

wardell-armstrong.com

ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE
ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY
INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES
LAND AND PROPERTY
MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING
MINERAL ESTATES
WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT



MANX UTILITIES

GARFF SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

JULY 2025

Wardell Armstrong (part of SLR)

Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke-on-Trent, ST1 5BD, United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 (0)1782 276 700 www.wardell-armstrong.com



DATE ISSUED: JULY 2025
JOB NUMBER: CA11812
REPORT NUMBER: 0009
VERSION: V1.0
STATUS: Final

MANX UTILITIES

GARFF SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

JULY 2025

PREPARED BY:

OH Planner

REVIEWED BY:

CB Technical Director

APPROVED BY:

CB Technical Director

This report has been prepared by Wardell Armstrong LLP with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, within the terms of the Contract with the Client. The report is confidential to the Client and Wardell Armstrong LLP accepts no responsibility of whatever nature to third parties to whom this report may be made known.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Wardell Armstrong LLP.



Wardell Armstrong is the trading name of Wardell Armstrong LLP, Registered in England No. OC307138.

Registered office: Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke-on-Trent, ST1 5BD, United Kingdom

UK Offices: Stoke-on-Trent, Birmingham, Bolton, Bristol, Bury St Edmunds, Cardiff, Carlisle, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Leeds, London, Newcastle upon Tyne and Truro. International Office: Almaty.

ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE
ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY
INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES
LAND AND PROPERTY
MINING AND MINERAL PROCESSING
MINERAL ESTATES
WASTE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION.....1

2 PLANNING POLICY.....2

3 PRE-APPLICATION ENGAGEMENT.....3

4 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY AND RESPONSES.....5

5 CONCLUSIONS.....19

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Questionnaire Form

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Development Context

1.1.1 Manx Utilities (MU) have prepared a planning application for the construction and operation of a proposed Sewage Treatment Works (STW), located within the Axnfell Plantation adjacent to Ballacollister Road near Laxey, Isle of Man.

1.1.2 It was originally proposed to locate the STW at The Cairns within the village of Laxey - a planning application (ref. 20/00082/B) for the proposals was submitted in January 2020. However, despite being recommended for approval by Planning Officers, the application was refused at Committee in July 2020. The reasons for refusal indicated that it was contrary to the land designation, and that there remained potential issues with odour and traffic, flooding, and visual detriment, as well as insufficient consideration of alternative sites that would potentially result in fewer adverse effects.

1.1.3 As a result, an extensive feasibility study was commissioned by MU to consider alternative STW locations. Following the feasibility study, a new preferred option for the STW was selected – at Axnfell.

1.1.4 Once operational, the STW will provide first-time sewage treatment of flows from the Laxey and Baldrine catchments on the east coast of the Isle of Man in the sheading of Garff. Providing first-time sewage treatment for these catchments is an objective of the Isle of Man Sewage Treatment Strategy Phase 2 (RSTS).

1.2 Purpose of this Report

1.2.1 During the process of preparing the planning application, MU hosted two public exhibition events in Laxey and Baldrine to gather opinions and comments on the proposed development from members of the public. More than 130 people had attended the events, with 73 attendees completing a questionnaire which sought to obtain opinions on the proposed development.

1.2.2 This Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) has been prepared in support of a forthcoming planning application for the proposed STW at Axnfell. It outlines the proactive and comprehensive engagement process that the applicant (MU) has followed during the preparation and design process. The SCI also provides an insight into the feedback provided by the members of the public on the proposed development following the public exhibition events. This includes feedback on the change in site location from The Cairns to Axnfell.

2 PLANNING POLICY

2.1 National Planning Policy

2.1.1 The Isle of Man does not have a bespoke Statement of Community Involvement guidance document to define the scope of the consultation required during the planning application process. The importance of consultation within the planning process is however emphasised throughout the Town and Country Planning Act 1999, albeit from the perspective of the determining body rather than the applicant.

