change in potential impact on the nearest sensitive receptors as a result of intensified construction activity over a shorter period on site to enable the development to come forward in a single phase. This will be managed through the details that are set out in Appendix 5.1A and 5.2A (Construction Management Plans for enabling phase and park) and the construction protection measures afforded to the proposed development. There is no perceptible change to the operational phase of development as a result of the proposed changes. This ES Addendum (paragraph 1.50-

EIA Chapter	Changes to information
	1.53) reflects this assessment and confirms that there are no changes to conclusion of the ES Chapter, in terms of cumulative or residual impact, or supporting technical appendices.
<u>Ecology</u> Original technical Appendices – Ecological Assessment Report, Bat Survey, River Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Ecology Strategy with Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations. (Appendix 9.1-9.8) Additional appendices – Ecology Report with BNG Calculations and Bird Nesting Strategy (Appendix 9.1A and 9.2A)	This ES Addendum updates the original 2019 ES with further quantitative and qualitative information to reflect the change in overall design of the park and detailed planting proposals and ecological enhancements. The construction impacts are the same due to the loss of habitat during the construction phase and mitigation proposed within the original 2019 ES still applies. The operational impacts of the proposed development also remain unchanged, despite the alterations to the Park design and effect this has had in terms of habitat creation and biodiversity net gain within the proposed development. Broadly speaking, wetland and riparian habitat types have been reduced due to the change in the design of the river and its banks. Whilst there has been a reduction in habitat types and the detailed planting palettes produced, the Park will still deliver a 90% net gain for biodiversity for Phase 1 in isolation. In order to support ambitious biodiversity net gain targets for the wider Mayfield SRF, future development plots within Phase 1, and future phases, should also seek to provide areas of additional habitat of value for local wildlife in Manchester. By incorporating biodiverse habitat areas into the proposed built plots, it will support the biodiversity provided by the Park and contribute to habitat mitigation and enhancement measures across the SRF, in line with the principles of biodiversity net gain. Measures by which this can be achieved are set out within Appendix 9.1A (Ecology Report with BNG). In addition to the habitats provided by the Park, features for species of importance have also been provided within the detailed design development. Therefore, as set out in paragraphs 1.54-1.84, the amendments to the proposed development are still considered to deliver the residual effects of a moderate beneficial effect on the River Medlock and a moderate beneficial effect on local fauna including bats, birds and invertebrates.
<u>Ground Conditions</u> Original technical Appendices – Phase 1 Ground Conditions Report (Appendix 10.1) Additional Appendices - Appendix 10.1A: Phase 2 The Freight Island Ground Investigation; Appendix 10.2A: Phase 2 Proposed Mayfield	This EIA Addendum updates the Original EIA with further quantitative and qualitative information to reflect the new proposed park levels and site remediation works required to respond to contamination recorded on site. These additional technical documents supersede and add to ES Volume 1 dated December 2019 through the appendices. This EIA Addendum (paragraph 1.85-1.92) reflects this further Site Investigation work and subsequently proposed Remediation Strategy undertaken. The changes to the conclusions of the originally approved ES Chapter is reflected in the supporting technical appendices included with this Addendum.

EIA Chapter	Changes to information
Park GI: (also covers Plot M); Appendix 10.3A: Phase 2 Site Investigation Plots O and N; Appendix 10.4A: Phase 3A Remediation Strategy - Plots O, N and M; Appendix 10.5A: Phase 3A Remediation Strategy – Parkland Area.	There are no changes to the original cumulative assessment within the EIA as there are no additional schemes in the local area that could combine with the proposal to generate a significant impact beyond that already tested. Detailed studies and remediation strategies submitted with this EIA Addendum as further technical appendices confirm that the previously set out residual impacts generated by the proposals are set out in this EIA Addendum and consistent with the original EIA. The potential impact can be mitigated to non-significant levels in line with the Original EIA.
<u>Water Resources and Flood Risk</u> Original technical Appendix: Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (Appendix 10.1) Additional Appendices - Appendix 11.1A: Stage 4 Drainage Strategy, Mayfield Park Revision P07; Appendix 11.2A: Hydraulic Modelling – Mayfield Park Phase 1 Full Build Out; Appendix 11.3A: Information to support discharge of Condition 66, relating to the River Medlock Works; and Appendix 11.4A: Information to Support Discharge of Condition 10 and Condition 22 dated 20 April 2021 relating to flood risk management.	The overall drainage strategy is consistent with the original approval, with areas that are required to act as flood compensation and infiltration of surface water amended by the new design to achieve the aims of the Flood Risk Assessment approved under CDN/20/0691. A qualitative statement (paragraphs 1.93-1.114) reflects the quantitative work that has been undertaken and is provided in Volume 2 of this ES Addendum to revise the drainage and flood mitigation for the site in line with the new river channel and park designs. These additional technical documents supersede and add to ES Volume 2 dated December 2019. On this basis, there is no significant change to the conclusion of the ES chapter, either in terms of cumulative or residual impacts, as confirmed in this ES Addendum.
<u>Wind Microclimate</u> Technical Appendix: Wind Assessment results (Appendix 11.1) Additional Appendices - None.	The Wind Microclimate chapter has been reviewed considering the changes to the park design and the relocation of soft landscaping and trees, which are considered to be in-built mitigation associated with the park. This is set out as a qualitative statement. The changes to the park are not likely to change the conclusion of the 2019 ES chapter with regards to the pedestrian conditions within the park. No safety issues are expected to occur. This review has highlighted likely changes to the wind conditions in the cumulative scenario with the phase 1 buildings. The introduction of the bridge may bring more northerly winds into the area and around the perimeter of the phase 1 buildings. The location of some of the trees has changed, and new sitting areas are located in the park to the north of the phase 1 buildings.

EIA Chapter	Changes to information
	The mitigation measures in these areas will need to be reviewed ahead of development at these plots being brought forward. Future testing of residual final wind impacts will be reviewed once mitigation has been implemented, with recommendations for further testing of wind mitigation proposed to confirm the final residual effects are within the comfort and safety thresholds and suitable for the design and location of entrances and activity.
<u>Daylight, Sunlight, and Overshadowing</u> Original Technical Appendix: Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (Appendix 12.1) Additional Appendices – None.	It is considered by the Original ES chapter authors that there is no change to the originally approved ES chapter as no changes are proposed to the building massing, which would affect the potential for daylight, sunlight and overshadowing effects on identified sensitive receptors (paragraph 1.122-1.123). On this basis, the conclusions of the Original ES are unchanged.
<u>Townscape and Visual Impact</u> Original Technical Appendices: Zone of Visual Impact and Viewpoints Plan, Verified Views (Appendix 13.1) Additional appendices – none.	The EIA Chapter author has reviewed the proposals and has confirmed that there is no change to the originally approved EIA Chapter as no changes are proposed to any of the building plots that would affect wider townscape views. The views of the park will amend the landscaping design but will still result in the delivery of a new 6 acre park and therefore the conclusions are the same as the original scheme assessed and as set out in EIA Volume 1 dated December 2019.
Socio-economic Impact Technical Appendix: Socio-Economic Data Tables (Appendix 14.1)	The amendments to the park design do not change the content of the socio-economic chapter of the Original EIA as there is no change to the floorspace proposed within the development. On this basis, the Original EIA chapter remains up to date and this has been confirmed by the Original EIA chapter author Eksogen.
Type 1 Cumulative Impact Assessment	There are no significant changes to the Type 1 (intra-project) cumulative impact associated with the development on specific receptors as a result of the design changes to the park. Any change in potential impact to the River Medlock as a result of the change in river wall strategy and planting is to be mitigated in order to offer a beneficial impact on this receptor, which in line with the Original EIA.
Summary of Residual Effects	No change as there are no significant anticipated impacts beyond those previously identified, subject to mitigation being implemented as recommended, as a result of the proposed scheme revisions and as set out in this EIA Addendum.
Non-Technical Summary	Amendments to the non-technical summary provided as part of the EIA Addendum to explain the revisions to the scheme and associated technical studies in non-technical language.

