



Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Risk Management Plan

Project Name	Sparkle Street
Site Address	Sparkle Street / Store Street Manchester, M1 2WA
Client	FORAS (Sparkle Street) Limited/ JRL Developments
Date	24/11/25

1st Line Defence

3 Maple Park, Essex Road, Hoddesdon. EN11 0EX

Tel +44 (0) 1992 245 020 **Email** info@1stlinedefence.co.uk

Web www.1stlinedefence.co.uk **Company Reg No.** 07717863



1ST LINE DEFENCE



Notes for the reader:

- To be filled in by site health and safety manager or equivalent competent person.
- The template below is designed to be completed by the client or a representative of the client who is responsible for the management or health and safety of a project site¹.
- It is designed to be site specific and once completed, it acts as an Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Risk Management Plan to stay on site for the duration of the project.
- The template takes the user through the recommended steps and considerations that should be taken into account or actioned in order to effectively deal with potential UXO risk during a construction project.
- This template should be completed with reference to 1st Line Defence UXO Risk Management Guidelines Sections 1-6.
- It should be noted that 1st Line Defence are not responsible for the completion of this document or the accuracy of information with which it is populated. The steps within this plan are considered to be a minimum (but not limited) 'best practice' set of considerations for the management of UXO risk, but may not apply to every site and every situation. Contact 1st Line Defence for more information or if assistance/advice is required.

Project/Site Information	
Client Name	David Rowlands
Contractor Name	Midgard Ltd
Project Name	Sparkle St
Project Reference (if applicable)	21A00103
Site Address	Sparkle Street Manchester M1 2WA
Name of Client Representative completing UXO Plan	David Rowlands
Site Opening Hours	7:30am to 6:00pm
Approx. max number of people on site	150
What is the nature of the proposed development/works	Construction of a part 28 storey and 10 storey residential building

¹ If required, 1st Line Defence can complete the form on behalf of the client.

--	--

Section 1 – UXO Risk Assessment				
Has a UXO Risk Assessment been undertaken for this project?		Yes	Y	No
<i>If 'No', it is recommended that an assessment is undertaken before continuing. In certain circumstances, this may not be essential (such as where UXO has already been encountered on a site, or where there is empirical evidence of UXO risk). However, even in these cases, it is recommended that the risk to works be assessed by a UXO specialist – contact 1st Line Defence for more information.</i>				
Who undertook UXO Risk Assessment		1 st Line Defence Ltd		
What risk from UXO was assessed? <i>Generally, UXO risk assessments will rate the risk on site low, low-medium, medium, medium-high, high or very high (or a combination of these if the site is 'zoned' into different risk areas). If a risk map has been created, add this as an attachment to this plan and reference the report.</i> <i>List the nature of the threat identified – German bombs, British land service ammunition (grenades, mortars, mines etc.) anti-aircraft projectiles.</i>		1st Line Defence has assessed that there is a Low Risk from items of German air delivered UXO, there is also an assessed Negligible Risk from Allied unexploded ordnance.		
Outline the key points of the risk assessment/summary of findings <i>Summarise the main points of the assessment – history of the site (especially any military history) whether it is bombed, bomb damage, frequency of access, ground cover etc.</i>		The Risk from German Air Delivered UXO ☐ During WWII, the site was situated in the County Borough of Manchester, which sustained an overall low density of bombing, with an average of 27.1 bombs recorded per 1,000 acres according to official Home Office bombing statistics. Aside from the 'Christmas Blitz' of December 1940, Manchester generally escaped the worst of Britain's WWII bombing, particularly when compared with London or nearby Liverpool. While the peripheries of the city were bombed sporadically, the major targets in the city were the port, city centre and industry in Stretford (Annex I). ☐ The site was developed during WWII. Historic OS mapping shows it was occupied by numerous buildings and a timber yard. ☐ No positive evidence of any bombing incidents could be found recorded on site or directly surrounding it within available bomb mapping or written archival records. The closest confirmed incident according to these sources was referenced within Manchester Air Raid Precautions Bomb Census and Damage Map. This was an HE bomb situated approximately 250m south-west of the site. ☐ Post-war imagery dated 1948 does not show any obvious indicators of damage on-site. On this occasion pre-war oblique imagery dated 1937 was available for consultation allowing for a 'before and after' comparison of the site. The site appears largely unchanged between the two images; the structures present on site appear to remain externally intact and apparently undamaged.		