2.1.2 The policy document of principal relevance in determining applications is the Isle of Man Strategic Plan 2016 (IMSP), which identifies the core policies to guide development proposals on the Island. The Central Strategic Aim found within the plan is as follows:

“To plan for the efficient and effective provision of services and infrastructure and to direct and control development and the use of land to meet the community’s needs, having particular regard to the principles of sustainability whilst at the same time preserving, protecting, and improving the quality of the environment, having particular regard to our uniquely Manx natural, wildlife, cultural and built heritage”.

2.1.3 To plan for development which meets the needs of the community, it is essential that a thorough consultation exercise be undertaken with the community to enable the proactive exchange of views, concerns and ideas, which can ultimately be fed into the design of the proposals to ensure they best serve the interests of that community.

2.1.4 MU conducted two public engagement events at Laxey and Baldrine on the 27th and 28th November respectively, whereby members of the public were invited to provide comments on the proposed STW at Axnfell. This has ensured a comprehensive engagement process which has effectively publicised the proposals and afforded the opportunity to members of the public to provide comments.

3 PRE-APPLICATION ENGAGEMENT

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 An important aspect of the planning process is effective consultation and as such public engagement has been undertaken during the preparation of the planning application.

3.2 Consultee Engagement

3.2.1 The nature of the proposals requires that they are appropriately assessed via an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). To support the composition of a robust EIA, a Scoping Technical Note, describing the scope of the environmental assessments proposed to inform the planning application for the Garff STW, was prepared in November 2024.

3.2.2 The purpose of the Technical Note was to provide consultees with sufficient information to form a scoping opinion on the environmental assessment proposed. Moreover, it also formed the basis of consultations held with the Isle of Man Department of Environment, Food & Agriculture (DEFA) regarding the scope of the environmental assessment. This has subsequently shaped the method and approach taken in the technical surveys and assessments to ensure they effectively consider all requisite matters.

3.2.3 It is clear from the Technical Note that MU have engaged with a number of consultees throughout the preparation of the planning application and the Environmental Statement (ES). Consultation undertaken by MU includes:

- Consultation with the Local Planning Authority Ecosystems Policy Officer to define biodiversity net gain objectives for the Biodiversity ES chapter
- Consultation with the Isle of Man Environmental Health Officer regarding the requirement and scope/methodology for noise surveys and the identification of appropriate mitigation for the Noise and Vibration ES chapter, and confirmation on whether a Section 61 noise/vibration consent would be required
- Consultation with the Isle of Man Department of Enterprise and other relevant stakeholders in relation to the Population and Human Health ES chapter
- Consultation with the police and the Isle of Man Government on decisions relating to evening and night-time working during the construction phase, if required.

3.3 Public Engagement

3.3.1 The public engagement process provided an opportunity for external parties to express their views on the proposals prior to the submission of the planning application. Responses from consultees have, where appropriate, contributed to the site design and have informed the planning application.

3.3.2 A series of exhibitions were held to allow members of the public to view the outline plans for a new STW proposed to serve Laxey and Baldrine. This was advertised in advance through, but not limited to, posts on social media, posts on the MU website, radio advertising and newspaper articles.

3.4 Public Exhibition Details

3.4.1 The first public engagement event was held at the Laxey Sailing Club in Laxey on Wednesday 27th November 2024 from 11:00am to 7:30pm, and the second public engagement event was held at the Baldrine Methodist Church Hall in Baldrine on Thursday 28th November 2024 from 11:00am to 7:30pm.

3.4.2 Responses from visitors were captured through a single sided A4 questionnaire, which sought opinions on:

- The level of support for the proposed Garff STW
- The ease of understanding of the information exhibited at the event
- The quality of the answers provided by attending staff in relation to questions asked by members of the public
- The level of understanding on why MU are proposing to build the Garff STW
- General comments on the proposed development.

3.4.3 The questionnaire also offered visitors the chance to provide their contact details so that MU could respond to any further queries that visitors had on the proposals.