1. EIA Addendum

Introduction

- 1.1. This Addendum Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Statement accompanies an application for a Variation of Condition under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to amend the Planning Permission Ref. 124972/FO/2019 in respect of the proposed development of Mayfield Phase 1 to accommodate changes to the design of the park.
- 1.2. Discussions with the LPA have confirmed in principle support for the revised proposals. It has been agreed that the planning mechanism that should be used for handling the change is under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to amend Planning Permission Ref. 124972/FO/2019. For clarity, this Application will seek to amend the following Conditions:
 - Condition 2: substitution of revised drawings, addendum Planning Statement, EIA Addendum and supporting technical appendices, as set out in this Statement, to reflect the changes to the park design;
 - Conditions 3, 5, 6a, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 66: amended to reflect the information discharged against 125248/FO/2019 between October 2020 and October 2021
 - Conditions 65a, 65b, 67, 71a, 72, 73, 74a-j, 75 and 86: amended to reflect new information submitted with this application as set out in this Statement.
 - Conditions 77a, 77b, 78, 79a-i, 80, 81, 82a-j, 84 and 85: amended to reflect the revised phasing of the park, due to come forward as a single phase of development and referencing information approved against Conditions 65a, 65b, 67, 71a, 72, 73, 74a-j and 75 for completeness.
 - Additional Conditions: new conditions are proposed to allow for the timely submission of further details where areas are being retained on a temporary basis, such as Freight Island (Phase X) and to allow for the submission of detailed information relating to an Art Strategy for the Park
- 1.3. This Addendum Statement briefly describes the proposed amendments and confirms that the conclusions of the original EIA remain broadly unchanged as a result of the proposed amendments.
- 1.4. It should be read together with the approved planning documents and the addendum to the Planning Statement and the technical information relating to ground conditions, remediation, river design and flood compensation, which further explain the rationale for the proposed amendments and assess them against key planning considerations.

Planning Background

- 1.5. Mayfield is a developing regeneration area within Manchester City Centre that seeks to act as a catalyst for increased economic activity in this part of the city centre and provide a significant outdoor public amenity space in the form of a new park. Permission was approved in February 2020 under planning permission references 124972/FO/2019 and 125248/FO/2019.
- 1.6. Construction commenced on site in March 2021 comprising the enabling works for the development, which constituted the removal of onsite structures, reprofiling of the site, works to the River Medlock, infrastructure delivery and remediation works.
- 1.7. This commencement of development on site followed the submission and subsequent discharge of planning conditions attached to 124972/FO/2019. The information submitted to Manchester City

Council and reviewed by various statutory bodies provided the new site investigation works, remediation strategy details, river channel works, flow control elements for flooding, hard and soft landscaping details and methodology and management of construction activities on site.

- 1.8. All of the information used to discharge planning conditions to date has been resubmitted alongside this ES Addendum in the form of technical appendices or submitted as detailed planning drawings and further non-ES technical information.

Original Planning Approval

- 1.9. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) accompanied two applications for Full Planning Permission, submitted to Manchester City Council (MCC), in respect of land within the Mayfield Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) area.
- 1.10. The first Application (Ref.: 124972/FO/2019) was approved on 14 February 2020 and comprised the following:
- Phased demolition and site clearance, earthworks including re-profiling and construction of retaining walls for the land bounded by the Mancunian Way to the south, Mayfield Depot to the north, Baring Street to the west and Hoyle Street to the east.
 - Mayfield Park: provision of circa 2.4 ha (6 acres) of public park, including hard and soft landscaping to be delivered in phases with new bridges across the River Medlock;
 - Baring Street Office 1: 9 storey office development including ground, mezzanine and plant level comprising 11,142 sq. m. (GEA) including active ground floor uses (A1, A2, A3, A4 or B1), public realm and a riverside walkway;
 - Baring Street Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP): 10 storey MSCP including ground for 581 car parking spaces; and
 - Highways and Infrastructure Works: creation of a new junction from London Road with required access to the multi-storey car park, works to Baring Street, and Traffic Regulation Orders to Buxton Street, Berry Street and Travis Street, which will be delivered and implemented prior to the MSCP becoming operational.
- 1.11. The second Application (Ref.: 125248/FO/2019) was approved on 14 February 2020, which was also covered by the same EIA, encompasses a 13-storey office development including ground and mezzanine floors comprising 29,315 sq. m. (GIA) (circa 31,887 sq. m. (GEA)) with active ground floor uses, highways and associated access and public realm. The details of Planning Application Ref.: 125248/FO/2019 remain unchanged and this is included for reference only, given the original EIA also supported this submission.

Proposed Amendments

- 1.12. An update to Planning Application Ref.: 124972/FO/2019 is required because amendments are sought to the details of the application approved with regards to the park design, which are set out in this Statement and submission as a whole.
- 1.13. This EIA Addendum describes the proposed amendments to Planning Application Ref.: 124972/FO/2019 and confirms that the conclusions of the original EIA remain broadly unchanged as a result of the proposed amendments.
- 1.14. It should be read together with the original EIA that was approved as part of 124972/FO/2019 and the addendum to the Planning Statement submitted with this application, which explains the rationale for the proposed amendments and assesses them against key planning considerations.

1.15. The design changes from the originally proposed scheme of Planning Application Ref.: 124972/FO/2019, as set out in the updated and enclosed planning drawings, Planning Statement Addendum and supporting technical appendices, are summarised as follows:

- **Phasing:** the park is now proposed to come forward in a single phase, rather than in three separate phases. This means that there are no longer phased measures to control river flow, save for those that need to take place whilst the park is being physically delivered.
- **River walls, silted banks, floor areas and green corridor:** rather than removing the existing river walls to the River Medlock and replacing these with new flow control elements, these will predominantly be retained, adapted and refurbished. This has the benefit of minimising the changes and complexity of working with the existing river morphology, whilst reducing the amount of embodied carbon needed to establish a refined river channel, which is now minimised. This approach has reduced the possibility to include as much wetland habitat as originally envisaged, which has impacted biodiversity net gain scores.
- **Relocation of areas:** the former 'wetland area' to the north east of the site is to become the 'Play Yard'. The former play yard area, where Dirt Factory is currently located, will become the new 'wetland area' and will provide areas of flood compensation and manage flood risk on site, up-stream and downstream in line with the new river design. This will also relocate and change the type of new habitat areas within the park compared to the approved scheme. Temporary areas are also now to be retained and incorporated within the first phase of development, including Freight Island (Phase X) adjacent to Baring Street.
- **Circulation:** the existing bridges on site will be retained and upgraded as part of the revised scheme. The park layout and routes have been refined so that all routes through and circumnavigating the site are accessible to those with mobility impairments. Where steps are proposed, an alternative level access route is provided adjacent.
- **Park entrance:** additional entrance proposed to allow for access to Baring Street to improve connections and permeability. This will help to animate Baring Street and reduce the reliance on the sole entrance adjacent to the Gatehouse and seek to complement the retained Freight Island. This temporary external area will help to activate the park whilst in its infancy, so will remain in-situ until further plots come forward to activate the wider Mayfield area.
- **Revised tree planting and soft landscaping:** following the decision to bring the park forward in a single phase and amend the strategy of river channel and morphology, the tree and planting schedule has been revised. This has been discussed with the City Council's Arborist on 09 October 2020 and further reviews on 11 January 2021 with the EA and GMEU, with subsequent email and telephone follow up as necessary. This has amended the areas provided for habitat creation within the park areas and particularly those adjacent to the river.

1.16. The site description and area as set out in the original EIA all remain consistent with the previously approved development and are therefore unchanged.

