# Biodiversity Metric Report

Levenshulme Cricket Club
Reference: 82-211-R2-4
Date: February 26



# E3P

Taylor Road
Trafford Park
Urmston
Manchester
M41 7JQ

+ 44 (0) 161 707 9612
https://e3p.co.uk

Registered in England
CRN: 08725262

## QUALITY ASSURANCE

| Report reference | **82-211-R2-4** |
|---|---|

| REV REF: | DESCRIPTION | AUTHOR | CHECKED | AUTHORISED | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| R2-2 | Updated landscape plans | PP | HM | CK | 25/11/25 |
| R2-3 | Updated landscape plans | PP | HM | CK | 14/01/26 |
| R2-4 | Updated landscape plans | PP | HM | CK | 10/02/26 |

This report has been prepared for the sole benefit, use, and information of the client. The liability of Environmental Engineering Partnership Limited T/A E3P with respect to the information contained in the report will not extend to any third party. This report has been prepared by the qualified persons as listed below.

| WRITTEN BY | QUALIFICATIONS | POSITION |
|---|---|---|
| Phoebe Parry | BSc (Hons) | Consultant Ecologist |

| REVIEWED BY | QUALIFICATIONS | POSITION |
|---|---|---|
| Huw Morgan | BSc (Hons), MIEnvSc, CEnv, MCIEEM | Principal Ecologist |

| AUTHORISED BY | QUALIFICATIONS | POSITION |
|---|---|---|
| Celia Kenyon | BSc (Hons), MSc, MIEnvSc, CEnv, MCIEEM | Associate Director |

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| | |
|---|---|
| **Site Address** | East Levenshulme Cricket Club, Elsa Road, Manchester M19 3JG |
| **Co-ordinates** | E 388375, N 394253 |
| **Site Area** | 1.28 ha |
| **Current Site Use** | The site comprises the former East Levenshulme Cricket Club, which was inactive at the time of the survey. Residential housing defines the northern and western site boundary, while a series of allotments are located directly adjacent to the east and south of the site. |
| **Proposed Development** | Development proposals comprise the redevelopment of the site to residential housing, with associated roads and landscaping. |
| **Results** | Based on the Draft Landscape Masterplan, the biodiversity metric results show a loss of 9.17 (-81.84%) habitat units and 0.81 (93.63%) hedgerow units on-site.<br><br>The trading rules of the metric would not be satisfied, as the other neutral grassland, bramble and mixed scrub, individual trees, and hedgerows lost have not been 'traded up'.<br><br>**Based on the current plans, a deficit on the 10% requirement of 10.29 habitat units will be incurred as a result of the development**. Furthermore, the following medium distinctiveness habitat units would need to be offset to satisfy the trading rules: 5.92 grassland units, 1.59 heathland and shrub units, and 2.45 individual tree units.<br><br>**Furthermore, a deficit on 10% requirement of 0.90 hedgerow units will be incurred as a result of the development,** including 0.74 medium distinctiveness and 0.12 low distinctiveness hedgerow units needed to satisfy the trading rules. |
| **Conclusions and Recommendations** | The proposed scheme shows a total loss of 9.17 habitat units (81.84%) and 0.81 hedgerow units (93.63%) as a result of the development. Due to the lack of compensation for the loss of the other neutral grassland, bramble scrub, mixed scrub, individual trees, and hedgerow habitats, the trading rules within the metric are not satisfied. Furthermore, due to the lack of available space to use as compensation within the site, this is considered to be unfeasible.<br><br>Given the loss of habitats on site and the limited area available for landscaping, it is not anticipated that the site would be able to achieve a 10% net gain and satisfy the trading rules; as such, off-site compensation or conservation offset payment will be required for the development to proceed. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) will need to be consulted to determine if an offset payment is acceptable.<br><br>Additional species enhancements could be provided on-site, which could include bat boxes, bird boxes, and hedgehog houses. |

# Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 2

1.INTRODUCTION ..... 4
1.1. Background ..... 4
1.2. Previous Surveys ..... 4
1.3. Site Location ..... 4
1.4. Objectives ..... 5

2.METHODOLOGY ..... 6
2.1. Biodiversity Metric ..... 6
2.1.1. On-Site Habitat Baseline Data ..... 6
2.1.2. Post-Development Habitat Creation ..... 6
2.2. Limitations ..... 6