4 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

4.1 Attendance and Feedback

4.1.1 The exhibition events were well attended, with a significant number of attendees taking the time to provide a written response via the questionnaires provided. Over 130 people had attended the exhibition events over the two-day period, with 73 attendees providing their opinions through the completion of the questionnaire. 47 questionnaire respondents attended the event at Laxey, whilst the remaining 26 questionnaire respondents attended the event at Baldrine.

4.1.2 Of the 47 respondents who completed the questionnaire at the Laxey public exhibition event, 38 (80.86%) respondents resided in Laxey, 1 (2.12%) respondent resided in Baldrine, and 4 (8.51%) respondents resided elsewhere (including in Lonan and Agneash). 4 (8.51%) respondents didn't provide an answer to the question.

4.1.3 Of the 26 respondents who completed the questionnaire at the Baldrine public exhibition event, 10 (38.46%) respondents resided in Baldrine, 10 respondents resided in Laxey (38.46%), and 5 (19.23%) respondents resided elsewhere (including in Lonan, Onchan and Baldhoon). 1 (3.85%) respondent didn't provide an answer to the question.

4.1.4 The questionnaire distributed provided a series of directly scored questions which were answered on a sliding scale of 1 – 5, with a score of 1 indicating a poor rating and a score of 5 indicating a good or excellent rating. Following on from these questions, respondents were also invited to provide a written response, thus providing the opportunity for members of the public to provide specific comments on the proposed development.

4.2 Summary of Feedback

Level of Support for the Proposed Garff STW

4.2.1 Question 1 of the questionnaire sought to establish the level of support for the proposed Garff STW from members of the public. The responses captured from the visitors for Question 1 are outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1							
1. Do you support our plans for first-time sewage treatment for Garff?							
	1 I do not support these plans	2	3	4	5 I fully support these plans	No answer provided	Total
Respondent Answers	26	7	9	14	13	4	73
Percentage (%)	35.62%	9.59%	12.33%	19.18%	17.81%	5.47%	100%

4.2.2 From the answers provided, 33 (45.21%) respondents were unsupportive of the proposals, 9 (12.33%) respondents felt neutral about the proposals, and 27 (36.99%) respondents were supportive of the proposals. Of the 73 responses received, the average response to the question was 2.7 out of 5, indicating that a balance of opinions about the proposals.

4.2.3 Question 2 of the questionnaire afforded members of the public the opportunity to build on their response through the provision of supporting comments. A mixture of positive and negative responses were received.

4.2.4 The positive comments received recognised the pressing need for modern sewage infrastructure and praised the relocation of the proposals from Laxey to Axnfell. Moreover, participants were positive about the quality of answers received by attending staff in response to questions raised about the proposed development. Themes for positive comments are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Positive Feedback from Respondents	
Theme	Example Comments from Respondents
Relocation of the proposed STW from Laxey to Axnfell Respondents felt that the relocation of the proposed STW from Laxey to Axnfell was positive, citing that the current proposals were a significant improvement on the previous proposals.	“Moving away from a conservation area and popular/busy tourist and leisure facility is a good idea” (L9) “It is an improvement on the previous proposal” (L27)

Table 2 – Positive Feedback from Respondents	
Theme	Example Comments from Respondents
The pressing need for the development Many respondents expressed a pressing need for the development, describing the project as ‘long overdue’ and advocating the need for a modern STW.	“Let’s get on with this – a solution is needed to provide clean water into Laxey Bay” (L30) “We need an updated and modern sewage system and stop pumping raw sewage into the sea!!!” (L37) “Sewage services are needed and long overdue” (L20) “Just need doing!” (L39) “Needed urgently” (L40) “A project long overdue” (B19) “Seems like an overall plan for dealing with a longer term problem is at last being brought to fruition – good!!!” (B4)
Quality of answers provided by attending staff in relation to questions asked by members of the public Respondents praised the quality of answers to questions that attending staff at the public exhibition events had provided .	“My questions were answered very well at the event – the staff were very friendly and helpful” (B25) “Our questions were well answered” (B26) “Very pleased to have attended. Thank you for the presentation” (B4)

4.2.5 Respondents who were unsupportive of the proposals raised a number of concerns, including concerns on noise, the location of the development, impact on residential amenity, visual impact, construction traffic and costs. There was also a clear preference for the previously proposed development at The Cairns over the amended proposals at Axnfell. Themes for concerns raised by respondents is detailed in Table 3 below, with responses from MU in relation to each concern also included.

