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### 1.0 Introduction

WYG has been commissioned by Northern Gateway Development Vehicle LLP (NGDV') to undertake a high level desk top and site reconnaissance constraints and opportunities review of a site known as Area GMA 1.2 ('the site') at the proposed Greater Manchester Northern Gateway development area.

Part of the site is identified as Allocation GM 1.2 in the draft Greater Manchester Strategic Framework (GMSF). If forms part of the strategic cross-boundary 'Northern Gateway' allocation positioned around the intersection of the M60, M62 and M66 motorways.

### 1.1 Instruction

This desk top assessment and constraints review provides information to support the promotion of the site for allocation in the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) and the assessment work will inform the proposed Masterplan for the site.

This report has assessed the land shown on A104444-5-MAN-N-02 as this area was identified by the NGDV for baseline technical and environmental assessment. However, only part of this wider assessment site is being identified for allocation for development within the GMSF (land to the south east of Simister).

### 1.2 Objectives

The overall objectives of the report are to:

1. Provide background desktop and site reconnaissance information.
2. To assess the constraints and opportunities for development.
3. To present next steps a) to assess constraints and opportunities and b) to address planning requirements (for allocation stage only).

The specialism specific objectives are:

1. Review the existing desk top assessments (Flood Risk and Drainage) for Areas 1 and 2, WYG reports A104444 High Level Constraints Volume 1 of August 2017.
2. Produce a flood risk and drainage report to include key constraints/opportunities relating the GMA 1.2 Development Site.

### 1.3 Proposed Development

It is understood at this stage that Area GMA 1.2 will be developed for residential purposes as well as a potential primary school and local centre, with associated spine roads, public open space, and soft and hard landscaping.

### 1.4 Report Conditions

Report conditions are enclosed as Appendix A.

### 1.5 Report Conclusions

The report concludes that flood risk to the development from existing fluvial (rivers and watercourses) sources is low and this is demonstrated on the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning. The masterplan is being developed with consideration of the existing watercourses and where feasible the plans promote green/blue corridors adjacent to the existing watercourses.

The developing surface water drainage strategy promotes the widescale use of sustainable drainage features in accordance with the CIRIA SuDS Manual. Flood risk from the development will be mitigated through these features and water quality will be improved by following the recommendation for pollution prevention for large scale commercial/industrial schemes.

There will be negotiations with United Utilities (UU) to develop an acceptable foul water strategy for the scheme and this is likely to include upgrades of the existing public sewer network and nearby Bury Wastewater Treatment Works. UU have representation on the greater Manchester infrastructure board and will be fully engaged with the delivery of Northern Gateway.

### 2.0 Site Setting

### 2.1 Location and Size

Key details for Area GMA 1.2 are summarised in the table below. For ease of analysis, this report has divided the GMA 1.2 site into two sub-areas, land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60 Simister Island junction and land to south and west of the M60 Simister Island junction.

| Site Specifics |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address | Land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60 junction (Simister <br> Island), Rochdale and to south and west of the M60. |
| Grid Reference | Land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60: 383939, 405837 <br> Land to the west and south of the M60: 382841, 405490 |
| Site Area | Land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60: 146 Hectares <br> Land to the west and south of the M60: 22 Hectares |

### 2.2 Site Description

Both development packages, together forming the 'site' currently comprise agricultural land with local \& main roads crossing through the proposed development area. There are a number of farms \& residential properties within the site boundary.

Both sites have overhead power lines running through them with them being more notable on the land to the west and south of the M60.

| Boundary | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| North | Land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60: The M62 and <br> agricultural land <br> Land to the west and south of the M60: the Simister roundabout <br> and M60 junction 18. |
| East | Land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60: The A6045, <br> residential properties and agricultural land. <br> Land to the west and south of the M60: The M60 carriageway <br> with residential properties and agricultural land beyond. |
| South | Land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60: The M60 <br> carriageway and residential properties with agricultural land <br> beyond. <br> Land to the west and south of the M60: Heaton Park. |
| West | Land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60: The M60 <br> carriageway and residential properties with agricultural land <br> beyond. |


|  | Land to the west and south of the M60: A school and residential <br> properties. |
| :--- | :--- |

### 2.3 Site Walkover

The land to the west and south of the M60 comprises of mainly agricultural land with several items of note including overhead electricity infrastructure with associated pylons, areas of stockpiled materials (including wood) and standing water.

The land from to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60 was identified as mainly agricultural land moving from south to north the following items of note were identified; boggy areas, fly tipped waste (particularly in the centre and north west, in the north west the material included an oil drum, oil containers, plastic, metal containers, a potential tank and wood)), electricity substations, stockpiles of wood and bunded soil. Possible asbestos containing materials were identified at one location in the west. In the northern centre of the site a solar farm was identified accompanied with a number of wind turbines,

The topography is undulating with surface water features (typically ponds, streams, standing water and ditches). The site is open to the public with some vehicle access routes and bridleways.

### 3.0 Site Overview and Catchment Assessment

The site currently comprises agricultural land with local roads crossing parts of the proposed development areas totalling 168 ha. The entire area being promoted by the NGDV lies within the Bury Council boundary.

As described previously, the site can be split into two distinct areas, land to the south of the M62 \& east of the M60 Simister Island junction (South-East Area) and land to south and west of the M60 Simister Island junction (South-West Area).

For the purposes of this report these two distinct areas have been split into sub-areas based on geographical areas, flow paths and local topography. The sub-areas are detailed following and can be seen in Figure 2.