3.RESULTS ..... 7
3.1. On-Site Baseline Condition Assessment Results ..... 7
3.2. Habitat Retention ..... 11
3.3. Habitat Creation Condition Assessment ..... 11
3.4. Strategic Significance ..... 0
3.5. Biodiversity Unit Result ..... 0

4.CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 1

5.PLANNING APPLICATION INFORMATION ..... 2

6.REFERENCES ..... 3

APPENDIX I UKHAB HABITAT PLAN ..... 4

APPENDIX II LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS ..... 5

APPENDIX III POST DEVELOPMENT PLAN ..... 6

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. BACKGROUND

E3P has been instructed by Southway Housing to undertake a Biodiversity Metric Calculation at Levenshulme Cricket Club; hereafter referred to as "the site".

This report has been produced by Phoebe Parry BSc (Hons), Consultant Ecologist at E3P. Phoebe holds a qualifying membership of CIEEM and has over two years of professional experience as an ecologist. Phoebe has experience conducting condition assessments and has completed biodiversity metric calculations for a wide range of projects across the UK. Phoebe has also completed internal training on Biodiversity Net Gain and using the Biodiversity Metric calculation tool. She has also undertaken a Modular River Survey training course focusing on generating River Condition, for which she is accredited. Carlin also holds a Level 4 Field Identification Skills Certificate (FISC).

This report should be read in conjunction with 'The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool – Levenshulme Cricket Club'.

## 1.2. PREVIOUS SURVEYS

E3P undertook a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal on-site in December 2024 (report reference: 82-211-R1). The survey included a Condition Assessment of the on-site habitats. During the survey, the site was found to comprise two structures, other neutral grassland, mixed scrub, bramble scrub, individual trees and native hedgerows.

## 1.3. SITE LOCATION

The site is located within the predominantly urban area of Levenshulme, south east of Manchester. The site is accessed via Elsa Road to the north of the site. A series of allotments are located directly adjacent to the east and south of the site, while residential housing defines the western site boundary. Highfield Country Park is located approximately 210 m south of the site. Greenbank Playing Fields are located approximately 310 m north-west of the site. The Secret Lake is located approximately 370 m north east of the site. Fallowfield Brook is located approximately 370 m south east of the site at its closest point. Nutsford Vale Park is located approximately 600 m north-west of the site. Please refer to Figure 1 for the approximate site location.

**Figure 1 Approximate Site Location**



## 1.4. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Biodiversity Metric are to:

- Identify the percentage change in on-site habitat.
- Identify the number of habitat units lost/gained on-site; and
- Determine the need for a conservation offset payment or off-site habitat creation.

The findings of the calculation are detailed within this report, along with recommendations.

# 2. METHODOLOGY

## 2.1. BIODIVERSITY METRIC

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' (DEFRA) Statutory Biodiversity Metric 2024 version was used to undertake the metric calculation. The metric was undertaken following guidance as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide (DEFRA, 2024).

This metric was calculated by Consultant Ecologist Phoebe Parry, BSc (Hons). Phoebe has completed calculations and has undertaken internal training on Biodiversity Net Gain and using the Biodiversity Metric calculation tool. Phoebe has also completed Condition Assessments on a number of sites across the UK and holds a Level 4 FISC.

This metric was reviewed by Director Celia Kenyon, BSc (Hons) MSc MIEnvSc CEnv MCIEEM. Celia has undertaken a number of online training courses with CIEEM, including 'Calculating and Using Biodiversity Units with Metric 2.0' and 'Biodiversity Net Gain Through Development'. Celia has also completed Condition Assessments on a number of sites across the UK and holds a Level 3 FISC.

### 2.1.1. ON-SITE HABITAT BASELINE DATA

The baseline data used to inform the condition assessment was collected on 09th December 2024 during the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (report reference: 82-211-R1). The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment Sheets (DEFRA, 2024) were used to undertake the condition assessment. The methodology follows the Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide (DEFRA, 2024).

On-site baseline habitats were measured off the UKHab Habitat Plan using QGIS and input into the metric. The Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of the individual trees were taken from the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) produced by E3P in May 2025 (Report Reference: 82-211-R3). These RPAs were used to inform the size categories input into the Metrics Tree Helper. Please see Appendix I for the UKHab Habitat Plan.