Table 3 – Concerns Raised by Respondents		
Theme	Example Comments from Respondents	Responses from Manx Utilities
Concerns over noise associated with the construction/operation of the development	“My concern is the construction noise of the plant being built” (L23) “I am concerned about vibration issues for residents” (L10)	“Where possible, we will work with the Contractors to programme major construction works to minimise any disruption and use best practice techniques

Table 3 – Concerns Raised by Respondents		
Theme	Example Comments from Respondents	Responses from Manx Utilities
Respondents expressed concern over the potential noise, vibration and disruption during both the construction and operation of the development.	“Still feel concerned re: potential noise of pumping against bedrock” (L1) “Please consider neighbouring properties when scheduling works, especially the tank construction” (L3)	to minimise noise, dust and traffic. We will meet separately with residents who may be directly impacted by the works to discuss further”. “The Environmental Impact Assessment, that will be submitted as part of the future planning application will detail how vibration will be dealt with at the treatment works and the pump station sites. The pumps that are proposed are relatively small compared to sites where we have experienced vibration problems in the past”
Concerns over visual impact Some respondents addressed concern over the visual impact of the proposed development	“Visual impact – site unsuitable industrialisation of rural...” (L32) “I would like to see more screening of the building” (L6) “Area of high landscape value” (L2) “Axnfell will be clear felled, resulting in your works exposed to views from Snaefell” (L4)	“Landscaping and screening will form part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and discussions with planners. The building will sit in a Conservation Area and the submitted plans will need to take the sensitive siting into account” “We will review screening provisions with the design team”
Concerns over the design of the development Some respondents were concerned about the design of the development. This included respondents citing that it was not in	“Please have a look at the design of pumping stations. The buildings are very poor and not in keeping with the Manx countryside. Reference <u>vernacular architecture</u>” (B3) “I would again urge the design team to consider	“Thank you for your comments regarding vernacular architecture. Where possible we will work with the Designers to review the designs of the buildings” “We will review the location of the tank and pump house at the Cairn with the Designers and try where possible to

Table 3 – Concerns Raised by Respondents		
Theme	Example Comments from Respondents	Responses from Manx Utilities
keeping with the local architecture.	<i>locating the tank and pumphouse further down the site” (L3)</i>	<i>minimise impacts on local residents and businesses”</i>
Concerns over the location being unsuitable/having a negative impact on amenity/having a negative impact on habitats and wildlife Respondents criticised the location of the development, addressing that it is too close to a number of residential receptors and would have a detrimental effect on the habitats and wildlife at Axnfell Plantation	• <i>“The sewage plant is needed but the location is wrong. If 50 sites were looked at and not suitable then surely IRIS would be better”. (L35)</i> • <i>“Not happy as live next to this proposal. I have lived here a long time” (L24)</i> • <i>“The treatment plant is too near Laxey village. The pump station near the harbour is obtrusive”(L12)</i> • <i>“Do not place so close to houses” (L8)</i> • <i>“Axnfell Plantation would be obsolete. Who is going to visit the plantation with a sewage farm” (L35)</i> • <i>“I support the principle of improving the water quality but I strongly object to the loss of the woodland at Axnfell. I had assumed it would be hidden in the dense, dark plantation, not the natural upper part of Axnfell” (B16)</i> • <i>“Loss of wildlife habitats” (L5)</i>	• <i>“We have considered over 50 sites for a new treatment works to serve Laxey and Baldrine. The assessment considered a wide range of issues including proximity to residential areas, traffic impacts, land zoning and likely environmental impact amongst others. The site at Axnfell scored favourably compared to others and is a site currently in public ownership. The whole scheme will be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment as part of the planning application which will be publicly available”</i> • <i>“The location of the treatment works, pumping stations and pipeline will be subject to a comprehensive EIA where ecological impacts will be fully assessed”</i>
Concerns over cost implications Respondents raised concerns about the financial implications of	• <i>“Expense to tax payer” (L5)</i> • <i>“For the amount of money this is costing why did you change from an affordable scheme” (L8)</i>	• <i>“Whilst we are unable to provide cost estimates (due to commercial confidentiality), we can confirm that the extra construction cost of providing a combined treatment works</i>