Use and Amount

1.17. As a result of the design development the Proposed Development will provide the following accommodation:

Use	Original Application	Revised Application
Site Area	5 ha – no change	
Office Building 1	10,184 sq. m. (GIA) / 11,142 sq. m. (GEA) – additional 701 sq. m. (GIA) or 1,155 sq. m. (GEA).	No change

Use	Original Application	Revised Application
Office Building 2	29,315 sq. m. (GIA) (circa 31,887 sq. m. (GEA))	No change
Baring Street Multi-Storey Car Park	581 spaces	No change
Park	2.4 ha (6 acres) of hard and soft landscaping, centred around the River Medlock and delivered in two phases, with relevant enabling and site remediation works associated with the delivery of each phase.	The park is now proposed to be delivered in one phase. The river channel design has been amended and flood compensation areas have been relocated to work with this new river design and achieve the aims of the approved flood risk assessment.
Other	Junction improvements to London Road, improvements to Baring Street and immediate surrounds and Traffic Regulation Orders and Stopping Up of Bond Street and Nether Street. – <i>no change</i>	

Phasing

- 1.18. The new phasing for the development results in the park coming forward as the first phase of works and will be delivered as one phase, rather than being split. The phasing for the development is now as follows:
- Phase A - Demolition and site clearance, earthworks including re-profiling, construction of retaining walls.
 - Phases F, G, H, I – Mayfield Park now delivered in one phase.
 - Phase B - London Road junction & temporary access road.
 - Phase C - MSCP and immediate public realm.
 - Phase D - Baring Street and associated highways and public realm.
 - Phase E - Baring Street Office 1, loading bay & immediate public realm (hard landscaping only).
 - Phase X – temporary retention of Freight Island that is to be replaced at a later date.
- 1.19. Please refer to drawings 0343-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-Z-001000 and MAY101-WSL-EXT-GIL-DR-7060-0129-S4-01, in addition to the phasing strategy and programme submitted against Condition 3, which highlight the new approach to phasing and delivery of the park.

Pre-Application Consultation

- 1.20. Revised designs for the park following pre-application consultation with officers at Manchester City Council and statutory consultees during the design development process regarding the principles of the proposed amendments, and the details and form of the forthcoming amendment application.
- 1.21. Where agreed and relevant to do so, the studies and chapters prepared in relation to the original EIA have been updated via this EIA Addendum. This document summarises any additional likely significant effects, cumulative impact and residual impact as a result of the changes. The additional documents reflect information that has been used to support the discharge of relevant planning conditions for the enabling phase of works.

- 1.22. Any updated technical appendices or figures are contained as an Appendix to this EIA Addendum with numbering that is consistent with the original EIA for ease of reference.

Resubmission Documentation

- 1.23. This EIA Addendum should be read together with the planning application documentation approved as part of 124972/FO/2019, with explicit reference to the Planning Statement Addendum submitted concurrently and the original EIA (Volume 1 and 2 and NTS) dated December 2019. In summary, the documentation submitted with this Application is as follows:
- Planning Statement Addendum and Appendices prepared by Deloitte Real Estate, with input from the other consultants as relevant;
 - EIA Volume 1 Addendum (this Statement) in addition to the following technical appendices (Volume 2) that have been approved as part of the condition discharge process:
 - Appendix 5.1A: Enabling Works Construction Management Plan;
 - Appendix 9.1A: Ecology Report with BNG Calculations;
 - Appendix 9.2A: Bird Nesting Strategy;
 - Appendix 10.1A: Phase 2 The Freight Island Ground Investigation dated 06 Apr 2021;
 - Appendix 10.2A: Phase 2 Proposed Mayfield Park GI: (also covers Plot M) dated 12 March 2021;
 - Appendix 10.3A: Phase 2 Site Investigation Plots O and N dated 12 January 2021;
 - Appendix 10.4A: Phase 3A Remediation Strategy - Plots O, N and M dated 19 January 2021;
 - Appendix 10.5A: Phase 3A Remediation Strategy – Parkland Area dated 19 January 2021;
 - Appendix 11.1A: Stage 4 Drainage Strategy, Mayfield Park, dated 01 March 2021 Revision P07;
 - Appendix 11.2A: Hydraulic Modelling – Mayfield Park Phase 1 Full Build Out dated 20 April 2021;
 - Appendix 11.3A: Information to support discharge of Condition 66, relating to the River Medlock Works dated 20 April 2021;
 - Appendix 11.4A: Information to Support Discharge of Condition 10 and Condition 22 dated 20 April 2021 relating to flood risk management;
 - Updated drawings relating to the design of the park and public realm areas submitted as part of the condition discharge process. An updated Drawing Schedule is submitted detailing the changes and new revisions; and
 - Additional Non-ES Technical documents that have been utilised in the discharge of planning conditions. A full list is contained in the Planning Statement Addendum and Covering Letter.
- 1.24. This EIA Addendum considers and assesses the proposed amendments in the context of the EIA chapters, impacts and conclusions presented within the original planning submission (Ref.: 124972/FO/2019).
- 1.25. The proposed amendments have been reviewed by the relevant EIA Consultants (BuroHappold) to assess their potential environmental effects as compared to the conclusions presented within the approved EIA.
- 1.26. The section below sets out the consequences of changes in relation to the original EIA submitted under Chapter headings and methodology consistent with the original EIA dated December 2019.
- 1.27. All other submission documents that were originally approved as part of Planning Permission reference 124972/FO/2019 are to remain as part of the revised Planning Permission that would be issued subject to approval.

Characteristics of the Potential Effect of the Proposed Amendments

- 1.28. The EIA Technical Team confirms within this EIA Addendum that the proposed amendments would not result in any significant effects on the environment beyond the extent identified in the conclusions of the approved EIA.
- 1.29. Although the conclusions of the originally approved EIA remain broadly unchanged, this EIA Addendum is submitted in order to clarify the changes to the overall proposed development and the set out revised mitigation measures needed in order to reduce any potentially significant effects.

Introductory Chapters

- 1.30. The chapters that comprise the non-technical chapters of the original EIA are 1) Introduction; 2) EIA Methodology; 3) Site and Development Description; and 4) Consideration of Alternatives.
- 1.31. Updates set out within this EIA Addendum reflect the changes as described in paragraph 1.15. There are no changes to the EIA methodology, site description and consideration of alternatives sections as set out in the original EIA Volume 1 dated December 2019.

Construction Management and Phasing

- 1.32. In relation to the construction methodology set out in EIA Volume 1 dated December 2019, there is no change to either Chapter 5 or supporting Technical Appendices 5.1 or 5.2, as the broad construction methodology remains the same. A further two technical appendices have been included (5.1A – Mayfield Enabling Works Construction Management Plan; 5.2A – Mayfield Park Construction Management Plan) to outline how the effects of the enabling phase, earthworks and remediation will be managed and confirm mitigation measures previously envisaged.
- 1.33. This information and construction methodology for the building plots will be refined through the condition discharge process, adding details regarding site-specific mitigation measures required to control the impact of the Proposed Development, as set out in Chapter 5 and cross-referenced in Chapters 6-15 as relevant.

Noise and Vibration

- 1.34. Buro Happold, the authors of the approved EIA chapter, have reviewed the package of information relating to the proposed amendments, including the proposed mitigation measures, and confirmed that the conclusions of the EIA will not change in relation to Noise and Vibration as a result of the proposed amendments to the design of the park. The baseline data used for this assessment remains consistent with the original EIA.
- 1.35. The approved 2019 ES chapter concluded that the effects of vibration are greatest when the excavation works take place in the park area and are not of significance when the buildings themselves are being constructed. Construction noise is of minor significance. A phased construction programme, process of mitigation and controlled site working is suggested in order to avoid significant effects.
- 1.36. Due to the change in phasing of the park, there will be a change to construction vehicle movements as outlined in the subsequent traffic and transport section of this ES addendum. However, these changes are not deemed to change the significance of noise effects identified in the Original ES.
- 1.37. There is no perceptible change to the operational phase of the proposed development in terms of noise and vibration as a result of the changes to the design of the park. On this basis, the original 2019 ES Chapter remains up to date, as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1 Summary of residual effects relating to noise and vibration

Effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
	Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
Demolition and construction			
Construction noise to residents at Piccadilly Place during earthworks and concreting	Minor adverse, temporary	None required	Minor adverse, temporary
Construction noise to residents at Piccadilly Place during piling	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Construction noise to residents at Piccadilly Place during main build	Minor adverse, temporary	None required	Minor adverse, temporary
Construction vibration – earthworks - to residents at Piccadilly Place	Moderate adverse, temporary	None required	Moderate adverse, temporary
Construction vibration – earthworks - buildings	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Construction vibration – piling and concreting to residents and buildings at Piccadilly Place	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Construction vibration – main - to residents at Piccadilly Place	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Construction vibration – main - buildings	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Operation			
Noise ingress	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Commercial noise egress	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Plant noise emissions	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Operational traffic noise	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Traffic and Transport

Policy Context

- 1.38. A review of the policy context has shown that the following national and regional policy guidance documents have been updated since the original 2019 ES chapter.
- *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, 2021)*. The NPPF was updated in July 2021. However there have been no material changes in terms of transport. There have been no other changes to national policy and guidance that are considered relevant to transport in the context of this application
 - *Places For Everyone: Joint Development Plan Document – Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford, Wigan – Draft (2021)*. The Plan sets out the underpinning principals for Greater Manchester’s recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic.
 - *Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 (2021)*. Whilst the policy names have changed since the previous iteration, the principles remain as described in the original 2019 ES chapter.
- 1.39. Since the original 2019 ES chapter was prepared, there has been no changes to local planning policy and/or guidance.