### 2.1.2. POST-DEVELOPMENT HABITAT CREATION

The Landscape Proposals was used to measure the proposed habitat creation on-site (Trevor Bridge Associates Ltd, 2026, Drawing Reference: 7775.01D). The areas of proposed habitat were measured using QGIS from the PDF drawing. The RPAs of proposed trees were calculated using the metric's tree helper. All newly planted trees are assumed to be small (<30cm diameter at breast height (DBH) when planted) in line with the guidance. Please see Appendix II for the Draft Landscape Masterplan and Appendix III for the Post Development Plan.

## 2.2. LIMITATIONS

Some areas on the site are double-counted, including root protection zones and areas of habitat, where overlap is shown. This means areas of habitat pre- and post-development do not total to the same area. However, this is accounted for within the metric.

# 3. RESULTS

## 3.1. ON-SITE BASELINE CONDITION ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Table 1 shows the details of the habitat condition assessment used for input into the metric calculation tool.

**Table 1 Habitat Baseline Condition Assessment Results**

| HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB) | AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM) | CONDITION ASSESSMENT | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Urban – Developed Land; Sealed Surface (Buildings and Hardstanding) | 0.1865 | N/A - Other | N/A – Other – Condition assessment automatically assigned by the metric. |
| Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland | 0.7399 | Moderate | Passes 4 of 6 condition assessment criteria:<br>• The grassland is a good representation of the habitat type it has been identified as, based on its UKHab description – the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely match the characteristics of the specific grassland habitat type. Indicator species listed by UKHab for the specific grassland habitat type are consistently present.<br>• Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm, and at least 20% is more than 7 cm), creating microclimates.<br>• Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) warrens.<br>• Cover of bracken (*Pteridium aquilinum*) is less than 20%, and the cover of scrub (including bramble (*Rubus fruticosus agg.*) is less than 5%. |
| Heathland and Shrub - Bramble Scrub | 0.3132 | N/A | N/A – Condition assessment automatically assigned by the metric. |
| Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub | 0.0422 | Moderate | Passes 3 of 5 condition assessment criteria: |

| HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB) | AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM) | CONDITION ASSESSMENT | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type - the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description (At least 80% of scrub is native, there are at least three native woody species, and no single species comprises more than 75% of the cover).<br>• There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA)), and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover.<br>• The scrub has a well-developed edge with scattered scrub and tall grassland, or forbs present between the scrub and the adjacent habitat. |
| **Individual Trees – Urban Trees** | 0.114 (x 28 small trees) | Moderate | Passes 4 of 6 condition assessment criteria:<br>• The tree is a native species.<br>• The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making <10% of the total area and no individual gaps being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).<br>• No evidence of adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities.<br>• More than 20% of the tree canopy is oversailing vegetation beneath. |
| | 0.0041 (x1 small tree) | Good | Passes 5 of 6 condition assessment criteria: |

| HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB) | AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM) | CONDITION ASSESSMENT | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • The tree is a native species.<br>• The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making <10% of the total area and no individual gaps being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).<br>• No evidence of adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities.<br>• Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as the presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.<br>• More than 20% of the tree canopy is oversailing vegetation beneath. |
| | 0.228 (x 7 small trees, x 10 medium trees, x 1 large tree) | Good | Passes 5 of 6 condition assessment criteria:<br>• The tree is a native species.<br>• The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making <10% of the total area and no individual gaps being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).<br>• The tree is mature.<br>• No evidence of adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities.<br>• More than 20% of the tree canopy is oversailing vegetation beneath. |
| Native Hedgerow | 0.030 | Moderate | No more than four failures in total.<br>AND<br>Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (Fails C1 and C2).<br>• Height >1.5 m average along the length.<br>• >Width 1.5 m average along length. |

| HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB) | AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM) | CONDITION ASSESSMENT | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length.<br>• Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5 m.<br>• >90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native plant species (including those listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and recently introduced species.<br>• >90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities. |
| **Species-Rich Native Hedgerow with Trees** | 0.093 | Moderate | No more than five failures in total.<br>AND<br>Does not fail attributes in more than one functional group (Fails B1, C1 and C2).<br>• Height >1.5 m average along the length.<br>• >Width 1.5 m average along length.<br>• Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5 m.<br>• >90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native plant species (including those listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and recently introduced species.<br>• >90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.<br>• There is more than one age-class of tree present, and there is, on average, one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 – 50 m of hedgerow. |

| HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB) | AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM) | CONDITION ASSESSMENT | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | At least 95% of the hedgerow trees are in a healthy condition (excluding veteran features valuable for wildlife). There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by damage from livestock or wild animals, pests or diseases, or human activity. |

## 3.2. HABITAT RETENTION

Table 2 outlines the area of habitats to be retained, which includes a small number of the on-site trees. All other habitats on-site will be lost to the development.