Table 3 – Concerns Raised by Respondents		
Theme	Example Comments from Respondents	Responses from Manx Utilities
the new plans, including the increased costs compared to the original scheme and ongoing operational costs. Respondents were interested in understanding the financial burden on taxpayers.	“What is the cost of the taxpayer in comparison to the Cairn site?” (L16) “Serious concerns as to cost – not just of build but on-going running costs (L46) - I’m concerned about the ongoing running costs of pumping sewage uphill” (B7)	rather than separate works at Laxey and Baldrine is approximately 15%”
Concerns over construction traffic Respondents raised concerns over construction traffic, citing that the surrounding lanes were not suitable for use by HGV traffic.	“Vehicles (tankers etc) should not be using Ballacollister Road – no vehicle passing places, used by horse risers, people walking with prams and young children” (L11) “Concern re: HGVs on small lanes (L1) “You are using extremely narrow country roads for large vehicles – single track roads” (L8)	“Construction traffic will inevitably have to use Ballacollister Road, but during operation we only envisage a maximum one small tanker visit per month to each of the pump stations and an occasional small van for maintenance” “The Construction Phase traffic movements will be subject to a Transport Assessment as part of the EIA where suitable access routes will be reviewed and considered. Any damage to roads will be repaired once the works are completed”
Concerns over accessibility to properties during construction Respondents were concerned that access to properties would be difficult during the construction phase, specifically when works are	“I need full access to my house which will not be accessible with digging road up for pipelines” (L8) “We need access along lane to our house when Exchange Hill is dug up for pipework. And we were offered temporary accommodation in a hotel while work on road which	“We will be discussing access provisions further with residents and will be touch in the future. We will try to provide ongoing access to your property, but there may be some short term instances where 24hrs vehicular access is not possible. In those instances we will discuss reasonable alternatives

Table 3 – Concerns Raised by Respondents		
Theme	Example Comments from Respondents	Responses from Manx Utilities
taking place within the road.	<i>is no good as we have 2 dogs, daughter and 2 grandsons living with us. Access has to be guaranteed". (L7)</i>	
Concerns over technical feasibility Respondents expressed scepticism about the technical feasibility of pumping sewage uphill and the overall effectiveness of the proposed solutions. They questioned the logic behind the engineering decisions made in the plans	• “Pumping uphill seems a complete waste of money and effort” (L10) • “Non-sensical pump uphill” (L31) • “Very cumbersome method – pumping up and down” (B8) • “Do not agree with pumping up hill (L7)	• “Whilst pumping sewage is not our preferred method of operation, it is carried out regularly across the network where we pump significant distances. This is not unique to the Isle of Man and is undertaken in other jurisdictions across the World. Our proposals currently include an energy recovery turbine to feedback into the grid from returning flows
Concerns over odour arising from the development Some respondents addressed concern on the potential odours arising from the development	• “I have concerns regarding effluent smell effecting my property” (L15) • “Further assurances about the escape of gas from the Treatment Plant are necessary” (L12)	• “The Environmental Impact Assessment, that will be submitted as part of the future planning application, will detail how odours will be dealt with at the treatment works and pump station sites. We are providing odour control at the system at the Cairn that will significant reduce any risk of odours”
Preference for the previous proposals at The Cairn Many respondents preferred the original plan for the STW at the Cairn site, citing it as cheaper, less disruptive, and more practical.	• “Understand numerous sites have been looked at however feel this will impact more people/houses than the original plan and this will still cause concern to those originally affected by original plans” (L1) • “Why not use Cairn if the impact is negligible” (L29)	• “Manx Utilities were disappointed that the original application for a new works at the Cairn was declined at the Planning Committee stage despite receiving Officer support. It was apparent at the time that there was little visible public support for a works at this site. Manx Utilities have therefore sought