	Of note is a significant level of clearance throughout the southern and western vicinity of the site. Clearance is typically indicative of severe bombing damage however on this occasion, it appears this pre-dates the war as the same clearance throughout the southern and western vicinities can be observed in oblique imagery dated 1937. This is supported by multiple anecdotal sources that suggest the area underwent slum clearance in the 1930s. As a result, it does not appear that this clearance was caused by bomb damage and is therefore not considered to be of concern. It is believed likely that the site's ground cover was conducive to the detection of UXO, with the site composing of undamaged buildings/a Timber Yard. This is because damage amongst such conditions typically resulted in a highly visible trail of debris. Further, it is likely that the site was subject to frequent access and observation during the war, owing to the nature of the site as a working Timber Yard. Moreover, due to the lack of bombing in the area, it is thought unlikely that evacuations on the site would have occurred. In summary, no positive evidence of bombing on site has been found in available record sets. Post-war aerial imagery does not show any major signs of damage within the site boundary, such as collapsed structures/clearance. A significant amount of clearance was situated in the vicinity of the site although this is believed to be related to pre-war slum clearance rather than bomb damage. As a result of the lack of bombing/damage conditions regarding ground cover and the extent to which the site was likely accessed are believed to have remained conducive towards the detection of UXO throughout the war. For these reasons, proactive risk mitigation measures for intrusive works are not considered a necessity on this occasion. Taking the above factors into consideration, the site has been assessed as holding an overall Low Risk of UXO contamination. UXO Awareness Briefings are however recommended as a minimum precaution. The Risk from Allied UXO There is no evidence that the site formerly had any military occupation or usage that could have led to contamination with items of Allied ordnance, such as LSA and SAA. The conditions in which HAA or LAA projectiles may have fallen unnoticed within the site boundary are however analogous to those regarding air delivered ordnance. Post-WWII Redevelopment
--	--

	☐ The site has undergone significant development post-WWII as the structures which once occupied the site were removed and replaced. The surrounding aforementioned clearance areas have also been heavily developed. ☐ The risk of UXO remaining is considered to be mitigated at the location of and down to the depth of any post-war redevelopment on site. For example, the risk from deep buried UXO will only have been mitigated within the volumes of any post-war pile foundations or deep excavations for basement levels. The risk will however remain within virgin geology below and amongst these post-war works, down to the maximum bomb penetration depth.
--	--

Section 2 – UXO Risk Mitigation Measures				
What UXO risk mitigation measures have been or will be put in place? (please outline) <i>A UXO Specialist can recommend and provide various types of risk mitigation measures, both proactive and reactive which can be undertaken to reduce the risk from UXO to as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)</i>	All Works UXO Risk Management Plan Site Specific UXO Awareness Briefings to all personnel conducting intrusive works.			
Name of UXO Consultant	Gareth McGill			
Contact Details of UXO Consultant	[REDACTED]			
Verification report provided following on-site support?	Yes		No	X
<i>Verification that UXO risk mitigation measures have been undertaken, including details of the methodology used, should be attached with this plan. This can be provided by the UXO specialist who undertook the support. This is often only provided following Intrusive or Non-intrusive UXO Survey.</i>				
Has UXO been encountered on site? (provide details)	No			

Section 3 - Site UXO Coordinator(s)				
Has a site UXO Coordinator(s) been identified and trained?	Yes	Y	No	
<i>In the event that a UXO Specialist is not present on site or is unavailable, a suitable person (or ideally multiple nominated persons) should be identified to act as a "UXO Coordinator". This will often be the person(s) responsible for management or health & safety of the site. If a suspect item is encountered, the UXO Coordinator should be informed.</i>				
Primary UXO Coordinator	Name	David Rowlands		
	Primary Contact No.	[REDACTED]		
	Secondary Contact No.	N/A		
	Email address	[REDACTED]		
Secondary UXO Coordinator	Name	TBC		
	Primary Contact No.			
	Secondary Contact No.			
	Email address			

Section 4 - Worker/Visitor/Sub-contractor UXO Awareness				
Is UXO Awareness incorporated into site visitor induction?	Yes	Y	No	
"Actions on Discovery of Suspect Item" poster displayed on-site?	Yes	Y	No	
Do ground workers receive a UXO safety and awareness briefing?	Yes	Y	No	
<i>If the answer to any of the above is 'no', it is recommended that these points be reviewed and actioned where possible.</i>				

Section 5 – Lines of Communication			
Communications Protocol <i>Summarise the means of communicating/raising alarm in the event that a suspect item is encountered – mobile phone, radio, PA system, runners etc.</i>		In the event of a suspect item being found all work operations in the area will cease. The works supervisor will be informed and all operatives will be removed and the area cordoned off. The supervisor is to inform the contract lead. The relevant authorities will then be informed, the site will follow the protocols following this as advised.	
Local Emergency Contact Details	Police Station No. <i>In event of emergency, always dial 999</i>	0161 872 5050	
	Hospital No.	0161 276 1234	
	Hospital Address	<u>Emergency and Urgent Services - Manchester</u> <u>Royal Infirmary (mft.nhs.uk)</u> Oxford Road Manchester M13 9WL	
	1st Line Defence		
	Site Manager No.		
	Client Contact No.		
	Site emergency/out of hours contact number		

Section 6 – Evacuation Planning				
Is there a plan for evacuating the site in place – e.g. in the event of fire?	Yes	Y	No	
<i>If 'Yes', attach evacuation plan and evacuation routes to this document. The plan should show emergency muster points off site. Ideally, plan should also show location of site office, welfare units, toilets, fuel dumps etc. If 'No', develop a plan for evacuating the site showing alternative exit routes.</i>				
Are workers/visitors/sub-contractors made aware of evacuation plan?	Yes	Y	No	
How are visitors made aware of evacuation plan?	Via Site Specific Induction			
Summarise means of raising alarm on site/evacuation plan	Air Horn or Fire Alarm			
Detail arrangements for checking off and accounting for all workers/visitors	Turnstile sign in records or Site Visitor Book			