



MIX MANCHESTER

Wildlife Hazard Management Plan

Airport City Limited Partnership

2488874-D01 (04)

www.rskbiocensus.com

RSK
biocensus
EXPERTS IN ECOLOGY

General Notes

Document ref.: 2488874-D01 (04)

Title: MIX Manchester – Wildlife Hazard Management Plan

Client: Airport City Limited Partnership

Date: 12/08/2026

Office: Hemel Hempstead

Status: Fourth Issue

Revision	Date	Comments/amendments	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
00	26/02/2026		JCC7	TF25	TF25
01	27/03/2026	Update to number of MSCP spaces and Appendix C	JCC7	TF25	TF25
02	08/06/2026	Response to MAG safeguarding team comments (round 1)	JCC7	TF25	TF25
03	10/07/2026	Response to MAG safeguarding team comments (round 2)	JCC7	TF25	TF25
04	12/08/2026	Response to MAG safeguarding team comments (round 3)	JCC7	TF25	TF25

RSK Biocensus (RSK) has prepared this report for the sole use of the client, showing reasonable skill and care, for the intended purposes as stated in the agreement under which this work was completed. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and RSK. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used, it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by RSK Biocensus for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that all relevant information has been supplied by those bodies from whom it was requested.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of RSK and the party for whom it was prepared.

Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work.

This work has been undertaken in accordance with the quality management system of RSK Biocensus.

Switchboard: +44 (0)330 223 6950

Company contact: enquiries@rskbiocensus.com

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Location and development details	1
2	RISK ASSESSMENT	3
2.1	Relevant guidance	3
2.2	Potential bird activity	3
2.3	Hazard identification	3
2.4	Risk species and site attractants	4
3	MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	7
3.1	Construction phase	7
3.2	Occupation phase	9
3.3	Monitoring protocol	11
3.4	Review and continuous improvement	12
4	References.....	13
	Appendix A – Species Risk Assessment.....	14
	Appendix B – Bird Monitoring Log (example fields)	17
	Appendix C – Development Plan (Sheppard Robson).....	18

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 RSK Biocensus has been commissioned by Airport City Limited Partnership to prepare a Wildlife Hazard Management Plan (WHMP) for MIX Manchester (formerly Airport City North) which is located adjacent to Manchester Airport.
- 1.1.2 The development will include mid-tech industrial units, multi-storey car parks, alongside ancillary commercial uses and associated public realm, access and landscaping. This WHMP has been prepared to support a planning application comprising full planning for the initial phase of the development (Phase 1) and outline planning for the remainder of the site.
- 1.1.3 The objective of the WHMP is to identify and manage the attractiveness the new development to wildlife, particularly bird species, during construction and occupation of the site. Furthermore, this WHMP aims to minimise the potential problems associated with high levels of bird activity the development could cause given its proximity to aerodrome activity. The primary goal of this plan is to reduce the potential for bird strikes on aircraft and ensure the safety of personnel, both on-site and in the surrounding areas.
- 1.1.4 The WHMP sets out design and operational controls to decrease the attractiveness of the development site to specific bird species, thus limiting bird activity in the immediate area and abating the occurrences of problems associated with bird activity near Manchester airport. It aligns with UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) Civil Air Publication (CAP) 772 (UK CAA, 2017), International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Airport Services Manual, Part 3 — Wildlife Hazard Management (ICAO, 2020) and CAST Advice Note 3 (CAST, 2024) and integrates Manchester Airport safeguarding expectations.
- 1.1.5 This WHMP should be considered a live document and will be active in perpetuity and is tied to the land. Should the site become vacant, the obligations within the WHMP will remain with the site owner.
- 1.1.6 Visits by representatives of Manchester Airport to the site will be allowed to assess the effectiveness of this plan. If bird monitoring identifies that prevention measures are ineffective, Manchester Airport will be contacted immediately, and this plan will be reviewed within five working days and revised by a competent professional, subject to agreement with Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff. Aggregations of any risk species exceeding their management action thresholds will trigger site-specific assessment. Level 3 (Intolerable) species will require immediate dispersal action, whereas Level 2 (Tolerable) species may be dispersed or otherwise managed where monitoring indicates an increasing hazard or where requested by Manchester Airport Airside Operations.