**Table 2 Habitat Retention**

| HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB) | AREA (HA) | CONDITION |
|---|---|---|
| **Individual Trees – Urban Tree** | 0.0407 (T9, T11, T13, T16, T24, T25, T27, T38, T40, T41*) | Moderate |
| **Individual Trees – Urban Tree** | 0.0733 (T10, T12, T15, T26, T37, T39*) | Good |

**Tree numbers are taken from the AIA produced by E3P in May 2025 (Report Reference: 82-211-R3).

## 3.3. HABITAT CREATION CONDITION ASSESSMENT

As per the Landscape Proposals, the site will comprise residential housing, with associated gardens and hardstanding, with several small areas of public open space (POS). Table 3 shows the details of the target condition assessment, and it has been assumed that there will be no significant delay in the creation of the proposed habitat features; as such, the delay in starting habitat creation has been set to zero.

**Table 3 Habitat Creation Condition Assessment Results**

| HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB) | AREA/LENGTH (HA/KM) | TARGET CONDITION/DESCRIPTION | TARGET TIME TO CONDITION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Urban – Developed Land; Sealed Surface (Plots) | 0.8712 | N/A<br><br>N/A – Other – Condition assessment automatically assigned by the metric. | N/A |
| Urban – Vegetated Garden | 0.3797 | N/A<br><br>N/A – Condition assessment automatically assigned by the metric. | Target time to condition will be one year. |
| Grassland – Modified Grassland | 0.0189 | Poor<br>Fails criterion 1 which is essential for achieving moderate condition as there are less than 6-8 species per m2 | Target time to condition will be one year. |
| Urban – Introduced Shrub | 0.0121 | N/A<br><br>N/A – Condition assessment automatically assigned by the metric. | Target time to condition will be one year. |
| Individual Trees – Urban Tree | 0.0122 (3 x small trees) | Moderate<br><br>Passes 4 of 6 condition assessment criteria:<br>• The tree is a native species.<br>• The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making <10% of the total area and no individual gap being >5m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).<br>• There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicides, or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain 75% of the expected canopy for their age range and height.<br>• More than 20% of the tree canopy is oversailing vegetation beneath. | Target time to condition will be 27 years. |
| Non-Native Ornamental hedgerow | 0.057 | Poor<br><br>N/A – Condition assessment automatically assigned by the metric. | Target time to condition will be one year. |

## 3.4. STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE

The strategic significance was defined as 'Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy' as the site is not defined within the Greater Manchester Nature Network (Greater Manchester Combined Authority, 2025) or the Manchester City Council Local Plan (2012) for its ecological value. Additionally, although the site comprises ecologically valuable habitats, they are not well connected to the wider landscape. Species are therefore likely to prioritise areas such as Highfield Country Park within the local area.

## 3.5. BIODIVERSITY UNIT RESULT

The headline results of the metric show a loss of 9.17 habitat units and 0.81 hedgerow units as a result of the development. Table 4 shows the headline results detailed within the Biodiversity Metric. Table 5 shows the deficit results.

**Table 4 Headline Results**

| HEADLINE | CATEGORY | RESULT |
|---|---|---|
| Total Net Unit Change | Habitat Units | -9.17 |
| | Hedgerow Units | -0.81 |
| | Watercourse Units | N/A |
| Total Net % Change | Habitat Units | -81.84% |
| | Hedgerow Units | -93.63% |
| | Watercourse Units | N/A |

**Table 5 Unit Deficit on a 10% Gain**

| CATEGORY | TARGET | BASELINE UNITS | UNITS REQUIRED | UNIT DEFICIT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Habitat Units | 10% | 11.21 | 12.33 | 10.29 |
| Hedgerow Units | 10% | 0.86 | 0.95 | 0.90 |
| Watercourse Units | 10% | 0.00 | 0.00 | N/A |

The trading rules of the metric would not be satisfied, as the other neutral grassland, bramble and mixed scrub, individual trees, and hedgerows lost have not been 'traded up'.