- South-West 1 (SW1) - South west of M62 junction 18, north of Simister Lane.
- South-West 2 (SW2) - North-east of Heaton Park Reservoir, south of Simister Lane.
- South-East 1 (SE1) - Between Blueball Lane and M62.
- South-East 2 (SE2) - South of Blueball Lane.
- South-East 3 (SE3) - North of M60 junction 19.


## Northern Gateway - High Level Constraints - Area GMA 1.2



Figure 2 - Sub-Areas of GMA 1.2 Development Site
Historical Ordnance Survey maps indicate that the GMA 1.2 site has predominantly been used for farming with some clusters of residential developments. This trend has continued to the present day.

### 3.1 Sub-Area Assessments

The following section contains an assessment and watershed analysis for each of the GMA 1.2 Sub-Areas. Note the following assessments, in particular the existing drainage catchments, will need to be verified following the future topographic survey of each development site.

A plan of the watershed analysis for the GMA 1.2 sites is included in Appendix B.

### 3.1.1 South-West 1

The South-West 1 (SW1) boundary currently contains existing residential properties, playing fields, agrarian land and grassed embankments of the M62/M60.

The central part of SW1 lies in a depression at approximately 98m AOD, with the areas to the
north, east and south increasing in elevation to $101-104 \mathrm{~m}$ AOD. There is a slight fall in a northwesterly direction, to a ditch within the SW1 boundary at 93m AOD.

Figure 3 following shows the lie of the land and directions of fall.


Figure 3: Area SW1 - Existing Topography

### 3.1.2 South-West 2

The South-West 2 (SW2) boundary contains agrarian land and a pond / kettle hole to the west.

Land falls from the north-west (107m AOD) to the south-east (95m AOD).
There is an unnamed ordinary watercourse in the south-east of the boundary which flows southwards into Heaton Park, via a number of ponds prior to discharging to the River Irk adjacent to Middleton Road.

There is a historic landfill site within the SW2 boundary, with waste classified as inert. Refer to the WYG Area GMA 1.2 Geo-Environmental High Level Constraints Review for more information.

Figure 4 following shows the lie of the land, existing watercourses and location of the inert historic landfill site.


Figure 4: Area SW2 - Existing Topography

### 3.1.3 South-East 1

The South-East 1 (SE1) boundary is made up of agrarian land with agricultural buildings located in the centre of the boundary. There is an existing residential area to the south-west of the boundary.

There are two central localised highpoints within the boundary at 110m AOD and 106m AOD. Aside from the two highpoints there is a general fall boundary across the boundary from south at 102 m AOD to the north at 97 m AOD.

There is a historic landfill site and sand pit in the centre of the SE1 boundary, with waste classified as inert and industrial. Refer to the WYG Area GMA 1.2 Geo-Environmental High Level Constraints Review for more information.

Additionally, a 200 mm diameter foul sludge main runs across part of the Sub-Area (refer to Public Sewer Records within Appendix C).

Figure 5 following shows the lie of the land, existing watercourses and location of the inert historic landfill site and sand pit.


Figure 5: Area SE1 - Existing Topography

### 3.1.4 South-East 2

The South-East 2 (SE2) boundary is made up of agrarian land with agricultural buildings located to the north of the boundary.

General fall direction of fall is from the north-west at 116 m AOD, to the south-east towards an unnamed watercourse to the west of the boundary at 84m AOD.

The unnamed watercourse flows southerly through the boundary and into Sub-Area SE3. There is also a small embanked reservoir / pond to the south-east, which feeds into the unnamed watercourse. Based on the area it is considered unlikely that this holds $25,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ or more, and is therefore not considered to be a large raised reservoir under the Reservoir Act 1975.

Figure 6 following shows the lie of the land and the existing watercourses.


Figure 6: Area SE2 - Existing Topography
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### 3.1.5 South-East 3

The South-East 3 (SE3) boundary is made up of agrarian land with agricultural buildings located in the centre of the boundary.

The highest elevations within the central part of the SE3 boundary with a peak of 105 m AOD. The land falls in all directions from this point to 91 m AOD to the north, 76 m AOD to the east and 76 m AOD to the south. Land to the east rises again within the boundary from 76 m AOD to 95m AOD.

At the 76 m AOD low point with the boundary there is an unnamed ordinary watercourse flowing from north to south. The point of discharge has not been confirmed however is assumed to discharge into the River Irk south of Old Manchester Road via. A series of culverts under the Rhodes residential area. There is also a pond to the north-east, outside of the boundary, which feeds into the unnamed watercourse.

Figure 7 following shows the lie of the land and the existing watercourses.


Figure 7: Area SE3 - Existing Topography

### 4.0 Flood Risk

A review has been undertaken of the EA Flood Maps for planning and the Bury Strategic Flood Risk Assessment mapping to identify the existing fluvial flood risk.

### 4.1 Fluvial Flood Risk

There are no main rivers across the GMA 1.2 site. The EA flood maps identify that all SubAreas are located within Flood Zone 1 (i.e. land assessed as having a lower than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding ( $<0.1 \%$ Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP)) in any one year) and is therefore land most suitable for residential development.

Figure 8 following shows the EA fluvial flood map for the area.


Figure 8: EA Fluvial Flood Map for Planning (Nov. 2019)

### 4.2 Surface Water and Overland Flows

The majority of the Sub-Areas drain overland to existing watercourses, as identified within Section 3.1 of this report.

Figure 9 following shows the EA surface water flood map for the area. The most at risk areas within the GMA 1.2 site have been highlighted.

As can be seen, the majority of the flood risk is around the local receiving watercourses. Additionally, there are some areas at risk of localised ponding. These are:

- The north-western region of SW1.
- The south and central region of SE1.


Figure 9: EA Surface Water Flood Map for Planning (Nov. 2019)
The predicted flooding in SW1 is concentrated to the north and south of the unnamed ditch identified in Section 0.