1.2 Location and development details

- 1.2.1 The site is located 12 km south of Manchester city centre and lies north of Ringway Road West (A555) and west of the M56, opposite the Manchester Airport airfield which lies south of the A555. The site currently includes surface-level car parks, a pedestrian and cycle route, and unutilised brownfield land. There are no sites designated for conservation importance within or adjacent to the site.

- 1.2.2 A plan for the proposed development (produced by Sheppard Robson) is provided in Appendix C. A planning application is to be submitted for the development, which will include:
- Full planning permission for three mid-tech industrial units (units A1, A2 and A5; max. height 12 m) and a multi-storey car park (MSCP; unit E1; 1,493 spaces), along with associated public realm, access and landscaping, collectively referred to as Phase 1 (total site area 4.566 ha).
 - Outline planning permission for the remainder of the site, which will include additional units, a potential additional MSCP, and associated public realm, access and landscaping (total site area 7.45 ha).
- 1.2.3 Landscape proposals for Phase 1 provide green corridors with native trees, hedges and scrub, and green streets with rain gardens. 20% of the scrub mix comprises fruit/berry-bearing species, whilst hedgerow planting avoids fruit/berry-bearing plants altogether (for example, through planting of male-only cultivars of some species). All waste stores are to be enclosed.
- 1.2.4 Proposals include new sustainable drainage system (SuDS) features, comprising swales along with bio-retention and softscape features. All new features that may hold open water above ground will be typically dry and will have a drain down time of less than 48 hours.

2 RISK ASSESSMENT

2.1 Relevant guidance

- 2.1.1 This report has been written in accordance with the following guidance documents, which provides guidelines for the control of bird hazards in the vicinity of an aerodrome.
- ICAO Doc 9137, Airport Services Manual, Part 3 'Wildlife Hazard Management' (5th Edition) (ICAO, 2020).
 - The Civil Aviation Authority's "CAP 772 – Wildlife hazard management at aerodromes" (UK CAA, 2017)
 - CAST Advice Note 3 'Wildlife Hazards Around Aerodromes' (CAST, 2024).

2.2 Potential bird activity

- 2.2.1 A thorough assessment is required to determine whether the proposed development may either improve current habitats or introduce new habitat or foraging opportunities that could attract birds to the site, thereby influencing future bird-hazard risk.
- 2.2.2 Should the development provide these new opportunities, there is a risk that the numbers of birds in the area will increase. A rise in bird activity near airports has been associated with an increased risk of bird strikes. However, the nature of bird activity, the species, and the time of the year are all key considerations in determining the likelihood of bird strike events.
- 2.2.3 Concern is given to any development that may have the potential to significantly increase bird activity within the general proximity of an airport.
- 2.2.4 Therefore, the approach that has been taken for this development is:
- to assess the potential for bird species, associated with bird hazard risk, to be attracted to the development;
 - to design out as far as practical the features that would attract these bird species to the site and enable them to nest and roost or loaf; and
 - to recommend a management and monitoring regime to identify any problems that might arise and measures to address these if they do such as to select deterrents that could be used as necessary.

2.3 Hazard identification

Assessment approach

- 2.3.1 We assessed the potential risk for each of 76 species previously recorded at Manchester Airport using eBird Observation Dataset sourced from the Global Biodiversity Facility (Imani et al., 2025). In line with ICAO (2020) guidance, for each species in the dataset, the overall safety risk was assessed based on:
- The probability of an individual being involved in a bird strike at Manchester Airport, based on the local abundance according to the 2011 Greater Manchester Bird Report (Atkins et al., 2011). On a precautionary basis, the highest abundance

value was used for each species (for example, a species listed as 'abundant' in winter but 'fairly common' in summer would be considered 'abundant' for the purposes of our assessment).

- The theoretical severity of the impact of a collision, which is a product of:
 - Average flock size, with more tightly-flocking species associated with higher severity due to the possibility of multiple collisions. Categorical values for flock size were assigned for each species based on professional judgement.
 - Maximum body mass, with higher mass associated with higher collision severity. On a precautionary basis, the maximum body mass for each species was taken from the Cornell Lab of Ornithology Birds of the World online resource (Billerman et al., 2026).