Baseline Conditions

- 1.40. The existing baseline remains unchanged from the original 2019 ES chapter as the 2021 baseline traffic flows remain as described in the original 2019 ES chapter. The baseline data used for this assessment remains therefore consistent with the original EIA.
- 1.41. The future baseline set out in the original 2019 ES chapter assumed that the consented development would be complete by 2023. This remains unchanged as the completion date for the Park is due in 2022 and the buildings are proposed to be operational by the end of 2023. Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) have confirmed that the 2023 baseline traffic flows extracted from TfGM’s traffic model and used in the original 2019 ES chapter are still representative.

Construction Effects

- 1.42. The proposed changes to the Park result in the construction phase taking place over a shorter timeframe. The construction phases for Plots O, N and M, which comprise the remaining elements of the proposed development, remain unchanged from the original 2019 ES chapter.
- 1.43. The revised forecast number of construction vehicles based on this change in phasing, and the net change from the original 2019 ES chapter, is shown in Table 2. This considers changes to construction phasing to the Park only.

Table 2 Change in Provisional Forecast of Construction Vehicles

Period		2019 Original ES		2021 ES Addendum		Change	
		Typical Vehicle Arrivals	Per Hour	Typical Vehicle Arrivals	Per Hour	Typical Vehicle Arrivals	Per Hour
		Per Month		Per Month		Per Month	
2020	Q1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Q2	151	1	0	0	-151	-1
	Q3	264	1	102	0	-162	-1
	Q4	641	2	646	2	5	0
2021	Q1	1091	4	1143	4	53	0
	Q2	969	3	1053	4	84	1
	Q3	690	2	732	2	42	0
	Q4	424	1	496	2	72	1
2022	Q1	298	1	309	1	11	0
	Q2	287	1	287	1	0	0
	Q3	298	1	298	1	0	0
	Q4	158	1	158	1	0	0

1.44. The changes in construction phasing result in a small increase in construction traffic during the peak construction year (2021), which remains unchanged from the original 2019 ES chapter. The identified receptors that have had an increase in construction traffic in 2021 are shown in *Table 3*.

Table 3 Identified Receptors with an increase in traffic during peak construction year

Paramics Link Ref	Receptor	2021 Baseline + 2019 Original ES Construction Vehicles		Additional Construction Vehicles		% Increase	
		AADT	AAWT	AADT	AAWT	AADT	AAWT
1	A635 Mancunian Way (east of Hoyle St)	47,468	48,891	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
2	A635 Mancunian Way (west of Fairfield St)	47,468	48,891	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
3	Fairfield Street (between Temperance & A635)	7,656	7,683	2	3	0.03%	0.03%

Paramics Link Ref	Receptor	2021 Baseline + 2019 Original ES Construction Vehicles		Additional Construction Vehicles		% Increase	
		AADT	AAWT	AADT	AAWT	AADT	AAWT
4	Fairfield Street (east of Travis St)	7,472	7,498	2	3	0.03%	0.03%
9	A6 London Road (south of Travis St)	18,566	17,359	1	2	0.01%	0.01%
11	A635 Mancunian Way (north of Fairfield Street)	31,912	31,983	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
12	Fairfield Street (east of A635)	25,012	25,069	1	1	0.01%	0.00%
14	A635 Ring Road (north of Pill Mill Brow)	47,368	47,471	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
15	A635 Ring Road (south of Pollard St)	34,461	34,538	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
37	A665 Ring Road (north of Pollard St)	40,891	40,980	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
38	A665 Ring Road (north of Old Mill St)	38,656	38,741	1	1	0.00%	0.00%
108	A635 Mancunian Way e/b slip (east of A6)	13	18	1	2	8.64%	9.72%
109	A635 Mancunian Way e/b slip (west of A6)	12,182	12,212	1	2	0.01%	0.01%
111	A635 Mancunian Way w/b slip (west of A6)	4,973	4,988	1	2	0.02%	0.04%

1.45. The majority of percentages shown in Table 3 have changed by less than 0.5% on all road links to those set out in the original 2019 ES chapter and this small change in the traffic flows is not considered significant. Link 108 A635 Mancunian Way eastbound slip is the exception to this, which shows a larger percentage increase because the baseline traffic flow is very low at only 13 vehicles.

1.46. Therefore, the conclusions set out in the original 2019 ES in relation to construction effects remain valid.

Operational Effects

1.47. The proposed amendments would not impact the conclusions of the operational phase of the Proposed Development as they relate to the design of the Park only. The proposed amendments will make the park more accessible and will therefore improve strategic and sustainable connections to adjacent areas.

- 1.48. In summary, the operational effects set out in the original 2019 ES chapter are unchanged and remain valid, in terms of cumulative or residual impacts, or the supporting technical appendices.
- 1.49. Residual Effects Table 4 summarises residual effects compared to the original 2019 ES in relation to Traffic and Transport.

Table 4 Summary of residual effects relating to traffic and transport

Receptors	Effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
Demolition and construction				
All local roads and road users	Construction Impact on all road users	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Operation				
All local roads	Traffic Impact on all Road Users - severance, pedestrian and cycle delay, pedestrian and cycle amenity, driver delay and accidents and safety	Negligible	None required	Negligible
All local roads	Improvements to public realm and cycle/pedestrian amenity (which for the purposes of this assessment includes fear and intimidation)	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Air Quality

- 1.50. The approved 2019 Air Quality ES chapter prepared by Buro Happold concluded that with the implementation of mitigation measures, the residual effects would not be significant (i.e. minor adverse/negligible). The baseline data used for this assessment remains consistent with the original EIA. In line with the summary of changes to the transport chapter set out above, the amount and timing of vehicle trips is likely to remain broadly unaffected.
- 1.51. The length of time that the Site would generate vehicular traffic is consistent with the scheme previously assessed and, although there may be some increases in peak traffic flows due to the park being delivered as one phase, this is not considered to exceed the conclusions of the original 2019 ES chapter.
- 1.52. The proposed amendments will not change the mitigation measures proposed as the potential impacts are broadly consistent with the originally approved scheme; therefore, it is considered that

the proposed amendments would not result in any changes to the conclusions of the original 2019 ES chapter.

- 1.53. In summary, the operational effects set out in the December 2019 ES are unchanged and remain valid and this ES Addendum confirms that there are no changes to conclusion of the original 2019 ES Chapter, in terms of cumulative or residual impact, or supporting technical appendices. This is demonstrated in Table 5.

Table 5 Summary of residual effects relating to air quality

Receptors	Effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
Demolition and construction				
Dust and other emissions generated during enabling and construction works	Nuisance from dust deposition and impact from elevated PM ₁₀ concentrations on human health	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Operation				
Operational traffic emissions	Changes in pollutant concentration owing to emissions from operational traffic generated by the development.	Slight adverse	None required	Slight adverse

Ecology

- 1.54. Buro Happold, the authors of the original ecology chapter contained in the December 2019 ES, have reviewed the previous conclusions in light of the proposed changes set out in paragraph 1.15 and supporting information in order to quantify the effect of the proposals.
- 1.55. The approved EIA chapter concluded that two positive residual effects were identified: the creation of the Mayfield Park and the improvements to the River Medlock corridor, both of which will provide habitats to support a number of local and UK biodiversity priority species including bat, bird and invertebrate species.