Table 3 – Concerns Raised by Respondents		
Theme	Example Comments from Respondents	Responses from Manx Utilities
	• “The Cairn site is best choice” (L26) • “I think the original plans for sewage treatment at the Cairn site would be easier and cheaper and less disruptive” (L22) • “It makes no sense when a perfectly suitable site at the Cairn has already been identified” (L17) • “It should be at the Cairn site!!” (L16) • “The Cairn site is still the best option it should have gone to appeal”. (L11)	a deliverable solution that minimises impacts across a wide range of issues. There is no ideal solution that satisfies all concerns that delivers first time sewage treatment for Garff, but we are confident that the scheme we are proposing satisfies most of them” • “We would therefore only consider returning to the Cairn site should the current proposals not be accepted”

Ease of Understanding on the Display and Other Information Provided at the Event

4.2.6 Question 5 gathered opinions on whether the display and information exhibited at the event was easily understandable. The responses captured from the visitors for Question 5 are outlined in Table 4 below.

Table 4							
5. How did you find the display and other information?							
	1 Poor and difficult to understand	2	3	4	5 Very clear and easy to understand	No answer provided	Total
Respondent Answers	2	3	16	27	20	5	73
Percentage (%)	2.74%	4.11%	21.92%	36.99%	27.39%	6.85%	100%

4.2.7 From the answers provided, 5 (6.85%) respondents felt that the display and information provided was difficult to understand, 16 (21.92%) respondents felt neutral about the display and information provided, and 47 (64.38%) respondents felt that the display and information provided was easy to understand. Of the 73 responses received, the average response to the question was 3.88 out of 5, indicating that the display and information provided at the public exhibition events were generally clear and easy to understand.

Quality of the Answers Provided by Attending Staff in Relation to Questions Asked by Members of the Public

4.2.8 Question 6 gathered opinions on the quality of answers given by the attending staff in relation to the questions asked by members of the public. The responses captured from the visitors for Question 6 are outlined in Table 5 below.

Table 5							
6. Were you able to ask questions and receive answers from attending staff?							
	1 No they couldn't answer any questions	2	3	4	5 Yes they answered all my questions	No answer provided	Total
Respondent Answers	1	1	2	15	49	5	73
Percentage (%)	1.37%	1.37%	2.74%	20.55%	67.12%	6.85%	100%

4.2.9 From the answers provided, 2 (2.74%) respondents felt that the attending staff were unable to answer their questions on the proposed development, 2 (2.74%) respondents felt neutral about the quality of answers provided by attending staff to questions raised by members of the public, and 64 (87.67%) respondents felt that the attending staff were able to answer their questions on the proposed development. Of the 73 responses received, the average response to the question was 4.62 out of 5, indicating that the quality of answers provided by attending staff to questions raised by members of the public were generally good/excellent.

Level of Understanding on Why MU are Proposing to Build the Garff STW

4.2.10 Question 7 sought to capture opinions on whether members of the public were able to understand why MU are proposing to build the Garff STW. The responses captured from visitors for Question 7 are outlined in Table 6 below.