- 2.3.2 Based on a combination of the factors above, each species was assigned an overall 'risk level' (1 [Acceptable], 2 [Tolerable] or 3 [Intolerable]). Species assigned levels 2 or 3 ('risk species') were considered further in this assessment, and are listed in Appendix A.
- 2.3.3 Additionally, based on the above factors, each risk species is assigned a 'management action threshold', whereby counts of that species observed on site which meet or exceed that number will require management action as detailed below. These thresholds are based on average counts at Manchester Airport (GBIF.org, 2016) and professional judgement. For Intolerable species above 3,000 g, the threshold is set to one individual.
- 2.3.4 Aggregations of any risk species exceeding the relevant management action threshold will trigger a site-specific assessment. Aggregations of Level 3 (Intolerable) species exceeding their management action threshold will require immediate dispersal action, subject to agreement with Manchester Airport Airside Operations.
- 2.3.5 Counts of Level 2 (Tolerable) species meeting or exceeding their management action threshold will be subject to further assessment and may require dispersal or alternative management measures where monitoring indicates an elevated risk, i.e. above average bird numbers compared with baseline monitoring records, or where such action is requested by Manchester Airport Airside Operations.
- 2.3.6 The likelihood that each of the risk species would occur within the site was then considered. Risk species were assessed against site attractants, such as suitable roosting/locations in and on buildings, lampposts and the presence of water (e.g. rain gardens and filter drains).

2.4 Risk species and site attractants

Risk species

- 2.4.1 The main risk species for consideration (Level 3 [Intolerable]) include large flocking birds such as pigeons (Columbidae), gulls (Laridae), Starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), and crows (Corvidae), which are all species of concern when considering bird strikes.
- 2.4.2 Waterbirds, such as Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), Canada Goose (*Branta canadensis*), and Mute Swan (*Cygnus olor*), also classify as Intolerable due to high individual-strike severity, but have low on-site likelihood due to the absence of permanent open water and SuDS drawdown design, and therefore are not a main focus of this management plan.

Construction site

- 2.4.3 Any excavations or earthworks may lead to the accumulation of rainwater within the construction site and may encourage invertebrates, such as earthworms, to surface, thereby attracting species such as gulls, starlings, and pigeons.
- 2.4.4 Food waste generated by site workers may attract species such as gulls and pigeons. Additionally, food waste may attract other scavengers, which could further encourage birds such as gulls to the site.

Building design

- 2.4.5 Nesting Jackdaw (*Coloeus monedula*) can use chimneys or similar structures such as cavities on roofs, but as there are no such structures known on the roofs of the buildings within Phase 1 or the outline planning, there is no potential for roof-nesting by this species.
- 2.4.6 Starling and pigeons prefer to nest in holes or cavities, at times using gaps to access under roof spaces. For the Phase 1 MSCP, the size of the cavity between the façade and slab has been minimised and therefore this is unlikely to be an attractive feature to starlings or other cavity-nesting species. Furthermore, the enclosure of the external stairwell of the MSCP at the design stage has prevented access to ledges or overhangs that may otherwise have been attractive to nesting birds.
- 2.4.7 Birds may nest on suitable internal ledges or cavities within the MSCP if access points are available. Whilst access points have been minimised at the design stage, the ground-level car park entrance and ramps on the 18th floor will remain open and could be used as entry and exit points by nesting birds.
- 2.4.8 The Phase 1 mid tech buildings and the additional buildings in the outline planning may provide nesting and roosting habitat for gull species due to their shallow gradient roof structure and lack of disturbance. Furthermore, photovoltaic (PV) solar panels will be installed on the roofs of the Phase 1 mid tech buildings and the additional buildings in the outline planning. The installation of solar panels may offer shelter, potentially enhancing the appeal of the roofs for nesting birds, including gulls, feral pigeons, corvids, and starlings. Access to the internal space of the buildings will be limited by automatic closing doors and plastic strip curtains on larger opening such as loading bays.