- 1.56. The proposed amendments include the relocation of the park areas and retention of river walls in some areas to help control existing river flow. The former 'wetland area' to the north east of the site is to become the 'Play Yard' play area.
- 1.57. The former play area will become the new 'wetland area' and will provide areas of flood compensation and manage flood risk on site, upstream and downstream in line with the new river design. It is noted that this will also lead to the creation of altered habitat areas within the park compared to the approved scheme.
- 1.58. Detailed soft landscaping information, including planting palettes, were produced to support the on-going design development and to quantify the impact of the proposed scheme changes and provide guidance on management and maintenance. These provided the species lists and attributes used to assign the planting areas to the habitat types and condition scores used within the biodiversity metric in the net gain assessment, and differ to those included within the original 2019 assessment.
- 1.59. The EPS licence for the removal of the bat roost within the culverted section of the River Medlock was submitted to and approved by Natural England, which was then subsequently issued to Manchester City Council in order to confirm the discharge of Condition 23 (CDN/21/0098) attached to Planning Permission Reference 124972/FO/2019.

Assessment approach

- 1.60. The methodology for the assessment remains unchanged from that used and set out in the original 2019 EIA. There have been no changes to the assessment limitations since the original 2019 EIA. The baseline data used for this assessment remains consistent with the original EIA.
- 1.61. The area now comprises a site that is under construction to deliver the Park as proposed within the documents submitted to MCC to discharge the relevant planning conditions. This has resulted in the removal of some of the river walls, a reduction in height of some of the retained river walls, the removal of the majority of the Baring Street culvert and associated hard standing, buildings and associated ephemeral vegetation.
- 1.62. Despite these recent changes to the site, the assessment baseline (2017) referred to in the original 2019 EIA remains the baseline for this EIA addendum as it represents the baseline ecological conditions prior to any development intervention on the site associated with the Mayfield proposals.

Likely Significant Effects

Demolition and Construction Effects

- 1.63. It was considered in the original EIA that the proposals had the potential to result in a number of significant adverse effects on habitats within or close to the site and species which utilise the site for breeding, resting and/or foraging. The identified effects included:
- Habitat loss to the River Medlock and of higher value habitats on site, including semi-improved neutral grassland;
 - Damage and disturbance from noise/ vibration, lighting, dust, and run-off during demolition and construction to retained habitats including the broadleaved woodland and River Medlock;
 - Potential spread of Schedule 9 listed (WCA) invasive non-native species;
 - Destruction of bat roosts and the potential for killing and injury of bats;
 - Loss of foraging habitat for bats and indirect impacts to retained roosts and foraging areas from noise/ vibration, light, dust and run-off during demolition and construction; and

- Severance of commuting routes from retained bat roosts elsewhere on site due to habitat loss and/ or night-time construction lighting.

- 1.64. The original EIA also identified intermediate year construction effects due to the phased programme of works to deliver the Park and development plots associated with Application 1 and Application 2. Whilst the phasing of the development has changed to deliver the Park in a single Phase, intermediate year construction effects are still relevant as construction of the development plots will potentially impact upon the completed areas of the Park.
- 1.65. The amendments to the proposed development are not considered to result in a material change in the assessment of the significant effects of the demolition and construction phases of the proposed development. Therefore, the effects outlined in the 2019 EIA remain accurate.

Operational Effects

- 1.66. The most significant operational effects from both Application 1 and Application 2 were moderate beneficial impacts to the River Medlock as a result of the naturalisation of the river corridor and the beneficial impacts of the new Park soft landscaping on local fauna including bats, birds and invertebrates.
- 1.67. Amendments to the proposed Park design have reduced the extent to which the River Medlock will now be naturalised, with more of the existing river walls to be retained.
- 1.68. Whilst previous proposals sought to remove almost all of the hard engineered walls along the length of the river in the site, the new proposals remove three distinct areas of the wall, creating the wildscape area in the centre of the site and bankside habitat on the northern bank in the west of the site. This, subsequently, reduces the amount of wetland and riparian habitat incorporated into the Park design.
- 1.69. Additionally, detailed hydrological modelling of the typical annual river flows identified areas where the naturalised edges in the amended proposed development design would be permanently or seasonally wet. The results of the modelling were used to define the extent of the wetland habitat areas that would realistically persist as intended on site. This proved to be less than originally assumed in the previous Park design.
- 1.70. Finally, detailed planting palettes to support the discharge of planning conditions to allow construction of the Park to commence provided further detail as to the types and extents of habitats that will be implemented across the Park which was not available at the time of the original EIA. Assumptions were made based on discussions with the landscape architect team to support the biodiversity net gain assessment presented in the original EIA.
- 1.71. The detailed Park planting mixes were designed by the landscape architect with input from Buro Happold project ecologist and river planting specialist contractor Salix for the wetland and in-channel planting. Proposed planting mixes were shared with the Environment Agency and Greater Manchester Ecology Unit for feedback on species composition. The final proposed mixes submitted to MCC to discharge the relevant planning conditions against the Park, and resubmitted with the amendment application, were considered to provide a suitable balance between native wildlife habitats and non-native planting typical of urban parks.

Biodiversity net gain

- 1.72. The original EIA was supported by biodiversity net gain (BNG) calculations using version 2.0 of the Biodiversity Metric, which was the most up to date version of the metric available at the time of the design process supporting the original planning submission. Updated BNG calculations have been undertaken to support this EIA addendum and to provide an updated assessment of habitat value change as a result of the new Park scheme and detailed planting designs for the Park.

Detailed calculations are provided in an Updated Ecology Strategy, which is included within Appendix 9.1A and is summarised below.

- 1.73. As with the original EIA, two sets of calculations were undertaken for the amended proposed development design. The first demonstrates how the Park supports the delivery of BNG across the wider Mayfield site and the core development area within the Mayfield Strategic Development Framework, working on the assumption that the majority of the recorded habitats in 2017 will be lost. The second calculation considers Phase 1 in isolation, comparing the pre- and post-development habitats and subsequent BNG delivered by this application alone in the advent that future phases of the Mayfield SRF do not come forward.
- 1.74. The updated calculations identify that the new Park design continues to provide a substantial BNG for Phase 1 in isolation. However, there is now a significant reduction in the amount of BNG delivered compared to the development presented in the original EIA, reducing from 175% net gain to 90% net gain as shown in Table 6.
- 1.75. The calculations also identify that the Park no longer delivers net gain for the wider SRF by itself, and so the developed plots within Phase 1, future plots across the SRF area, and areas proposed for hard and soft landscaping will need to consider habitat contributions to support BNG across the wider site. It is considered that given the areas of the future phases and plots that this should be easily achievable whilst making use of built landscaping techniques including green roofs and green walls.
- 1.76. There are currently no detailed designs available to support the production of BNG calculations for these future development plots and work will continue to identify ways in which these can support biodiversity improvements as proposals are brought forward. A summary of the pre and post development BNG scores are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 Summary of the pre and post development BNG scores

Application	Calculation area	Post-Development Biodiversity Units		Pre-Development Biodiversity Units		Change in Biodiversity Units
Update EIA Addendum Park design (2021)	Wider Mayfield site	11.50	minus	13.25	=	-1.75
	Phase 1 site	11.21		5.90	=	+5.31

Mitigation Measures

Demolition and Construction Mitigation

- 1.77. The mitigation measures set out in the 2019 EIA remain valid to mitigate the potential impacts summarised previously, and no further supplementary mitigation measures for the demolition and construction activities relating to the amended proposed development are required. The proposed mitigation measures are summarised in the Updated Residual Effects and Conclusions section below.

Operational Mitigation

- 1.78. Whilst the new design of the Park has reduced the wetland habitat provision and application of the detailed landscape palettes have led to a reduction in the amount of biodiversity net gain delivered by the Park, the amendments to the proposed development are not considered to result in a material change in the assessment of the significant effects of the operational phase of the proposed development.