Table 6							
7. Do you understand why we are doing the work?							
	1 No I do not understand why the work is needed	2	3	4	5 I understand clearly why the work is needed	No answer provided	Total
Respondent Answers	5	0	5	7	53	3	73
Percentage (%)	6.85%	0.00%	6.85%	9.59%	72.60%	4.11%	100%

4.2.11 From the answers provided, 5 (6.85%) respondents were unable to understand why the work is required, 5 (6.85%) respondents felt neutral about the requirement for the work, and 60 (82.19%) of respondents were able to understand why the work is required. Of the 73 responses received, the average response to the question was 4.47 out of 5, indicating that the members of the public were generally able to understand why MU are proposing to build the Garff STW.

4.3 Summary

4.3.1 The review of the responses reveals that the primary concerns among respondents revolve around the location of the STW, preference for the original plans, potential noise and disruption during construction, economic implications, and scepticism regarding the technical aspects of the proposed solutions. These themes reflect a strong desire for transparency, environmental consideration, and community engagement in the planning process.

4.3.2 Although opinions on the proposed development were mixed, the display and information exhibited at the event was considered easily understandable, the quality of the answers provided by attending staff in response to questions raised by

members of the public received positive feedback, and the reasoning behind why the works are proposed was well understood by members of the public.

- 4.3.3 A copy of the questionnaire form used to obtain responses from members of the public is provided at Appendix A of this report.

4.4 Considerations of Matters Raised

- 4.4.1 The following section provides detail on how issues raised by members of the public have been addressed in the final design of the proposed development, as outlined within the Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the Environmental Impact Assessment prepared by Arcadis.

Air Quality and Odour

- 4.4.2 MU have confirmed that a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) would be prepared and would set out measures to minimise the potential for dust soiling and dust associated effects on human health during construction. Moreover, a Dust Management Plan would be prepared and approved by the local planning authority and would require the contractor to engage with the local community, maintain the construction site in good order, monitor dust impacts, and operate vehicles, plant and machinery sustainably. It is not envisaged that residual dust risks from construction activities will be significant, subject to these measures being implemented.
- 4.4.3 With reference to odour, it has been confirmed that emissions of odour from the treatment process will be contained and processed by Odour Control Units (OCUs) before being released into the air. An assessment was also undertaken to predict odour concentrations at the nearest sensitive receptors such as residential properties to the new sewage treatment works and pumping stations. Odour concentrations were predicted using a dispersion model and were compared against industry benchmark levels to determine the effects on sensitive receptors. The assessment predicted that the resulting odour effects on receptors would be negligible.

Biodiversity

- 4.4.4 MU have confirmed that several ecological enhancements have been proposed as part of the development.
- 4.4.5 As part of the proposals, the escarpment will be enhanced by mixed scrub planting in peripheral areas north and east of the sewage treatment works in order to create new habitats for a variety of species including invertebrates, breeding and sheltering birds

and commuting and foraging bats. The increase in length of Manx sod hedgerow near the site access is expected to benefit invertebrates, birds and common lizards.

- 4.4.6 New trees will be planted along the site's western perimeter and a further 75m of Manx sod hedgerow will be planted, enhancing screening and benefitting protected species.
- 4.4.7 The grassland enhancements and planting of new hedgerow will result in a biodiversity net gain (BNG) of 11.56%.
- 4.4.8 As part of the CEMP, mitigation measures for protected species, which include a Lighting Plan for bats; pre-clearance checks for birds and lizards by an Ecological Clerk of Works before vegetation is removed; and the avoidance of vegetation clearance during the breeding bird season, will be implemented to ensure that there will be minimal impact on protected species during the construction phase.

Landscape and Visual

- 4.4.9 MU have clarified that the accompanying CEMP will provide mitigation measures and will put controls on construction fencing, construction lighting and the height of stockpiles, in addition to ensuring that retaining trees and hedgerow are protected. These measures will contribute to the protection of the landscape during construction. Moreover, mitigation planting is proposed where scheme features are proposed to enhance visual screening.
- 4.4.10 The operational phase assessment considered effects on landscape character and visual amenity in year 1 and year 15. Significant effects identified relate to the visual amenity of people using nearby public rights of way, residential properties, local road network and from the Great Laxey Wheel viewing platform in year 1; however, these impacts are expected to reduce to non-significant by year 15 due to the mitigation planting that will have matured by that time.
- 4.4.11 In addition, the careful selection of colour and siting of the infrastructure will minimise visual effects of above ground scheme features. The layout of the Cairn pump station, and screening of infrastructure at Ballacollister Road and the entrance to the STW have also been modified in response to comments raised at the engagement events.