Landscaping and use of outdoor area

- 2.4.9 The landscaping elements includes outdoor seating but does not comprise open bins, skips or food waste resources, and all waste storage is to be enclosed and bird-proof, reducing the potential for food waste to attract birds. A café or food retail unit will be included within Block A7 for Phase 1 (Appendix C) and potentially within the buildings in the outline planning. Birds such as starlings, gulls, corvids, and pigeons could be attracted to the area if food waste is dropped instead of being disposed of carefully.
- 2.4.10 The planting regime for the Phase 1 and outline planning is to avoid any berry-bearing plants for the hedgerow planting, reducing the food attractants present within the site. However, berry-bearing species are to comprise 20% of the native scrub planting mix. The scrub planting mix will include equal proportions (4%) of Hazel *Corylus avellana*, *Pyracantha* 'Saphyr Orange', Sweet-briar *Rosa rubiginosa*, Wayfaring Tree *Viburnum lantana*, and Sweet Box *Sarcococca confuse*. Hedgerow planting will comprise of

cultivars that do not produce any fruit or berries, i.e. i.e. Yew *Taxus baccata* (male only), Holly *Ilex aquifolium* (male only), or species that produced some nuts when they are in fully mature, i.e. Beech *Fagus sylvatica* and Hornbeam *Carpinus betulus*.

- 2.4.11 Furthermore, pollen- or nectar-rich flowering species will be used which is likely to attract insects that would provide a food source for birds. However, given the comparatively limited extent of planting, these measures are unlikely to lead to any meaningful increase in bird-strike risk — particularly when contrasted with the 666 ha of actively managed meadows within Munich Airport's Nördliches Erdinger Moos SPA, where elevated bird presence is successfully reconciled with ongoing flight operations (Flughafen München GmbH, 2016).
- 2.4.12 Most of the tree species to be planted will have light to moderate canopy density (below 30%). Some of the tree species (for example, Common Lime and Wych Elm) have dense canopies. Parcel A (outline permission) includes an existing area of mature trees.
- 2.4.13 Grass swards within the site will be kept under 150mm in height and therefore will not provide sufficient cover to attract birds.
- 2.4.14 There are no new features of standing water within the landscaping proposals. Filter drains underlying all new SuDS features (swales, bio-retention and softscape features) will drain surface water within 48 hours, and therefore these features are unlikely to attract waterbirds.
- 2.4.15 The lamp posts within the Phase 1 and outline landscaping may serve as perches for gulls and corvids.

3 MANAGEMENT PLAN

3.1 Construction phase

- 3.1.1 The following actions will be taken during construction phase of the proposed development to ensure that the risk of increased bird activity remains low.

Ground and earth works

- 3.1.2 Development activities that involve ground and earth works (including planting of trees and landscaping) will be managed to reduce bird-related risks by minimising the attractiveness to corvids and gulls. This will be accomplished through the adoption of good construction practice guidelines, including the prevention of rainwater accumulation in any excavations and in other areas (for example, on access tracks). All accumulations of water will either be drained within 24 hours by pumping away water or access by birds minimised by or covering. Where water persistently accumulates infilling and/or regrading will be carried out to prevent further occurrences. It may be necessary to cover any excavations overnight to prevent rainwater accumulation. Excavations will be monitored by site workers, and any long-term (i.e. longer than 24 hours) accumulation of water will be reported to the site manager.
- 3.1.3 Areas of broken ground will not be left exposed for extended periods and will be covered or reinstated as soon as practicable. Where prolonged exposure is unavoidable—for example, due to adverse weather—these areas shall be compacted and covered with tarpaulin.
- 3.1.4 All material arising from ground and earth works shall be placed directly into a covered trailer or removed via vacuum extraction, including fine aggregate generated during demolition. Finer aggregate material created from breaking hardstanding will be cleared as soon as possible, especially where it occurs near locations that are known or likely to accumulate surface water.
- 3.1.5 Any soil stockpiles and areas of vegetation clearance shall be compacted, securely covered with tarpaulin, and reinstated or removed from site at the earliest opportunity. Where vegetation is used or establishes on stockpiled material, the resulting sward will be maintained in accordance with the CAP 772 long-grass policy, with a post-cut height maintained between 150 mm and 200 mm. When establishing vegetation on stockpiled material only seed mixes approved for airside will be used.
- 3.1.6 The use of proactive management actions will be implemented if the levels of site activity reduce for more than three days.

Pollution prevention

- 3.1.7 The majority of artificial or chemical substances used during the construction phase are unattractive to bird species. However, the following pollution prevention measures will be used to minimise bird hazard:
- All waste from construction is to be stored within the site boundary and removed to a permitted waste facility.
 - Excavated soil will be stored on site or removed by a licensed waste disposal unit.