- 1.79. The Park will still deliver a 90% net gain in biodiversity value for Phase 1 when considering both Application 1 and Application 2, for which the original EIA was undertaken. Therefore, the effects following the application of mitigation outlined in the original EIA remain accurate.
- 1.80. In addition, habitat features have been included within the detailed design of the Park to mitigate for removal of features for species as part of the works, such as crevices for roosting bats, as well as to provide additional enhancements to support the Park in providing improved ecological resource for species in Manchester.
- 1.81. It is considered therefore that the development also continues to provide a **moderate beneficial** effect for local species including bats, birds and invertebrates. Details of the habitat features included within the Park design are provided within the Updated Ecology Strategy in Appendix 9.1A and a detailed Nesting Bird Strategy, produced to support the discharge of planning condition 72 is included in Appendix 9.2A.

Residual Effects

- 1.82. A summary of the residual effects anticipated as a result of the amendments to the proposed development design is provided in Table 7.
- 1.83. It should be noted that the residual impacts for the Application 1 and Application 2 development are not considered to have materially changed as a result of the amendments to the Park design. However, due to potential impacts to the wider SRF, the design of future development plots across the SRF should seek to retain and protect more valuable habitats, in line with the mitigation hierarchy where possible, and create habitats of value for biodiversity to contribute to biodiversity net gain for the SRF as a whole.
- 1.84. Additional habitat provision within the developed plots included within this assessment has not been included at this stage due to the absence of detailed designs. As these details are developed, they should be added to the biodiversity metric calculations, as provided within the Updated Ecology Strategy, to contribute to the net gain delivered by Phase 1 and to further support BNG delivery across the wider SRF.

Table 7 Summary of residual effects relating to ecology

Ecological feature	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
Demolition and construction				
The River Medlock	Habitat loss in Application 1	Moderate beneficial	None required	Moderate beneficial
	Damage and disturbance from noise/vibration, lighting, dust and run-off during demolition and	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Ecological feature	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
	construction of Application 1 and Application 2			
	Potential spread of Schedule 9 (WCA) INNS in Application 1	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Broadleaved woodland	Damage and disturbance from noise/vibration, lighting, dust and run-off during demolition and construction of Application 1 and Application 2	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Semi-improved neutral grassland	Loss of habitat in Application 1	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Roosting, and foraging and commuting bats	Loss of roosts in Application 1. Destruction and potential for killing or injury of bats	Negligible	None required	Negligible
	Indirect impacts from noise/vibration, light, dust and run-off during demolition and construction in Application 1 and Application 2.	Negligible	None required	Negligible
	Loss of foraging and commuting habitat across the site in Application 1	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Ecological feature	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
Breeding birds	Possible killing and injury of birds, by the destruction of active nests in Application 1	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Completed phase of Mayfield Park and improved River Medlock corridor (future receptor)	Damage and disturbance from noise/vibration, lighting, dust and run-off during demolition and construction in Application 1 and Application 2	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Operational				
River Medlock, Mayfield Park and habitats used by fauna of conservation value	Impacts from noise, human disturbance and lighting from Application 1 and Application 2	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Roosting, and foraging and commuting bats	Impacts from noise, human disturbance and lighting from Application 1 and Application 2	Negligible	None required	Negligible
	Biodiversity enhancements in Application 1	Moderate beneficial	None required	Moderate beneficial
Local fauna including black redstart, generalist	Impacts from noise, human disturbance and lighting from Application 1 and Application 2	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Ecological feature	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
birds and invertebrates	Biodiversity enhancements in Application 1	Moderate beneficial	None required	Moderate beneficial

Ground Conditions

- 1.85. In terms of changes that have relevance to the Ground Conditions section (Chapter 10) of the EIA, the proposed changes include the method and required mitigation associated with delivering the park as a single phase. This strategy has been informed by further ground investigations and proposed site remediation strategies that have been submitted as part of the Condition Discharge process to date, which have been appended to this EIA Addendum and summarised below. The baseline data used for this assessment remains consistent with the original EIA.

Likely Significant Effects

- 1.86. These alterations identified within the Ground Conditions chapter of the EIA have been assessed against the baseline conditions, potential impacts on ground conditions from earthworks, construction and operations, receptors identified on and off site, potential for significant impacts, cumulative effects with respect to adjacent developments, mitigation measures where significant impacts are identified and residual impacts.
- 1.87. It is considered that the proposed changes and further detailed investigation works, would not fundamentally change the assessment of the baseline conditions, receptors, and potentially significant impacts during the demolition, construction or operation of the plot within Application 1.
- 1.88. When assessed against potential cumulative effects with regards to other development in respect of ground conditions, it is not considered the amendments proposed alter the conclusions set out in the EIA dated December 2019.

Mitigation Measures

- 1.89. During the groundworks for the park, appropriate mitigation measures have been agreed in order to mitigate any significant impacts to the River Medlock and ground contamination. Therefore, additional measures above those recommended within the submitted EIA are as follows:
- Where areas of soft landscaping are proposed, a capping layer will be required to a minimum of 450mm. Soils used in soft landscaping capping should be natural nonreworked origin and will be subject to a program of chemical testing to confirm suitability for use in this context at a frequency of 1 sample / 250m³ used. Photographic evidence that the required capping thickness has been achieved should be obtained at all soft landscaping locations.
 - The reuse of this site won material will need to be done in compliance with the RoC Consulting Earthworks specification in order to ensure its conformity with requirements as engineered fill.

In addition, the material should be subject to chemical analysis at a frequency of 1 sample per 500m³ used to ensure no sources of contamination are being introduced to site soils during the earthworks process. As is the case with proposed landscaping capping, the contractor should ensure samples of site won material proposed as backfill are taken at the required frequency for chemical analysis.

- Earthworks proposals will see the majority of made ground deposits excavated until natural strata (either alluvial deposits or Sandstone bedrock) is encountered. Site levels will then be restored using site won material that complies with the specification for material reuse outlined above. As such it is considered the risks posed towards both surface (Medlock) and bedrock aquifers will be reduced.
- Special precautionary measures will be required when working near the riverbank. Access to the riverbank should be restricted by way of fencing and / or rails. Access to the riverbank beyond protective barriers should not be permitted unless appropriate risk assessments have been undertaken and alternative safety measures employed. Discussions with the Environment Agency regarding protection of the River Medlock and any works undertaken within proximity of the river are subject to submission of adequate risk assessments and require approval before commencing works.
- It is likely that contaminated material including Asbestos will be encountered during bulk earthworks. All construction persons should be properly briefed on the identification of Asbestos material and, where encountered, earthworks should cease whilst risks are properly considered. The regular damping down of excavations and excavated soils would also be prudent in such instances to prevent dust generation and release from any Asbestos contaminated soils.
- Any sources of contamination uncovered during site development works should be brought to the immediate attention of RoC Consulting for consideration and comment. As required, the findings and recommendations of the current assessment may require amendment to reflect changes in site condition.
- A watching brief should also be adopted throughout ground works and any suspected sources of grossly contaminated soil brought to the immediate attention of RoC Consulting for consideration and comment.
- The operation of plant and refuelling facilities should include appropriate provision to reduce the risk of leakage / spillage, particularly into the site's groundwater table or exposed natural soils.
- All excavated materials stockpiled should be periodically dampened down to control dust release. Similarly, the disposal of any material from site should be completed using covered wagons.
- During redevelopment the workforce will need to adopt full HSE measures to ensure that the elevated concentrations of contaminants requiring cover, treatment and/or removal are dealt with according to current guidelines and codes of practice. Suitably experienced and competent staff should be employed to carry out the on-site remediation. It is considered the use of full PPE and proper site welfare and hygiene practises will adequately mitigate against risks posed.
- Dust mitigation measures are to be employed during the site's development, particularly when dealing with made ground that may contain asbestos fibres. Dust mitigation measures include but are not limited to the periodic damping down of stockpiled materials, avoidance of

doubling handling and real time air quality / asbestos fibre monitoring. Asbestos awareness training should be provided for all groundworkers at the site.

- 1.90. It is considered that, based on the site conditions and the proposed works, that the above mitigation measures will manage any potentially significant impacts associated with ground contamination and will lead to instances of unacceptable contamination being remediated.