The predicted flooding in SE1 is on the flattest sections of land within the Sub-Area. Under existing site conditions localised ponding could occur in these areas.

The potential risk posed by surface water flooding can be mitigated by maintaining the existing flow paths, implementing an appropriate drainage solution and developing a masterplan that
is mindful of the flood risk. Potential measures include but are not limited to providing land drainage, raising Finished Floor Levels, maintaining existing flow paths, and maximising the amount of permeable area retained within the development.

### 4.3 Groundwater Flooding

Groundwater levels generally rise during wet winter months and fall over the summer months as water flows out into rivers. In very wet winters, rising water levels may lead to the flooding of normally dry land, as well as reactivating flow in 'bournes' (streams that only flow for part of the year).

The Bury, Rochdale and Oldham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment dated November 2009 details that there have been relatively few reported incidents of groundwater flooding in the areas and did not identify any substantial evidence of groundwater flooding occurring in the region.

Geological maps for the area indicate that Glacial Till underlies the whole GMA 1.2 site, with localised areas of moraine, head, peat and ice contact deposits above it.

The soils at the site are classified as having low to high leaching potential. The Peat and Glaciofluvial Deposits typically have high leaching potential, whereas the leaching potential of the Glacial Till is low.

The British Geological Survey Groundwater Flood Map (shown in Figure 10 following) shows that there is potential for groundwater flooding across Sub-Area SE1, and adjacent to the unnamed watercourse which flows southerly through Sub-Areas SE2 and SE3.

It is therefore considered that there is a localised risk of groundwater flooding at and below ground level across parts of the eastern section GMA 1.2 site. Notwithstanding this, Finished Floor Levels will be set appropriately to mitigate against any groundwater flood risk issue and the avoidance of the construction of basement levels wherever possible and applying appropriate waterproofing and anti-flotation measures to reduce the impact of high ground water to any below ground structures. Where necessary local land drainage systems will be designed and installed to lower the risk of groundwater flooding. The exact measures to be implemented will need to be considered further at detailed design.


Figure 10: BGS Groundwater Flood Map (2017)

### 4.4 Reservoir Flooding

A review of the EA online map of 'Risk of Flooding from Reservoirs' identified that the Sub Areas SW1 and SW2 are at risk of flooding as a result of Heaton Park Reservoir failure. Sub Areas SE1, SE2 and SE3 are not identified on the map as being at risk of reservoir flooding. It should be noted, as described in Section 0 , that there is an additional body of water to the south-east of Sub-Area SE2. Based on the area it is considered unlikely that this holds $25,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ or more, and is therefore not considered to be a large raised reservoir under the Reservoir Act 1975. It may however pose a risk of flooding to lower lying areas.

Although the probability of catastrophic dam failure is considered to be extremely low, the consequence of such an event would be severe.
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It should be noted, all reservoirs greater than $25,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ are regularly monitored and inspected by a certified Panel Engineer, in-line with the Reservoirs Act 1975. Responsibility lies with reservoir owners, and failure to carry out adequate inspections is a criminal offence. Therefore, due to the ongoing inspection of the reservoirs, the actual risk from a failure and subsequent flooding is considered to be low.

Developers should however be aware of this low flood risk.
Figure 11 following shows the EA reservoir flood map for the area.


Maximum extent of flooding

Figure 11: EA Reservoir Flood Map for Planning (Nov. 2019)

### 4.5 Sewer Flooding

Other than a 175 mm diameter public combined sewer along Heywood Road between SubAreas SW1 and SW2, there are no existing public sewers within the GMA 1.2 development site. A copy of the public sewer records has been included within Appendix C .

The Bury, Rochdale and Oldham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment dated November 2009, states that the United Utilities DG5 sewer flooding database (June 2007) was provided during the

SFRA production, and details that Bury had minimal recorded DG5 flooding incidents. It is anticipated that this trend has continued to present day.

Whilst this data can give an idea of areas with limited drainage capacity, it should be noted that it is a register of properties that have already been flooded due to exceedance or the blockage or failure of sewer systems, not properties at risk of flooding. For this reason, the DG5 register has limited usefulness in predicting future flooding locations.

More useful indicators of risk are associated with the data generated using hydraulic sewer network models, which should be investigated by United Utilities as Northern Gateway plans development and points of connection are determined.

At this stage, taking into account all of the above, it is considered that the site is at low risk of sewer flooding.

### 4.6 Greater Manchester Strategic Flood Risk Management Framework

The Strategic Management Framework published September 2018 did not identify any additional potential sources of flood risk to the site.

### 4.7 Bury, Rochdale, and Oldham Joint Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) jointly published in November 2009 included a review of DG5 records provided by United Utilities detailing internal and external flooding of properties caused by sewers. It did not identify any instances of public sewer flooding within the site boundary.

No other additional information was noted during the review of the SFRA.

### 5.0 Preliminary Design Considerations

### 5.1 Flood Risk

As described in Section 4.0 of this report, there is potential for groundwater flooding within the GMA 1.2 boundary. This flood mechanism (and others) should be considered throughout the development process to ensure that all flood risks are understood, mitigated against, and not worsened elsewhere.