- All construction workers will be made aware of the location of spill kits, which will be used in the event of a spillage or leakage.
- A member of staff will be nominated as the environmental officer by the Contractor. Their responsibility will be to ensure good practice measures are implemented and adhered to.

3.1.8 Any non-compliance issues or other incidents will be reported to the site manager and project team.

Removal of waste

- 3.1.9 Any food waste produced during the construction of the proposed development will be minimised and will be appropriately disposed of in accordance with the approved construction site waste management plan. Covered bins will be made available where food waste is stored.
- 3.1.10 The construction site will be always kept tidy and any waste likely to attract birds will be collected in covered bins or skips.
- 3.1.11 Deliberate feeding of birds by staff or site workers will not be permitted.
- 3.1.12 Suitable kitchen and toilet facilities will be made available to site workers during the construction phase of the proposed development.
- 3.1.13 Any waste storage and handling operations will be conducted inside a controlled area to prevent problems with windblown litter. Any vehicles with an ejector trailer will be covered with vehicle nets. A competent driver with a Category C and E license will be required to check these nets are correctly installed and undamaged.
- 3.1.14 Pest and vermin control (including rodents such as mice and rats, as well as insects such as cockroaches) may be implemented as needed to prevent them from attracting birds such as gulls and starlings.

Monitoring of construction-phase mitigation

- 3.1.15 A dedicated bird monitor nominated by the Contractor will conduct regular inspections of the site for the duration of the construction phase. The bird monitor can be any employee/s of the Contractor (including the nominated environmental officer), provided they are suitably trained in the identification and dispersal of relevant bird species. Alternatively, a dedicated pest/bird control company could be employed.
- 3.1.16 The bird monitor shall inspect the entirety of the working area on foot, and shall ensure that:
- There is full compliance with all of the mitigation measures and protocols outlined above;
 - There are no bird attractants within the site (such as water aggregations or loose litter); and
 - There are no aggregations of birds present within the site.
- 3.1.17 Any bird attractants identified during the inspection will be reported to the Contractor, who will be responsible for removing the feature/s in question as soon as possible (for example, draining any water aggregations). Any aggregation of a risk species which exceeds its management action threshold (Appendix A) encountered during the inspection will be dispersed by the bird monitor, subject to agreement by Manchester

Airport Airside Operations staff. In particular, for Level 3 (Intolerable) species, dispersal will be carried out as an immediate priority following agreement by Manchester Airside Operations.

- 3.1.18 Monitoring inspections will be made at least twice a month, or more frequently if large or persistent aggregations of birds are observed.
- 3.1.19 The bird monitor will keep a logbook recording any birds or attractants encountered, including both positive or negative registrations for all inspection visits, and actions taken to disperse flocks or remove attractants. These records will be made available to Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff and/or the local planning authority to inspect upon request.
- 3.1.20 Other site staff will be made aware of the need to monitor bird presence within the working area and report any sightings of bird aggregations to the bird monitor. Any aggregations of risk species exceeding their respective management action thresholds that are encountered by the bird monitor or other staff between inspections shall be dispersed by the bird monitor (subject to agreement by Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff) and recorded in the logbook. In particular, for Level 3 (Intolerable) species, will should be carried out as an immediate priority following agreement by Manchester Airside Operations.

3.2 Occupation phase

Prevention of roosting and/or nesting on roofs

- 3.2.1 The roofs of the mid tech buildings and the buildings in the outline planning will feature a shallow gradient (<45 degrees) and will be more than 10m x 10m in area. As stated by ICAO (2020) guidance, where flat and / or shallow pitched roofs greater than 10m x 10m cannot be avoided in the design, there will be access available by foot to all areas of the roof to ensure that any hazardous birds nesting, roosting, and loafing can be dispersed and where necessary any nests and eggs can be removed (under licence).
- 3.2.2 The roofs of the mid tech units will only be accessible via a Mobile Elevated Working Platform (MEWP).
- 3.2.3 If dispersal of risk species from the roof is required, Airside Operations at Manchester Airport will be contacted before dispersal actions are taken. There will be full cooperation with Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff if dispersal action is requested on site at any time.
- 3.2.4 Nesting gulls will be deterred through regular disturbance (at least once weekly between March and September) through access (via a MEWP) and monitoring of the roof.
- 3.2.5 Any nests built or eggs laid despite the aforementioned disturbance efforts will be immediately removed. This can only be done under an appropriate licence from Natural England, and such a licence will therefore be obtained in advance so that nests or eggs can be removed immediately if needed.
- 3.2.6 Where appropriate, deterrent measures such as spikes, wires, netting, or bird repellent gel will be used to deter nesting and roosting by making any ledges, shallow areas, and/or gaps unsuitable for or inaccessible by birds. Where PV arrays are installed, access to voids will be blocked wherever possible using meshes/skirts. Where panels are installed,