Based on the current plans, a deficit on the 10% requirement of 10.29 habitat units will be incurred as a result of the development. Furthermore, the following medium distinctiveness habitat units would need to be offset to satisfy the trading rules: 5.92 grassland units, 1.59 heathland and shrub units, and 2.45 individual tree units.

Furthermore, a deficit on 10% requirement of 0.90 hedgerow units will be incurred as a result of the development, including 0.74 medium distinctiveness and 0.12 low distinctiveness hedgerow units needed to satisfy the trading rules.

# 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed scheme shows a total loss of 9.17 habitat units (81.84%) and 0.81 hedgerow units (93.63%) as a result of the development. Due to the lack of compensation for the loss of the other neutral grassland, bramble scrub, mixed scrub, individual trees, and hedgerow habitats, the trading rules within the metric are not satisfied. Based on the current layout, a 10% net gain in habitat and hedgerow units is unlikely to be achieved on-site, and off-site compensation or a conservation offset payment will be required.

**Based on current plans, a deficit of 10.29 habitat units and 0.90 hedgerow units will need to be compensated for to achieve a 10% net gain.** Furthermore, the following medium distinctiveness habitat units would need to be offset to satisfy the trading rules: 5.92 grassland units, 1.59 heathland and shrub units, 2.45 individual tree units, and 0.74 medium distinctiveness and 0.12 low distinctiveness hedgerow units needed to satisfy the trading rules.

Given the loss of habitats on site and the limited area available for landscaping, it is not anticipated that the site would be able to achieve a 10% net gain and satisfy the trading rules; as such, off-site compensation or conservation offset payment will be required for the development to proceed. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) will need to be consulted to determine if an offset payment is acceptable.

The Biodiversity Metric does not take into account additional species enhancements within the site, and to further increase the site's value for wildlife, the following could be provided:

- Creation of hibernacula (following the guidance set out within Froglife, 2001) for common amphibians.
- Hedgehog houses may be installed to enhance the site for hedgehogs.
- Bat and bird boxes could be installed on proposed buildings and/or retained mature trees within the site.

# 5. PLANNING APPLICATION INFORMATION

**Please provide the pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitats on the date of calculation.**

11.21 habitat units / 0.86 hedgerow units

**Please provide the date the onsite pre-development biodiversity value was calculated:**

19/12/2024

**If an earlier date, to the date of the planning application, has been used, please provide details on why this date has been used:**

N/A

**When was the version of the biodiversity metric used published?**

23/07/2024

**Has there been any loss (or degradation) of any onsite habitat(s), resulting from activities carried out before the date the onsite pre-development biodiversity value was calculated. Either:**

- **- on or after 30 January 2020, which were not in accordance with a planning permission; or**
- **- on or after 25 August 2023, which were in accordance with a planning permission?**

No

**Does the development site have irreplaceable habitats (corresponding to the descriptions in column 1 of [Schedule to the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations (2023)) which are:**

**i. on land to which the application relates; and**

**ii. exist on the date of the application for planning permission (or an earlier agreed date)**

No

# 6. REFERENCES

- Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (2024). The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide.
- Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (2024). Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.
- E3P (2024). Preliminary Ecological Appraisal – Levenshulme Cricket Club (Report Reference 82-211-R1).
- E3P (2025). Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Report – Levenshulme Cricket Club (Report Reference: 82-211-R3).
- Greater Manchester Combined Authority (2025). Greater Manchester Nature Network
- Manchester City Council (2012). Local Plan.
- National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.
- Trevor Bridge Associates Ltd (2026). Landscape Proposals (DWG no. 7775.01D)
- UKHab (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0.
- Wildlife and Countryside Act (2010). Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

## END OF REPORT

# APPENDIX I
# UKHAB HABITAT PLAN






Key:

- Red Line Boundary
- Large urban trees
- Medium urban tree
- Small individual trees
- Native hedgerow
- Species-rich native hedgerow
- Bramble scrub
- Developed land; sealed surface
- Mixed scrub
- Other neutral grassland
- Buildings

Notes

| Issue: | Revision: | Date: | Drawn: | Authorised: |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | LS2 | 09/01/2026 | CK |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Client: Southway Housing | Job No. 82-211 | Date: 09/01/2026 |
| | Drawing No. 82-211-001 | Scale: 1:750 @ A4 |
| Job title: Levenshulme Cricket Club | Drawing title: UKHab Habitat Plan | |

Environmental Engineering Partnership Ltd
Manchester Office
Taylor Road, Urmston M41 7JQ
Tel: 0161 707 9612
Email: info@e3p.co.uk
Website: www.e3p.co.uk

The client must not amend any drawing, design or other intellectual property produced by E3P Ltd without permission in writing from E3P Ltd in advance of any amendments being made. In the event that such written permission is not obtained in advance of the amendments being made, E3P Ltd shall not be liable for any damage and/or losses occurring as a result of the amended drawing, design or intellectual property.