The main design considerations to mitigate this flood risk are:

- Existing watercourses should be maintained in open channels with culverting and or major diversions avoided where possible;
- Existing watercourses should form an integral element to any future development. Consideration should be given to green / blue corridors centred around the natural channels of the watercourses. This would provide a cost effective and efficient method of delivering flood risk mitigation, SuDS features, habitats and biodiversity throughout the development area;
- As the areas are to be developed it is likely that ground levels will be adjusted, altering overland flow routes and areas at risk of flooding. It is essential that future plans for the GMA 1.2 site take into account the overland flow routes and potential areas of ponding, particularly in Sub-Areas SW1 and SE1 where surface water flooding is currently predicted. Surveys of watercourses and areas of standing water may be required by Developers during the design stages to fully understand flow paths across the area;
- Developers should consider maintaining a minimum 3m clear zone either side of any existing ordinary watercourses which pass through the development site; and,
- Sub Areas SW1 and SW2 (and potentially SE2) are at risk of flooding as a result of reservoir failure, the consequence of such an event would be severe. All reservoirs greater than $25,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ are regularly monitored and inspected by a certified Panel Engineer, in-line with the Reservoirs Act 1975. Responsibility lies with reservoir owners, and failure to carry out adequate inspections is a criminal offence. Therefore, due to the ongoing inspection of the reservoirs, the actual risk from a failure and subsequent flooding is considered to be low. Developers should however be aware of this low flood risk.


### 5.2 Local Planning Polices

Local Council policies were reviewed along with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority policies.

### 5.2.1 Greater Manchester Spatial Framework

The Greater Manchester Spatial Policy (GMSF) details Manchester's future plan for homes, jobs and the environment. The draft GMSF published January 2019 notes that there are areas of flood risk within Manchester and presents policy GM-S 5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment'. The policy states that efforts should be made to adopt natural flood management including the use of Sustainable Drainage System to minimise the impact of present and future flooding. Furthermore, discharge of surface water should be restricted to greenfield run-off rates or alternative rates specified in district local plans.

Area GMA 1.2 is allocated within the draft GMSF published in January 2019 as GM Allocation 1.2 'Simister/Bowlee (Northern Gateway)' for primarily residential development. This allocation and two others, GM 1.2 and GM 1.3, together form the wider 'Northern Gateway' crossboundary strategic allocation (Policy GM Allocation 1).

The GMSF sets high level principles for flood risk and drainage in the Greater Manchester area, these will need to be incorporated within the GMA 1.2 development. Policy GM Allocation 1.2 and the supporting text specifies that:

- A drainage strategy will be required to control surface water run-off from the site.
- Designed features should look to mimic the natural drainage features on the Development Site.
- Sustainable drainage features should be incorporated and include 'green and blue' infrastructure. These shall address both flooding and water quality issues.
- Recreational areas should be incorporated into SuDS features.


### 5.2.2 Bury Unitary Development Plan

Section 2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan adopted August 1997 includes policy EN5/1 - New Development and Flood Risk. As part of this clause the council will not permit development where such development would be at risk of flooding, would be likely to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, or would adversely affect river flood defences.

### 5.3 Surface Water Drainage

### 5.3.1 Surface Water Drainage Strategy

In order to ensure that surface water runoff from the site does not cause an increase in flood risk, the management of runoff has been considered via a sequential approach, in line with Building Regulations and national planning policy.

The following options for the disposal of surface water runoff were considered, in order of preference:
i) A soakaway or some other infiltration system - Based on the ground conditions detailed within Section 4.3, it is considered that the use of infiltration techniques may be viable on parts of the GMA 1.2 Development Site. This is the preferential option to discharge surface water from the site
ii) A watercourse or tidal outfall - The majority of Sub-Areas drain overland to existing watercourses. It is therefore assumed that these will provide suitable points of surface water discharge for future developments.
iii) A sewer - there are minimal public sewers within or adjacent to the Development Site.

If infiltration is deemed unsuitable within a Sub-Area the potential discharge points are:

- SW1 - If identified as flowing, to the unnamed ordinary watercourse to northwest of boundary. Land falls in this direction.
- SW2 - To unnamed ordinary watercourse in south-east of development, eventual discharge to River Irk. Land falls in this direction. Note, the presence of an historic landfill site to the south-west of the Sub-Area means infiltration may not be suitable in some areas.
- SE1 - As ground falls northward towards the M62, there is a depression of land where (without significant alteration of ground levels) surface water may require discharge by either pumping to local watercourse or by means of infiltration. Note, the presence of an historic landfill site to the central region of the Sub-Area means infiltration may not be suitable in some areas.
- SE2 - to unnamed ordinary watercourse to west of boundary. Land falls in this direction.
- SE3 - Developments in north, central, eastern and southern likely able to discharge to unnamed ordinary watercourse to the east of the boundary as land fall in this direction. Developments to the west may be able to discharge to the watercourse
also, although due to distance and topography may need to find alternative points of discharge such as infiltration or pumping.

Suitable points of discharge for future surface water run-off will be required for all development Sub-Areas, with the allowable discharge rate being restricted to the predevelopment greenfield discharge rates.

In draining the new development sites, it will be necessary to design the drainage to ensure that there is no increased flood risk outside of each site for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus climate change storm event. In addition, the design should seek to maximise the use of SuDS techniques as required by the Bury Flood Risk \& Drainage planning policy and the policies within the GMSF.

### 5.3.2 Required Attenuation

As the development will result in a significant increase in the impermeable area, on-site attenuation is likely to be required which may be provided in plot, phase, or development wide attenuation features.

The preferred and most economical solution is generally to provide a suitable sized attenuation basin, which maximising infiltration where feasible, within each phase of the development serving a number of plots and these would ideally be located adjacent to, and at a higher elevation than, their receiving watercourse.

The attenuation basins, which can be singular per individual development plot or site wide attenuation features can be designed as a dry basin or a pond which retains a shallow level of permanent water.