skirts will be attached to both the panels and the roof, with no gaps which would allow pigeons or gulls to access voids or become trapped. It will not be possible to net the entire roof space, though it is anticipated that through the employment of suitable deterrent measures and regular checks of the roofs, nesting and roosting of birds can be prevented.

- 3.2.7 Auditory deterrence measures, i.e. playing recordings of distress calls of the birds being targeted e.g. Herring Gull and/or calls of a bird of prey e.g. Peregrine, may be implemented if other deterrent measures have been attempted and deemed ineffective. When auditory deterrence is implemented, it will only occur during daylight hours and will be specifically targeted at roof areas. Auditory deterrence will be used manually and not on an automatic system as this pairs the threat suggested by the auditory deterrent with the physical threat posed by human presence and helps to reduce the chance of habituation by birds to the noise.
- 3.2.8 The killing of adult birds under licence may only be done as a last resort, where all other deterrent measures have failed and there is a significant risk of bird strike. The populations of many bird species are declining in the UK and Herring Gull, Lesser Black-backed Gull, and Starling are species of conservation concern that may be present on or around the proposed development site. If it is determined that deterrent measures have not succeeded and that lethal measures under license are necessary, guidance will be obtained from a qualified and experienced bird control specialist on the appropriate course of action.
- 3.2.9 Through implementation of the above measures, in conjunction with the monitoring proposed below, the complete prevention of successful nesting by large gulls will be achieved across the site.
- 3.2.10 The methods outlined above will be implemented as part of a comprehensive set of prevention measures. No single measure will be relied upon exclusively.

General prevention of roosting and/or nesting

- 3.2.11 The presence of ledges, openings and cavities has been minimised at the design stage. Where birds do make regular use of any ledges, openings and cavities these will be made unsuitable for or inaccessible to birds by retro fitting spikes, wires, or bird repellent gel. This may include lamp posts within the site and suitable internal features within the MSCP. Netting can be used to exclude birds, however this will be checked at least quarterly to ensure compliance with animal welfare legislation and it will be maintained in good condition to be effective.

Removal of waste

- 3.2.12 Site staff will be briefed on the importance of good housekeeping and disposal of litter. Signage will be erected within the outdoor areas explaining the importance of disposal of litter for staff and the general public and stating that birds should not be fed outside the buildings. Regular monitoring will occur by staff, and litter will be cleaned up and removed if necessary.
- 3.2.13 The covered bins within the outdoor areas will be emptied on a regular basis to prevent birds becoming attracted to food waste left by staff. This will be subject to a site wide waste management protocol.

Removal of food attractants from outdoor area

- 3.2.14 Hedgerows will be trimmed annually to prevent production of seeds which may attract birds to forage within the site.

