### EIA Quality Mark

#### Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siemens Campus, Princess Road, Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Key Issues** –  |
| There were a number of key issues that needed to be addressed through the EIA and design process, including: |

  - The Strategic Regeneration Framework established the development principles and so the LPA advised that each development phase was to be submitted as a standalone detailed application (rather than first securing an Outline Permission for the whole masterplan). It was therefore necessary to adopt a robust EIA approach that covered the two detailed applications being submitted as well as all future phases, in order to identify trigger points for mitigation in future applications. The SRF only provided total site-wide development parameters, therefore requiring the sum of development across all phases to be consistent.  
  - Considering the potential impacts arising from alternative phase delivery sequences.  
  - Implementing a robust pre-application consultation, which provided clear articulation of the EIA strategy as well as identifying and addressing any outstanding issues raised.  
  - Use of appropriate transport baseline data and agreement with relevant highways authorities. |

| **Purpose of the project** |
| Within the context of the existing Development Framework for the wider site, two standalone planning applications for residential and commercial development were submitted to Manchester City Council (MCC). The applications represented the first two of five phases to be brought forward over a period of two years. The Development Framework had previously been endorsed by Manchester City Council in 2014 and established the development principles for future development. The Framework would be considered as a material consideration in the determination of future detailed planning applications. |

| **Description of the project** |
| The planning applications related to land, which is located on Princess Road, Manchester. Phase 1 proposed 2,350 sq. m GEA commercial floorspace, 48 parking spaces and landscaping. The proposals also reconfigured 526 existing parking spaces associated with Siemens’ existing offices. Phase 2 sought a Hybrid permission for residential development to deliver up to 92 dwellings over two sub-phases (Outline and Detailed), as well as 25 residential units. To ensure a robust series of standalone applications, an overarching EIA was prepared to assess the detailed Phases 1 and 2, as well as anticipated development parameters of future Phases 3 – 5. |
**Description of the project (cont.)**
The parameters of future development phases were identified for the purpose of the EIA, due to the need to identify potential impacts. These included a Multi Storey Car Park (526 spaces), and two commercial buildings comprising up to 14,760 sqm (GEA). Due to the parameter approach taken to assess later phases, the EIA will be valid for future detailed applications, so long as they are consistent with the assessed parameters.

Phases 1 and 2 were granted planning permission in 2017.

**Lessons learnt**
The overarching EIA approach worked effectively to ensure a robust approach was adopted and enabled the identification of mitigation required in future development phases. This ensured that the risk of ‘salami slicing’ was avoided. It also provided stakeholders and consultees with a clear indication of the impacts and associated mitigation that would be put in place for future development phases, therefore providing comfort that a comprehensive approach was being adopted. Finally, it provided the developer with early warning of potentially significant costs associated with junction remodelling.

Following agreement of the EIA strategy with the LPA, early stakeholder engagement and community consultation were critical to effective articulation of the relationship between the first two detailed applications and the overarching EIA that included future phases. This was assisted by the production of a graphic representation of the planning and EIA submission, which helped to convey a complex application structure in a non-technical way.
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**Lessons learnt cont. –**

It was considered that technically assessing every possible sequence would be onerous. Therefore, consultants were asked to consider whether significant impacts may arise from any particular sequence and to assess the ‘worst case’ scenario. This approach was agreed with the LPA and provided a pragmatic and robust solution.

Undertaking a comprehensive engagement strategy was of significant importance due to the concerns that were raised in respect of ecology and transport. This enabled the EIA to ensure relevant issues were directly assessed and to make recommendations for mitigation where necessary. The recommended mitigation to protect existing wildlife addressed concerns and gained in principle support for the proposals.

During pre-application consultation, the Applicant’s transport advisors agreed the use of existing baseline data with the local highways authority. Following submission of the application, Transport for Greater Manchester objected to the use of existing data and requested new baseline data be used. The issue was resolved through spot testing certain junctions at agreed times of day in order to check the validity of the existing data. This issue demonstrated the need to consult with all relevant statutory consultees during pre-application discussions.

For access to more EIA case studies and hundreds of non-technical summaries of Environmental Statements visit: [www.iema.net/qmark](http://www.iema.net/qmark)