A preliminary attenuation estimate has carried out based on the following parameters:

- Greenfield Run-Off QBar Rate - $7.5 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{s} /$ ha (calculations within Appendix E).
- Total Area - 182 ha.
- Assumed $60 \%$ impermeable land for proposed residential areas.

Therefore, the total greenfield run off rate for the 109 ha impermeable area of the GMA 1.2 site is $818 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{s}$.

For the 1 in 30 year storm event approximately $\mathbf{3 7 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ of attenuation is required for the GMA 1.2 site (assuming no infiltration), equating to $\mathbf{2 0 3} \mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ per hectare (MicroDrainage Storage Estimate screenshots are included within Appendix F).

Additional storage will be required to cater for all events up to and including the 1 in $100+$ CC storm events and this can either be provided by allowing temporary above ground flooding to hardstanding areas such as roads and car parks, or alternatively approximately doubling the size of attenuation ponds. Total required attenuation including above ground on-site storage is approximately $\mathbf{8 1 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{~ m 3}$ (assuming no infiltration), equating to $\mathbf{4 4 5} \mathbf{~ m 3}$ per hectare. As it is currently proposed that the development site is purely for residential use it is considered that a lifespan of 100 years through to 2119 is suitable in this instance; Environment Agency guidance for peak rainfall intensity increase due to climate change over this period is $+40 \%$.

The actual required attenuation will depend on the extent of the impermeable area in each phase, which may differ from the $60 \%$ estimate made, and the infiltration properties of the soils throughout the site. If there is infiltration potential within the soil, this will reduce the volume of attenuation required. This infiltration potential shall be determined through ground investigation in latter stages of the planning process.

### 5.4 Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

The new developments in GMA 1.2 offer an opportunity to deliver a fully compliant SuDS design in relation to the surface water drainage of each site.

In order to comply with the national guidelines and policies set by the local authorities and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage, the design of the surface water drainage system should seek to maximise the use of SuDS techniques.

This section reviews the suitability of the different SuDS elements available for the application site.

### 5.4.1 Potential for Infiltration

As detailed in Section 4.3, Glacial Till underlies the GMA 1.2 site, with localised areas of moraine, head and ice contact deposits above it.

The bedrock of Pennine Coal Measures and Glaciofluvial Deposits present on the Eastern Sub-Areas can provide a level of permeability. Additionally, Chester Formation bedrock found at the Southern Sub-Area are layers of rock that have high intergranular and/or fracture permeability - meaning they usually provide a high level of water storage. A Geology Plan displaying the local ground conditions is included within Appendix G .

It is therefore considered that infiltration techniques may be viable on parts of the GMA 1.2 Development Site. As described previously, this is the preferential option to discharge surface water from the site and has the potential to reduce the attenuation requirements across the site.

Ground conditions will need to be confirmed by ground investigation on a more localised basis as the GMA 1.2 development plans progress, to determine where infiltration of surface water may be utilised.

### 5.4.2 The SuDS Management Train

The overarching principles of a SuDS system are to minimise the impacts arising from the development, whilst at the same time replicating the natural drainage from the site before development.

SuDS key objectives are to minimise the impacts from the development on the quantity and quality of run-off and to maximise amenity and biodiversity opportunities.

The accepted SuDS management train consists of three elements:

- Source Control: Water butts, green roofs, filter drains, pervious surfaces, swales.
- Site Control: Swales, ponds, wetlands, infiltration devices
- Regional Control: Basins, ponds, wetlands, and reservoirs

The following (Figure 12) is an illustration of the SuDS principles and how they may be applied to a development via a SuDS Management Train.


Figure 12: SuDS Principles

Table 5.1 following reviews the suitability of different SuDS elements within the site. Note development plans, and therefore applicable SuDS elements, are indicative at this stage.

Table 5.1 - Review of SuDS Options

| Type of SuDS |  | Description | Applicability to the Site |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source Control | Water butts | Small storage tanks on each individual housing plot. | May be appropriate for the site. |
|  | Rain water harvesting | Recycling of water from roofs and impermeable areas. | May be appropriate for the site however not common for standard residential properties. |
|  | Green roofs | Vegetated roofs that reduce runoff and remove pollutants. | May be appropriate for the site however not common for standard residential properties. |
|  | Pervious surfaces | Permeable surfaces that allow surface water inflow into underlying basal stone drainage systems and then into the surface water sewers. | May be appropriate for the site. |
| Site \& Regional Control | Filter drains | Linear drains or trenches filled with granular material that allow infiltration to the surrounding ground. | May be appropriate for the site however is dependent on localised ground conditions. |
|  | Swales | Vegetated channels to convey store and treat runoff. | May be appropriate for the site. |
|  | Basins/ponds | Shallow areas of open space that temporarily hold water and collect silt. | May be appropriate for the site. |
|  | Infiltration basin | Shallow depression that stores runoff before it infiltrates into the subsoil. | May be appropriate for the site however is dependent on localised ground conditions. |
|  | Infiltration devices | Generally granular trenches or soakaways that store water and allow infiltration to the surrounding ground. | May be appropriate for the site however is dependent on localised ground conditions. |

### 5.4.3 Water Quality

The SuDS design should seek to provide an appropriate management train of SuDS components to effectively mitigate the pollution risks associated with the different site users.

Within the GMA 1.2 site, based solely on residential developments, there are likely two key drivers in respect of pollutant risks to the receiving groundwater:

- Pollution from vehicle parking areas and access roads;
- Pollution from residential roofs.

In accordance with Table 26.2 of The SuDS Manual, as summarised in Table 5.2 following, if the site is solely standard residential developments the overall pollution hazard level would likely be 'Low'. Therefore, the requirements for discharge to surface waters state that the 'Simple index approach' should be used.