# APPENDIX II
# LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS




MARCLIFFE
ANCHOR CLOSE
HALLSVILLE RO
plot 33
plot 32
plot 31
plot 30
plot 29
plot 28
plot 27
plot 34
plot 35
plot 36
plot 37
plot 38
plot 39
plot 40
plot 41
plot 42
plot 43
plot 44
plot 45
plot 46
plot 47
plot 48
plot 49
plot 50
plot 1
plot 2
plot 5
plot 6
plot 7
plot 8
plot 9
plot 10
plot 11
plot 12
plot 13
plot 14
plot 15
plot 16
plot 17
plot 18
plot 19
plot 20
plot 21
plot 22
plot 23
plot 24
plot 25
plot 26
44 No.FS
1 No.PCC
6 No.HMT
5 No.CSB
5 No.SJA
6 No.HEP
9 No.EEG
1 No.CA
1 No.ILEA
10 No.HMT
18 No.CSB
6 No.PFF
9 No.HEP
8 No.PFF
8 No.SJA
344 No.FS
13 No.VINMIAT
18 No.PKD
26 No.SS
14 No.COF
24 No.RM
21 No.VINMIAT
25 No.PKD
16 No.CSB
27 No.SS
19 No.PKD
4 No.EEG
7 No.HMT
4 No.BCO
4 No.SR
4 No.HMT
3 No.SR
6 No.BCO
3 No.SJA
4 No.AJV
13 No.FS
1 No.PAM
4 No.EEG
3 No.PFF
4 No.BCO
4 No.VD
1 No.PCC
4 No.HEP
3 No.CSB
4 No.HMT
1 No.PCC
4 No.VD
4 No.CTS
4 No.HMT
4 No.SR
4 No.BCO
4 No.SJA
3 No.AJV
29 No.FS
4 No.HEP
4 No.HMT
4 No.CTS
4 No.SJA
6 No.EEG
5 No.HMT
6 No.BCO
5 No.HEP
10 No.HEP
5 No.SJA
6 No.EEG
7 No.HMT
6 No.BCO
4 No.SJA
4 No.SR
4 No.HMT
38 No.FS
4 No.SJA
3 No.CSB
4 No.HMT
4 No.SR
5 No.VD
1 No.PSB
28 No.FS
4 No.EEG
4 No.HEP
6 No.AJV
5 No.VD
4 No.HMT
4 No.BCO
41 No.FS
5 No.BCO
6 No.AJV
5 No.HMT
4 No.VD
29 No.FS
4 No.VD
5 No.EEG
5 No.CTS
4 No.VD
4 No.SR
5 No.SJA
4 No.HEP
4 No.EEG
4 No.AJV
3 No.HMT
3 No.AJV
3 No.SR/
3 No.VD
39 No.FS
5 No.SJA
5 No.EEG
4 No.HEP
1 No.ADA
4 No.HEP
4 No.EEG
3 No.CSB
4 No.HMT
4 No.HMT
3 No.EEG
4 No.HEP
36 No.FS
30 No.FS
6 No.BCO
6 No.HMT
6 No.EEG
4 No.SJA
3 No.PFF
5 No.SR
5 No.VD
4 No.CTS
6 No.EEG
3 No.AJV
4 No.VD
6 No.SJA
6 No.VD
4 No.SJA
4 No.PFF
4 No.HEP
4 No.SJA
4 No.PFF
5 No.HEP
7 No.SR
13 No.EEG
10 No.SR
11 No.HMT
8 No.AJV
8 No.PKD
5 No.AJV
16 No.PKD
18 No.VINMIAT
15 No.SS
18 No.PKD
16 No.PKD
18 No.RM
11 No.VINMIAT
3 No.CSB
3 No.HMT
4 No.AJV
7 No.CSB
10 No.COF
18 No.VINMIAT
9 No.SS
12 No.PKD
1 No.SOM
1 No.PSB
29 No.FS
6 No.SR
3 No.PFF
4 No.HMT
4 No.BCO
3 No.PFF
4 No.HMT
4 No.BCO
6 No.SR
6 No.BCO
70 No.FS
4 No.HMT
3 No.AJV
4 No.BCO
3 No.PFF
3 No.PFF
4 No.HEP
3 No.CSB
4 No.EEG
1 No.PSB
4 No.SJA
4 No.SR
4 No.HMT
1 No.PSB
28 No.FS
9 No.EEG
9 No.VD
7 No.PFF
4 No.SJA
12 No.EEG
12 No.VD
9 No.HMT
5 No.EEG
6 No.HMT
5 No.BCO
4 No.SJA
3 No.PFF
4 No.EEG
4 No.SJA
1 No.PSB
1 No.PSB
5 No.EEG
5 No.BCO
1 No.PSB
5 No.EEG
6 No.HMT
11 No.HEP
5 No.BCO
4 No.SJA
4 No.BCO
4 No.SJA
6 No.HMT
5 No.EEG
4 No.SJA
5 No.BCO
11 No.HEP
6 No.HMT
5 No.EEG
4 No.SJA
29 No.FS
5 No.BCO
6 No.HMT
1 No.PSB
5 No.EEG
4 No.SJA
1 No.PAM
1 No.PSB
4 No.VD
4 No.HMT
3 No.PFF
4 No.BCO
5 No.BCO
11 No.HEP
6 No.HMT
5 No.EEG
4 No.SJA
1 No.PSB
6 No.HMT
5 No.EEG
4 No.SJA
3 No.BCO
7 No.SR
3 No.VD
5 No.BCO
4 No.SJA
5 No.EEG
6 No.HMT
11 No.HEP
11 No.HEP
5 No.BCO
1 No.PSB
6 No.HMT
5 No.EEG
4 No.SJA
3 No.PFF
4 No.HMT
4 No.VD
44 No.FS
1 No.SOM
10 No.PKD
12 No.KJP
10 No.CSB
1 No.SOM
24 No.SS
18 No.VINMIAT
19 No.RM
14 No.COF
18 No.SS
15 No.PKD
1 No.SOM
12 No.CSB
20 No.PKD
11 No.VINMIAT
12 No.PKD
6 No.HMT
11 No.SR
8 No.PFF
6 No.BCO
6 No.SR
3 No.PFF
4 No.HMT
4 No.BCO
6 No.SR
3 No.PFF
4 No.HMT
4 No.BCO
18 No.COF
17 No.VINMIAT
17 No.CSB
9 No.SS
13 No.PFF
12 No.RM
23 No.PKD
12 No.SS
17 No.PKD
13 No.VINMIAT
4 No.HEP
8 No.SR
6 No.HMT
4 No.CTS
1 No.PAM
3 No.PFF
3 No.AJV
4 No.BCO
4 No.CTS
1 No.ADA
4 No.CTS
3 No.AJV
3 No.PFF
4 No.BCO
30 No.FS
6 No.SR
6 No.SJA
6 No.SJA
6 No.SR
1 No.ADA
1 No.ADA
1 No.ADA