Residual Impact

- 1.91. Consistent with the EIA dated December 2019, the residual effects are not likely to be significant during the demolition and construction or operational phases of redevelopment provided that the mitigation measures set out in paragraph 1.89 are implemented as part of the works and these measures are evidenced following completion of the site works.
- 1.92. On this basis, the impact during the construction phase can be managed to **negligible** levels and during the operational phase would result in a **minor beneficial** impact.

Water Resources and Flood Risk

- 1.93. The implications of the amendments to the park and river channel design upon the water environment, and changes to the original assessment made within the original 2019 ES (ES Vol I, Chapter 11), are considered below.
- 1.94. This ES Addendum is supported by an updated Drainage Strategy contained in Appendix 11.1A and further modelling exercises and technical notes (Appendix 11.2A and Appendix 11.3A) to detail the proposed design and consequential works to the River Medlock.
- 1.95. This information supersedes the Drainage Strategy from the December 2019 ES Vol II, Appendix 11.1), which provides commentary on any changes to the original FRA and Drainage Strategy. The baseline data used for this assessment remains consistent with the original EIA.
- 1.96. This ES Addendum is also supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) statement of conformity (Appendix 11.3A), which assesses whether flood risk has changed because of the updated park design.
- 1.97. In relation to Park, different areas of infiltration and flood mitigation and compensation are proposed as part of the new design.

Likely Significant Effects

- 1.98. The alterations to the design of the park have been assessed against the construction and demolition effects relating to water resource and flood risk, which were originally detailed in the original 2019 ES.
- 1.99. As outlined in the FRA statement of conformity, the proposed amendments to the design of the park have no impact on the conclusions of the original 2019 FRA in relation to flood risk associated with fluvial, surface water, groundwater, and artificial sources. Therefore, the significance of effects relating to flood risk remains unchanged since the original 2019 ES.
- 1.100. Taking into consideration the measures set out in the updated Drainage Strategy (Appendix 11.1A), which are outlined in the subsequent section of this ES addendum, the significance of effects relating to the River Medlock and surface water remain unchanged compared to the original 2019 ES.
- 1.101. The significance of effects relating to potable water demand, both during construction and operation of the proposed development, remains unchanged from the original 2019 ES. Water

from wells on the site is proposed to be used for irrigation purposes during operation, thereby reducing the demand for water supplied by United Utilities.

- 1.102. When assessed against potential cumulative effects with regards to other development in respect of water resources and flood risk, it is not considered the amendments to the proposed development alter the conclusions set out in the original 2019 ES.

Mitigation Measures

- 1.103. This section summarises the proposed surface water drainage strategy, set out in the updated Drainage Strategy (Appendix 11.1A).
- 1.104. In line with the December 2019 Drainage Strategy, the updated proposed Drainage Strategy has been designed:
- To protect against flooding
 - To reuse rainwater as a resource for the site
 - To collect and convey surface water away from developed areas in a safe and controlled manner
 - To protect surface receiving waters, in both quality and hydraulic terms
 - To be sustainable and maintainable; and
 - To ensure structural integrity over the duration of the development design life
- 1.105. Since the December 2019 ES, the Drainage Strategy has progressed and been refined. The new below ground drainage network shall replace the existing and convey water directly to outfalls into the River Medlock and to outfall into the designed wildscape, to then discharge overland into the river. Unlike in the December 2019 ES where it stated that pumping stations may be required, the system has now been designed such that all new sewers will drain by gravity.
- 1.106. A Soakaway Testing and Contamination Report highlights the soakaway testing and leachate testing that was carried out on the site. Soakaway results were found in the locations of all rain gardens, this was incorporated into the hydraulic drainage model and it was updated to suit. The results of the leachate testing for rain garden 3 confirmed that no contamination was present, and infiltrating would be safe. In the case of rain garden 1 and 2, there was some contamination present. To ensure that no contaminants were mobilised into the ground water, the design was updated to ensure that at the base of each rain garden the existing ground would be excavated and disposed of, until the existing bedrock material was hit, which was proven to be clean sandstone. The pit would then be backfilled with clean stone and rain garden 1 and 2 will infiltrate into this.
- 1.107. The landscape masterplan has been designed in tandem with the proposed river flood extents, with a designed wildscape area situated at the centre of the site, which intentionally floods in the 1 in 25 year fluvial event and a larger portion of the park designed to flood in the 1 in 100 year +35% climate chance fluvial event.
- 1.108. The hardscape areas surrounding the park are designed to drain directly onto the softscape areas promoting natural irrigation of the trees and vegetation in the landscaping and replicating the natural water cycle. Two outfalls from the site wide drainage system have been located within the wildscape wetland area to further slow the flow into the River Medlock.
- 1.109. Where hardstanding areas could not be directed to wetland or heavily vegetated areas, rain gardens have been placed to capture, treat and convey the flow strategically into the wider network, whilst maximising SuDS benefits.
- 1.110. The surface water strategy proposes to discharge the vast majority of surface water flows from hardstanding within the park to either the soft landscaping or the wildscape area. For the remaining small catchments that are picked up by formal SuDS features, including a filter strip or by

traditional drainage (linear drainage & gulleys) these will either pass through one of the rain gardens before discharging into the river or discharge directly into the river.

- 1.111. All surface water that falls on the surrounding and future buildings will be attenuated on plot with peak flows restricted. The outfalls within the park have been designed to account for these external flows, no additional outfalls into the River Medlock are envisaged as part of future development works. This surface water from the plots will be discharged via a series of pipes outside the park boundary connecting into the park drainage system before discharging into the River Medlock.
- 1.112. The updated Drainage Strategy (Appendix 11.1A) contains the following SuDS features, which have been included in the scheme:
- **Wetlands** - A wildscape area has been incorporated into the park design. This area will flood during high river flow events and a river flow flood model is being developed to help the detailed design of this area. Due to the variable nature of the river flooding, an outfall from the drainage system has also been incorporated into the landscape to provide natural irrigation to the vegetation in this area;
 - **Filter drains** - In the park there are several filter drains provided to drain hardscape and areas of steep slopes. The filter drains will consist of a gravel section with perforated pipe to convey the flow to the drainage system;
 - **Rain gardens** - Three rain gardens have been included within the surface water design to manage the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100-year storm events;
 - **Permeable surfaces** - Paving along the footpaths that are within the park and the flood zones are proposed to be resin bound material, these hardscape areas are designed to discharge onto the into the surrounding soft landscaping, infiltrating through the proposed planting and grassed areas. The surrounding clay pavers and concrete slabs outside of the flood zones are for the most part proposed to be drained by the same SuDS mechanism with a few strategic formal drainage points where levels do not permit; and
 - **Tanked systems** - Plots 'The Poulton' and 'MSCP' have designed below ground tanks within their boundary in order to restrict their flows to a surface water runoff of 50% of the 1 in 100-year storm brownfield runoff rate minus 2l/s/ha as agreed with MCC. The discharge of all the plot designers' attenuation will be discharged into the proposed surface water network within the park that transfers surface water to the River Medlock.
- 1.113. The proposed foul water drainage network remains unchanged from the Drainage Strategy submitted with the original 2019 ES.

Residual Impact

As outlined in

- 1.114. *Table 8*, the residual effects are consistent with those set out in Chapter 11 (Water Resources, Drainage and Flood Risk) of the December 2019 ES and its associated technical appendices (included within this EIA Addendum as Appendix 11.1A, 11.2A, 11.3A and 11.4A).