Step 1 of the simple index approach is to identify the pollution hazard indices for the proposed land use, as set out in Table 5.2 following.

Table 5.2 - Pollution Hazard Indices

| Land use | Pollution <br> hazard level | Total suspended <br> solids (TSS) | Metals | Hydro- <br> carbons |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential Roofs | Very Low | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.05 |
| Other Roofs | Low | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.05 |
| Individual property <br> driveways, residential car <br> parks, low traffic roads <br> and non-residential car <br> parking with infrequent <br> change | Low | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |

Step 2 of the simple index approach is to select SuDS with a total pollution mitigation index that equals or exceeds the required pollution hazard index identified within Table 5.2.

Table 26.3 of The SuDS Manual states the various mitigation indices for discharges to surface waters. As plans for the GMA 1.2 site are indicative at this stage, it is not possible to determine the exact SuDS management strategy and treatment processes. For reference, the treatment properties for the SuDS elements detailed in Table 5.1 previously can be seen in Table 5.3 following. It is clear that for some SuDS elements, such as filter strips and filter drains, two levels of SuDS treatment will be required.

Table 5.3 - SuDS Mitigation Indices

| Types of SuDS <br> component | TSS | Metals | Hydrocarbons |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Filter Strip | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Filter Drain | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Swale | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Bioretention <br> System | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Permeable <br> Pavement | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Detention Basin | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Pond | 0.8 | 0.8 |  |
| Wetland | 0.8 |  |  |

Provided that the mitigation indices of the treatment techniques are greater than or equal to the hazard indices for the proposed development then there should be no reduction in the overall water quality within the receiving system.

### 5.4.4 Maintenance of the Drainage System

In order for the SuDS elements to work effectively ongoing maintenance of the drainage system will be required. Depending on the drainage adoption strategy, the maintenance will be undertaken by either the local water authority (United Utilities), local authority or an approved management company.

United Utilities are currently preparing for the implementation of the Sewerage Sector's Design and Construction Guidance (DCG) that has been produced as a requirement of Ofwat's Adoption Code which will be implemented in April 2020. A major change in the new guidance is that, for the first time, guidance is provided on the type of SuDS that will be adoptable (by meeting the definition of a sewer) by Water Companies in England.

### 5.5 Foul Drainage

### 5.5.1 Existing Foul Drainage

Copies of the United Utilities public sewer records have been obtained for the Development Site. Analysis of these has confirmed that in Sub-Areas:

## SW1 and SW2

- The only existing foul sewerage is a 175 mm diameter public combined sewer along Heywood Road between Sub-Areas SW1 and SW2.
- There is an existing foul water pump station off Heywood Road, opposite St. Margaret's Primary School. This is outside of the GMA 1.2 development boundary.
- There is an existing foul water pump station, accessed between 49 and 51 Parrenthorn Road. This is outside of the GMA 1.2 development boundary.


## SE1, SE2 and SE3

- Within the eastern Sub-Areas (SE1, SE2 and SE3) there are no existing public foul sewers within the development site and limited public sewers adjacent to the boundaries. Note, from analysis of United Utilities sewer plans it appears records may be incomplete as they do not show any public sewer system along Old Heywood Road.
- An existing foul water pump station is present to the west of the SE1 Sub-Area, approximately 150 m outside of the boundary.
- It is understood that the existing farms located within the development site are drained to private septic tanks or similar non-mains sewage systems.
- There is a 200 mm diameter sludge main running across Sub-Area SE1 to the north of Simister Lane. A 6 m easement will be required along the alignment of this main, this will require consideration during the development of plans for the area.

The nearest United Utilities wastewater treatment works is south of Bury, it is located approximately 2 km to the north-west of the GMA 1.2 area.

To the north, within the G1.1 development boundary, industrial estates drain to private sewage treatment plants, which discharge into adjacent watercourses.

Copies of the United Utilities Sewer Records are Contained within Appendix C.

### 5.5.2 Foul Water Drainage Strategy

United Utilities have a responsibility to provide points of connection for new developments. A full consultation with United Utilities will be required to confirm and agree on the overall development strategy for foul water. UU have been engaged through the Greater Manchester Infrastructure Board forum and consultation is continuing to determine appropriate points of discharge to coordinate with the wider upgrade works of the public sewer network in the region. This desktop study has identified the following options for disposing of foul water from the different development sites.

## SW1 and SW2

It is anticipated that the 175 mm diameter combined sewer is operating close to capacity however there may be opportunity to discharge foul flows to this from some of the new developments adjacent to Heywood Road for the SW1 and SW2 developments.

If capacity issues are present along the 175 mm diameter sewer there may be an opportunity to connect directly into the foul pump station opposite St. Margaret's school. Alternatively, some upsizing of sewers may be required by United Utilities.

Foul flows from developments to the north of Sub-Area SW1 will need pumping up to the higher elevation at Heywood Road, if connection to either the 175 mm diameter sewer or pump station opposite St. Margaret's school is authorised by United Utilities.

An alternative would be to connect to the additional foul pump station between 49 and 51 Parrenthorn Road. This would require sewerage to be constructed across private land so would therefore require requisition. The pump station pumps flow in a southerly direction up to Heywood Road where it is discharged and flows westerly by gravity.

Any foul flows from the south of Sub-Area SW2 will need pumping up to the higher elevation at Heywood Road.

## SE1, SE2 and SE3

It is anticipated some upgrade works will be required by United Utilities to facilitate the construction of the SE1, SE2 and SE3 developments.

There is potential for developments in the SE1 Sub-Area to drain to the existing foul water pump station to the west of the boundary. This would require sewerage to be constructed across private land, therefore a requisition would be required.