3.3 Monitoring protocol

Buildings

- 3.3.1 A dedicated bird monitor will conduct regular inspections of both the interior of the MSCP and the roofs of the mid-tech buildings as specified in detail below. The bird monitor can be any employee/s of the occupants of the buildings or of a property management company, provided they are suitably trained in the identification and dispersal of relevant bird species as well as in safe roof access. Alternatively, a dedicated pest/bird control company could be employed.
- 3.3.2 The bird monitor will fill in a logbook to record any positive or negative (i.e. no birds present) registrations. These records will be made available to Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff and/or the local planning authority to inspect upon request. An example format that may be used for a logbook is provided in Appendix B.
- 3.3.3 If any flock of a risk species exceeding its relevant management action threshold (Appendix A) are seen on the roofs of the mid-tech buildings, the monitor will proceed to the roof via a MEWP to disturb and disperse the birds as soon as agreed by Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff. Additionally, if any such flocks are seen within the MSCP, the monitor will proceed to the area on foot and disperse the birds, subject to agreement by Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff. In particular, for Level 3 (Intolerable) species, dispersal should be carried out as an immediate priority following agreement by Manchester Airside Operations.
- 3.3.4 Other site staff will be made aware of the need to monitor bird presence within, on or around the buildings and report any sightings of flocks to the bird monitor.
- 3.3.5 The key period for monitoring birds on the roof and within the MSCP is during the nest prospecting and egg laying/incubation period. This is when birds are looking for nesting sites and will be most responsive to disturbance that will discourage them from breeding. This period can start in mid-March and continue until early June. Monitoring will occur at least once a week during this period. During monitoring, the roofs (and MSCP interior) will be accessed and walked safely, and subject to the need for approval by Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff any flocks of risk species above their relevant thresholds will be dispersed.
- 3.3.6 Any nests or eggs discovered will be immediately removed under a licence from Natural England as stated above.
- 3.3.7 Should nesting attempts by birds persist beyond early June, further weekly monitoring inspections will be required. If absolutely necessary, intervention measures (such as the killing of adult birds) will be carried out under a licence from Natural England.
- 3.3.8 The bird monitor will also be vigilant for any birds using the mid-tech roofs or MSCP interior between the routine checks and during the non-breeding season. Outside of the bird nesting period (mid-June to mid-March), monitoring inspections can be made twice

a month, or more frequently if birds are observed to congregate on the roofs or within the MSCP.

Trees

- 3.3.9 In addition to monitoring the buildings, the bird monitor will conduct regular on-foot inspections of all trees within the site, checking whether any aggregations of risk species exceeding their relevant management action thresholds (Appendix A) are occurring within them. If any such aggregations are encountered, the monitor will proceed to the area on foot and disperse the birds, subject to agreement by Manchester Airport Airside Operations staff. In particular, for Level 3 (Intolerable) species, dispersal should be carried out as an immediate priority following agreement by Manchester Airside Operations. Additionally, the bird monitor will fill in a logbook recording any positive or negative registrations.
- 3.3.10 Inspections will be made once per week during the bird nesting season (February to June). Outside of this period, monitoring inspections can be made twice a month, or more frequently if birds are observed to congregate within the trees on site.
- 3.3.11 Where trees are identified as supporting aggregations of risk species, e.g. Rook (*Corvus frugilegus*) which require management to reduce bird strike risk, canopy thinning, pruning and deadwood removal will be considered in the first instance. Tree removal and replacement will be considered as a last resort.
- 3.3.12 Any nests built or eggs discovered within the trees during or between inspections will be removed as soon as possible, under an appropriate licence from Natural England.

3.4 Review and continuous improvement

- 3.4.1 Following a request from Manchester Airport, visits by representatives of Manchester Airport to the site to assess the effectiveness of this WHMP will be facilitated as soon as possible. Manchester Airport may then arrange future visits according to the apparent effectiveness of the bird deterrents and the numbers of birds observed within the site.
- 3.4.2 If aggregations of any risk species exceed a management action threshold on site during three consecutive monitoring inspections, or on three separate occasions within any one-month period during the construction or occupation phase of the development (in spite of the control measures outlined above), this plan will be deemed ineffective, and will be reviewed within five working days and revised by a competent professional, subject to agreement with Manchester Airport Airside Operations.
- 3.4.3 This plan will be reviewed following any wildlife strike reported by MAG involving a risk species (Appendix A), where there is reason to believe that the bird originated from within the site.
- 3.4.4 Furthermore, this WHMP will be reviewed at least annually and following significant changes to site layout/land use or persistent nesting attempts. Measures and training will be updated accordingly, subject to agreement with Manchester Airport.
- 3.4.5 Further action relating to bird hazard management will be undertaken at the reasonable request of Manchester Airport.