Table 8 Summary of residual effects relating to water resources and flood risk

Receptor	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
Demolition and construction				
The River Medlock	Increased sediment loads	Minor adverse (temporary)	None required	Minor adverse (temporary)
	Accidental release of hydrocarbons	Minor adverse (temporary)	None required	Minor adverse (temporary)
	Accidental release of hazardous materials	Minor adverse (temporary)	None required	Minor adverse (temporary)
	Leak or breakage of the temporary sewerage system	Minor adverse (temporary)	None required	Minor adverse (temporary)
	Dust and debris	Minor adverse (temporary)	None required	Minor adverse (temporary)
	Direct pollution and / or disturbance from in river works	Minor adverse (temporary)	None required	Minor adverse (temporary)
Water services infrastructure (supply)	Increased water demand during the construction period	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Water services infrastructure (surface water capacity)	Increased sediment loads	Negligible	None required	Negligible
	Sediment clogging and pollution from dewatering of excavations	Minor adverse (temporary)	None required	Minor adverse (temporary)
Site users (construction workers and plant users)	Flood risk to site workers (from groundwater, surface water, and fluvial flooding from the River Medlock)	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Operational				
River Medlock	Pollutants contained in surface water	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Receptor	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
	River naturalisation	Minor to Moderate beneficial	None required	Minor to Moderate beneficial
	Flood risk	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Water services infrastructure (surface water)	Flood risk	Negligible	None required	Negligible
	Change to runoff rates			
Water services infrastructure (foul water capacity)	Increased foul water drainage demand	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Water services infrastructure (supply)	Increased potable water demand	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Site users (occupants of commercial office blocks)	Flood risk to site users	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Wind Microclimate

- 1.115. This ES Addendum has reviewed the assessment set out in Chapter 12 from the December 2019 ES as a result of the latest scheme amendments set out in paragraph 1.15. The assessment approach, methodology, policy context and baseline conditions set out in the December 2019 ES Wind Microclimate chapter (ES Vol I, Chapter 12) remain valid.

Likely Significant Effects

- 1.116. The proposed changes to the park design reposition the locations of trees and planting, which typically serve a dual function as wind mitigation within large open spaces and within urban areas (see Figure 1).



Figure 1 Image showing the proposed changes to the design of the park

- 1.117. The impact of the changes to the design of the park have been reviewed qualitatively and it has been confirmed that very similar operational effects to those reported in the December 2019 ES are anticipated.
- 1.118. BuroHappold has assessed qualitatively the likely level of change due to the relocation of soft landscaping and consider this change to result in a negligible effect in terms of wind conditions. For the case where the park is constructed, the changes in the hard landscape are also likely to be negligible (e.g. the introduction of the bridge on the west side of the park) as the bridge may allow for more winds to move southward during the winter. This is not likely to affect the use of the bridge as conditions will still be suitable for the activity of standing and walking. No safety concerns have been identified.

Cumulative and Residual Effects

- 1.119. In this cumulative scenario, the same mitigation that was tested for the Application 1 and Application 2 scenario has been applied. This review has highlighted likely changes to the wind conditions in the cumulative scenario when the Phase 1 buildings (i.e. development plots O, N and M) are brought forward.
- 1.120. The introduction of the bridge may bring more northerly winds into the area and around the perimeter of the buildings. The location of some of the trees has changed, and new sitting areas are located to the north of the buildings.
- 1.121. The mitigation measures in these areas will need to be reviewed ahead of development at these plots being brought forward, which is controlled via planning condition. Subject to any further design changes, future testing of residual final wind impacts will be reviewed, with recommendations for further testing of wind mitigation proposed to confirm the final residual effects are within the comfort and safety thresholds and suitable for the planned activities. Future monitoring of significant residual effects remains unchanged from the December 2019 ES.

Daylight, Sunlight, and Overshadowing

- 1.122. As outlined in
- 1.123. Table 9, the original 2019 Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing assessment and anticipated residual effects set out in the ES Chapter are unaffected as there are no changes proposed to the height of surrounding buildings associated with the Proposed Development.
- 1.124. On this basis, the baseline information, mitigation measures, cumulative impacts and residual impacts are consistent with those set out in Chapter 13 (Daylight and Sunlight) of the original 2019 ES and its associated technical appendices.

Table 9 Summary of residual effects relating to daylight sunlight and overshadowing

Receptor	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
Operational effects – Proposed Development, Application 1				
Existing receptors				
Dwelling houses	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Liberty Point E	Daylight/Sunlight	Minor adverse	None required	Minor adverse
Liberty Point S	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Liberty Point N	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Unite Students E	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Unite Students S	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Unite Students N	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Macdonald Manchester	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Amenity space 1 (Liberty Point)	Sunlight	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Amenity space 2 (London Road)	Sunlight	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Amenity space 3 (Macdonald Manchester)	Sunlight	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Future receptors				
A	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
F	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
G	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
H	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact

Receptor	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
I	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
J	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
K	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Logik 1	Daylight/Sunlight	Minor to Major adverse if residential, otherwise not considered a sensitive receptor	None required	Minor to Major adverse if residential, otherwise not considered a sensitive receptor
Logik 2	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Mayfield Park	Sunlight	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Operational effects – Proposed Development, Applications 1 & 2				
Existing receptors				
Dwelling houses	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Liberty Point E	Daylight/Sunlight	Minor adverse	None required	Minor adverse
Liberty Point S	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Liberty Point N	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Unite Students E	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Unite Students S	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Unite Students N	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Macdonald Manchester	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Amenity space 1 (Liberty Point)	Sunlight	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Amenity space 2 (London Road)	Sunlight	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Receptor	Description of effect	Approved 2019 ES chapter (and subsequent ES addendum)	2021 park amendments ES addendum residual effects	
		Effect significance (after mitigation)	Further supplementary mitigation	Effect significance
Amenity space 3 (Macdonald Manchester)	Sunlight	Negligible	None required	Negligible
Future receptors				
A	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
F	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
G	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
H	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
I	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
J	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
K	Daylight/Sunlight	Minor adverse if residential, otherwise not considered a sensitive receptor	None required	Minor adverse if residential, otherwise not considered a sensitive receptor
Logik 1	Daylight/Sunlight	Minor to major adverse if residential, otherwise not considered a sensitive receptor	None required	Minor to major adverse if residential, otherwise not considered a sensitive receptor
Logik 2	Daylight/Sunlight	No impact	None required	No impact
Mayfield Park	Sunlight	Negligible	None required	Negligible

Townscape and Visual Impact

- 1.125. The author of the TVIA has reviewed the proposed design changes and has confirmed that there will be no change to the conclusions of the TVIA chapter in the EIA as a result of the proposed park amendments to the Phase 1 Mayfield Application. The baseline data used for this assessment remains consistent with the original EIA.
- 1.126. On the basis that there will be a negligible change to four viewpoints, there will be no change to the conclusions of Chapter 14 in terms of cumulative or residual impact. An updated CGI has been submitted with the Application to confirm the revised treatment.

Socio-economic Impact

- 1.127. The scheme changes to the park have been reviewed by ekosgen to provide an update on how the changes, described in this EIA Addendum, impact the previous socio-economic impact assessment in the Environmental Statement for Mayfield Phase 1.
- 1.128. It is considered that, due to the buildings remaining as approved, the proposed amendments would not result in any significant cumulative impacts when considered alongside other committed development and / or proposed development close to the site in relation to socio-economic impact.

Conclusion

- 1.129. In view of the information set out in this EIA Addendum Statement, it can be concluded that there will be no significant effects on the environment, on or close to the application site, beyond those already identified and mitigated for within the EIA dated December 2019, as a result of the proposed amendments to the park.
- 1.130. As such, there are no changes required to the Non-Technical Summary of the EIA and the Technical Appendices (Volume 2) remain the same unless included in the Appendices to this EIA Addendum.



This document is confidential and it is not to be copied or made available to any other party. Deloitte LLP does not accept any liability for use of or reliance on the contents of this document by any person save by the intended recipient(s) to the extent agreed in a Deloitte LLP engagement contract.

This Environmental Statement has been prepared by Deloitte Real Estate, with technical input from Buro Happold “the Consultants”. Although we have read the Consultants’ reports for consistency and provide our observations based on our knowledge and experience, we accept no liability or responsibility for the Consultant’s Reports and will not be responsible for the technical content of this document.

If this document contains details of an arrangement that could result in a tax or National Insurance saving, no such conditions of confidentiality apply to the details of that arrangement (for example, for the purpose of discussion with tax authorities).

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 1 New Street Square, London, EC4A 3HQ, United Kingdom.

Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom affiliate of Deloitte NSE LLP, a member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee (“DTTL”). DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL and Deloitte NSE LLP do not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more about our global network of member firms. Real Estate Services regulated by RICS.