The logical foul water drainage strategy for Sub-Areas SE2 and SE3 is to drain from north to south with the lie of the land, and discharge into the existing public sewer network to the north-east of the M60 junction 19. If a public sewer is present along Old Heywood Road, this would also provide a point of connection for some developments.

It is anticipated that United Utilities will have to provide upgrade works to enable the connection of both the eastern and southern developments to their network.

### 6.0 Constraints and Opportunities

There are no significant constraint that preclude the development of the site provided consideration is given to the following during planning and detailed design.

### 6.1.1 Surface Water

- Discharge is to be restricted to the greenfield run-off rate of $7.5 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{ha}$.
- At the restricted discharge rate it is estimated that $37,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ( $203 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) of attenuation storage will be required across the GMA 1.2 development for the 1 in 30 AEP storm event and a total of $81,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ( $445 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) for the 1 in 100 AEP $+40 \%$ climate change storm event. Attention is drawn to the fact that any body of water with an excess of $25,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ of storage above ground level is classed as a reservoir and as such must meet the requirements of the Reservoirs Act 1975.
- As it is proposed that some Sub-Areas are discharged to watercourses, consultations should be made to the Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency and Flood Defence Consent applied for where required.
- Parts of the site have been identified as historic landfill sites; it is considered that infiltration of surface water may not be an environmentally safe option in these areas.


### 6.1.2 Foul Water

- Consultations will need to be made with United Utilities at the planning application stage to confirm the capacity of the existing foul water network and determine preferential points of connection.
- If the construction of sewerage outside the red line boundary is required, this will require requisitions.
- An easement will be required over the existing 200 mm diameter sludge main within the Sub-Area SE1.


### 6.2 Opportunities

- The drainage strategy provides an opportunity to bring the GMA 1.2 Development inline with the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework Policy. The drainage system should include a variety of SuDS feature providing green/blue spaces (such as detention basins and swales). These shall address both flooding and water quality issues and be designed to mimic natural drainage features of the Development Site and provide recreational areas for the public.
- It is recommended that, due to the scale of the attenuation required, that this is provided in phase specific detention basins.
- Alternate SuDS options, such as wetlands, provide an opportunity to maximise biodiversity and maximise public open space.
- Infiltration may be possible across much of the GMA 1.2 Development Site, subject to detailed ground investigations on a localised basis.


### 7.0 Conclusions

The Flood Risk and Drainage Constraints Assessment has determined that the GMA 1.2 development area is at low risk of flooding from fluvial sources. This is supported by the EA Flood Maps for Planning which indicate the development is entirely in Flood Zone 1. The masterplan should be developed with due consideration for the existing topography, watercourses and rivers, and development plots located with substantial offsets from these features. Opportunities should be maximised to create green/blue corridors adjacent to the alignments of these existing watercourses. Furthermore, this approach does not require the diversion of any of these existing watercourses and culverting works will be kept to a minimum and required only where there are highway crossings.

The report sets out the high level principles for how the scheme can be served for surface water drainage and it is proposed to comprehensively promote the use of sustainable drainage systems across the scheme to mitigate flood risk occurring from the development and to minimise pollution runoff into the receiving waterbodies. It is proposed that all SuDS features will comply with CIRIA C753, The SuDS Manual, and any requirements of Bury Council in their capacity as the Lead Local Flood Authority. It is proposed that the post-development discharge rates will be limited to existing greenfield and where possible the increase in volumetric runoff will be limited by the potential use of infiltration structures such as basins, soakaways, filter drains, etc. Where it is not possible to infiltrate to the ground the additional volume of run-off will be attenuated and discharged at existing greenfield rates. All surface water discharge points are proposed to connect to the existing watercourses in and around the development site over existing public sewerage which would require significant upgrades. This strategy is in accordance with the hierarchy established in planning guidance, the SuDS Manual, and Building Regulations Part H.

Engagement with UU is proposed to establish a feasible regional foul drainage strategy which will rely upon upgrade works of the UU public sewer network and potentially to Bury Wastewater Treatment Works. It has been identified that the majority of the development site is likely to discharge to the Bury Wastewater Treatment Works to the west of the M66. Provision should be allowed for in the masterplan for a primary foul pump station to facilitate this strategy. Discharge from the foul pump station would be either directly into the public sewer network or into the sewer network of GMA 1.1 to the north.

This Assessment demonstrates there are no flood risk or drainage constraints that would preclude the proposed development of Area GMA 1.2 and the site is suitable for allocation in the GMSF.

Further detailed investigations and consultation with UU, the EA and the Lead Local Flood Authority will be undertaken as part of the detailed design stage for any future planning application.


Northern Gateway - High Level Constraints - Area GMA 1.2

### 8.0 Appendices

## Appendix A - Report Conditions

This Report has been prepared using reasonable skill and care for the sole benefit of Northern Gateway Development Vehicle LLP ("the Client") for the proposed uses stated in the report by WYG Environment Planning Transport Limited ("WYG"). WYG exclude all liability for any other uses and to any other party. The report must not be relied on or reproduced in whole or in part by any other party without the copyright holder's permission.

No liability is accepted or warranty given for; unconfirmed data, third party documents and information supplied to WYG or for the performance, reliability, standing etc of any products, services, organisations or companies referred to in this report. WYG does not purport to provide specialist legal, tax or accounting advice.