# APPENDIX III
# POST DEVELOPMENT PLAN






Key:

- Red Line Boundary
- Retained large urban tree
- Retained medium urban tree
- Retained small urban tree
- Proposed small urban tree
- Non-native and ornamental hedgerow
- Proposed developed land; sealed surface
- Proposed introduced shrub
- Proposed modified grassland
- Proposed vegetated garden

Notes

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Issue: 1 | Revision: 3 | Date: 09/01/2026 | Drawn: LS2 | Authorised: CK |
| Client: Southway Housing | | | Job No. 82-211 | Date: 09/01/2026 |
| | | | Drawing No. 82-211-002 | Scale: 1:750 @ A4 |
| Job title: Levenshulme Cricket Club | | | Drawing title: Post Development Plan | |

e3p
Environmental Engineering Partnership Ltd
Manchester Office
Taylor Road, Urmston M41 7JQ
Tel: 0161 707 9612
Email: info@e3p.co.uk
Website: www.e3p.co.uk

The client must not amend any drawing, design or other intellectual property produced by E3P Ltd without permission in writing from E3P Ltd in advance of any amendments being made. In the event that such written permission is not obtained in advance of the amendments being made, E3P Ltd shall not be liable for any damage and/or losses occurring as a result of the amended drawing, design or intellectual property.