Appendix A – Species Risk Assessment

Common name	Scientific name	Local abundance	Body mass (g)	Flock size	Risk level	Management action threshold
Mute swan	<i>Cygnus olor</i>	Fairly common	10200	Usually solitary or widely spaced	Level 3 (intolerable)	1
Pink-footed goose	<i>Anser brachyrhynchus</i>	Common	3860	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	1
Canada goose	<i>Branta canadensis</i>	Common	4858	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	1
Mallard	<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>	Abundant	1301	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	2
Pheasant	<i>Phasianus colchius</i>	Common	3000	Usually solitary or widely spaced	Level 3 (intolerable)	2
Coot	<i>Fulica atra</i>	Abundant	1200	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	2
Buzzard	<i>Buteo buteo</i>	Common	1364	Usually solitary or widely spaced	Level 3 (intolerable)	2
Cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>	Common	3700	Usually solitary or widely spaced	Level 3 (intolerable)	1
Lapwing	<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>	Common	330	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	10
Black-headed gull	<i>Chroicocephalus ridibundus</i>	Abundant	325	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	5
Lesser black-backed gull	<i>Larus fuscus</i>	Common	1200	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	2
Common gull	<i>Larus canus</i>	Common	586	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	5

Common name	Scientific name	Local abundance	Body mass (g)	Flock size	Risk level	Management action threshold
Herring gull	<i>Larus argentatus</i>	Common	1525	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	2
Woodpigeon	<i>Columba palumbus</i>	Abundant	690	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	5
Collared dove	<i>Streptopelia decaocto</i>	Abundant	243	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	5
Feral pigeon	<i>Columba livia</i>	Abundant	369	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	5
Jackdaw	<i>Coloeus monedula</i>	Common	265	Often in loose flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	5
Starling	<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	Abundant	100	Often in tight flocks	Level 3 (intolerable)	10*
Moorhen	<i>Gallinula chloropus</i>	Abundant	493	Usually solitary or widely spaced	Level 2 (tolerable)	3
Great black-backed gull	<i>Larus marinus</i>	Uncommon	2000	Usually solitary or widely spaced	Level 2 (tolerable)	2
Magpie	<i>Pica pica</i>	Abundant	270	Usually solitary or widely spaced	Level 2 (tolerable)	3
Carrion crow	<i>Corvus corone</i>	Abundant	602	Usually solitary or widely spaced	Level 2 (tolerable)	3
Rook	<i>Corvus frugilegus</i>	Fairly common	571	Often in tight flocks	Level 2 (tolerable)	3
Redwing	<i>Turdus iliacus</i>	Fairly common	80	Often in tight flocks	Level 2 (tolerable)	10*
Fieldfare	<i>Turdus pilaris</i>	Common	141	Often in tight flocks	Level 2 (tolerable)	10*

*Due to their tendency to form tight mixed winter flocks, starling, redwing and fieldfare have been assigned an aggregate threshold, such that a total of 10 or more individuals comprising any mixture of these species should trigger management action.

Appendix B – Bird Monitoring Log (example fields)

Date	Time	Monitor	Species/group	Number of birds	Action taken	Reaction	Direction	Follow-up action/person
24/02/2026	12:30	J Bloggs	Herring gull	13	Contacted Airside Operations. Permission to disperse granted by J Doe. Proceeded to access roof via MEWP and walked area used by birds.	Birds departed the site.	West and North.	No further action required until next inspection.

Appendix C – Development Plan (Sheppard Robson)



Illustrative Masterplan
1:1000

NOTES

- Planning Application Boundary
- Outline Development Parcels
- Proposed Building Footprints for Detailed Approval
- Illustrative Building Plots for Approval in Outline (all matters reserved, save for primary access)

FOR ELECTRONIC DATA ISSUE
Please Note: Footprints are based on 'best use' and should not be
re-interpreted for measurement. All dimensions and levels should read, only
from the same datum as used in the drawing.

REV.	DATE	AMENDMENT
REV1	06/03/20	Planning Boundaries
REV2	05/03/20	Planning Boundary Updated
REV3	11/03/20	For Planning
REV4	06/03/20	For Planning

KEYPLAN

CLIENT
Airport City Limited Partnership

PROJECT
MIX Manchester
SCALE: B&A
1:1000
DATE
6/03/20
ORIGINATOR
JD
CHECKED
CP
AUTHORISED
PC

STAGE
Stage 3

SR NO
7092

**SHEPPARD
ROBSON**

17 Parkway, Camden Town, London, N1W 7PL
T: +44 (0)20 7306 1100 E: enquiries@sheppardrobson.com

STATUS: **Planning**

7092-SRA-ZZ-ZZ-OR-A-02050

REV: P04



RSK
biocensus
EXPERTS IN ECOLOGY

www.rskbiocensus.com