The report refers, within the limitations stated, to the environment of the site in the context of the surrounding area at the time of the inspections'. Environmental conditions can vary and no warranty is given as to the possibility of changes in the environment of the site and surrounding area at differing times. No investigative method can eliminate the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise, incomplete or not fully representative information. Any monitoring or survey work undertaken as part of the commission will have been subject to limitations, including for example timescale, seasonal and weather-related conditions. Actual environmental conditions are typically more complex and variable than the investigative, predictive and modelling approaches indicate in practice, and the output of such approaches cannot be relied upon as a comprehensive or accurate indicator of future conditions. The "shelf life" of the Report will be determined by a number of factors including; its original purpose, the Client's instructions, passage of time, advances in technology and techniques, changes in legislation etc. and therefore may require future re-assessment.

The whole of the report must be read as other sections of the report may contain information which puts into context the findings in any executive summary.

The performance of environmental protection measures and of buildings and other structures in relation to acoustics, vibration, noise mitigation and other environmental issues is influenced to a large extent by the degree to which the relevant environmental considerations are incorporated into the final design and specifications and the quality of workmanship and compliance with the specifications on site during construction. WYG accept no liability for issues with performance arising from such factors.

Appendix B - Watershed Analysis of GMA 1.2 Sub-Areas


## Appendix C - Existing Pubic Sewer Records
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Appendix D - Historic Borehole Records
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## Borshole Record

Profoct North Hestern Road Construation Unit, 1. 6. Kouchel if fartners, ME Nonchester outer Kitg Rod. Suphementary Sire lovestigation Sotion 2

| Contract | 52904 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 餭orohote <br> Shee: ; of | $5$ |
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Rorefole Record

Prolecthorth Western Road Construrtion Unit, Contract S2go4 i. G. Wouchel \& Partners,

365 Wanchester Guter fing Road,
Supplementary Site Investigation Section 3
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## Appendix E - Greenfield Run-Off Calculations

## Greenfield runoff rate estimation for sites

 www.uksuds.com | Greenfield runoff tool| Calculated by: <br> Site name: Chris Baker |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site G1.2 |  |
| Site location: | Manchester |
| Site |  |
| This is an estimation of the greenfield runoff rates that are used to meet normal best |  |
| practice criteria in line with Environment Agency guidance "Rainfall runoff management |  |
| for developments", SCO30219 (2013), the SuDS Manual C753 (Ciria, 2015) and |  |
| the non-statutory standards for SuDS (Defra, 2015). This information on greenfield runoff rates may |  |
| be |  |
| the basis for setting consents for the drainage of surface water runoff from sites. |  |

Site Details

| Latitude: | $53.54733^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Longitude: | $2.25428^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$ |
| Reference: | 1278222508 |
| Date: | Nov 142019 08:38 |

the basis for setting consents for the drainage of surface water runoff from sites.

## Runoff estimation approach

| Site characteristics |  |  | Notes <br> (1) Is $Q_{B A R}<2.0$ I/s/ha? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total site area (ha): 1 |  |  |  |
| Methodology |  |  |  |
| $Q_{B A R}$ estimation method: <br> SPR estimation method: | Calculate from SPR and SAAR |  | When $Q_{B A R}$ is $<2.0 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{ha}$ then limiting discharge rates are set at $2.0 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{ha}$. |
|  | SOIL ty |  |  |
| Soil characteristics |  |  |  |
| SOIL type: | 4 | 4 | (2) Are flow rates < $5.0 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s}$ ? |
| HOST class: | N/A | N/A | Where flow rates are less than $5.0 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s}$ consent for discharge is usually set at $5.0 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s}$ if blockage from vegetation and other materials is possible. Lower consent flow rates may be set where the blockage risk is addressed by using appropriate drainage elements. |
| SPR/SPRHOST: | 0.47 | 0.47 |  |
| Hydrological characteristics | Default | Edited |  |
| SAAR (mm): | 999 | 999 | (3) Is SPR/SPRHOST $\leq 0.3$ ? |
| Hydrological region: | 10 | 10 |  |
| Growth curve factor 1 year: | 0.87 | 0.87 | Where groundwater levels are low enough the use of soakaways to avoid discharge offsite would normally be preferred for disposal of surface water runoff. |
| Growth curve factor 30 years: | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| Growth curve factor 100 years: | 2.08 | 2.08 |  |
| Growth curve factor 200 years: | 2.37 | 2.37 |  |

## Greenfield runoff rates

$Q_{B A R}(1 / s):$
1 in 1 year ( $1 / \mathrm{s}$ ):
1 in 30 years (//s):
1 in 100 year (l/s):
1 in 200 years (l/s):

| Default | Edited |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7.32 | 7.32 |
| 6.37 | 6.37 |
| 12.44 | 12.44 |
| 15.22 | 15.22 |
| 17.35 | 17.35 |

This report was produced using the greenfield runoff tool developed by HR Wallingford and available at www.uksuds.com. The use of this tool is subject to the UK SuDS terms and conditions and licence agreement, which can both be found at www.uksuds.com/terms-and-conditions.htm. The outputs from this tool are estimates of greenfield runoff rates. The use of these results is the responsibility of the users of this tool. No liability will be accepted by HR Wallingford, the Environment Agency, CEH, Hydrosolutions or any other organisation for the use of this data in the design or operational characteristics of any drainage scheme.

## Appendix F - Supporting Micro Drainage Calculations

## 1 in 30 Year Storm Event - Attenuation Storage Estimate



| i) Quick Storage Estimate |  |  |  | $\square$ 回 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Results |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Global Variables require approximate storage of between $28772 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ and $45643 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. <br> These values are estimates only and should not be used for design purposes. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Variables |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Results |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overview 2D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overview 3D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| V t |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Analyse | OK | Cancel | Help |  |
| Enter Maximum Allowable Discharge between 0.0 and 999999.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 1 in 100 Year Storm Event $+\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ Climate Change - Attenuation Storage Estimate




Appendix G - Geology Plan