Noise and Vibration

- 4.4.12 MU have confirmed that construction phase noise will be controlled through measures specified in the CEMP, such as controls on working hours and requirements for vehicles, plant and machinery to be modern and well-maintained, considering the

phasing of the works, atypical activities, control measures, complaint procedures and compliant schemes. The construction phase assessment concluded that, with these controls in place, there will be no significant effects from noise or vibration.

- 4.4.13 Mechanical pumping equipment at all sites will be below ground and mounted where appropriate on anti-vibration material. Therefore, during operation there will be minimal potential to result in significant noise and vibration impacts.

Population and Health

- 4.4.14 MU have confirmed that no community assets are anticipated to be affected by the proposed construction works and impacts related to dust, noise, water quality and flood risk would be controlled through the implementation of a CEMP, leading to no health effects.
- 4.4.15 The sewage treatment works would also provide employment opportunities during construction and are anticipated to benefit the local economy.
- 4.4.16 Although there are likely to be some disruptions to public rights of way during construction, temporary diversions of any affected recreational routes will be implemented to ensure that opportunities for people to participate in recreational activities will not be negatively impacted upon.
- 4.4.17 Moreover, discussions have been held with landowners affected by pipeline routes (where they have wished to engage) and engagement with other residents is currently ongoing.

Water Quality

- 4.4.18 In relation to water quality, MU have confirmed that the CEMP will require the contractor to prepare a Pollution Control Plan to safeguard water quality and manage flow regimes during pipeline installation. With the best practice procedures in place the construction phase residual effects on the water environment will be limited and localised.
- 4.4.19 Surface water runoff from the sewage treatment works will be managed in accordance with Isle of Man policy and the drainage strategy. Land within the pipeline corridor and at watercourse crossings for the pipeline installation will be reinstated following construction, therefore no impacts on water receptors, the land drainage regime or flood risk are anticipated with that part of the proposed development during operation.

4.4.20 Moreover, during operation there is anticipated to be a significant benefit to water quality of the River Laxey.

Materials and Waste

4.4.21 MU have confirmed that the majority of construction materials will be sourced from the UK and excavated materials and primary aggregate will be sourced from the Isle of Man. Use of these materials and the effect on their availability and supply would not be significant.

4.4.22 Surplus construction materials brought to site will be reused, recycled or recovered at a rate of at least 90% and a project site waste management plan will be developed to detail methods of managing any waste generated on site.

4.4.23 The reduction in pollution as a result of the sewage treatment works will improve water quality of the River Laxey and Laxey Bay and improve human health.

Summary

4.4.24 In summary, it is evident that MU have considered the concerns raised by members of the public at the exhibition events and have implemented these into the final design and the construction and operational phases to ensure that adverse effects are minimised wherever possible.

5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1.1 36.99% of the individuals who attended the two public exhibitions at Laxey and Baldrine and completed the questionnaire were supportive of the proposals presented by MU, with 12.33% of individuals feeling neutral about the proposals, and 45.21% of individuals unsupportive of the proposals. Over three quarters of visitors were local Laxey and Baldrine residents. 64.38% of visitors found the exhibition clear and easy to understand and 82.19% of visitors understood the reasons for the project.
- 5.1.2 Several visitors also provided contact details which will permit all outstanding questions or concerns to be answered directly by MU.
- 5.1.3 The application is supported by various detailed technical assessments, including a full Environmental Statement which assesses the overall impact of the proposals, and seeks to demonstrate that there will be no unacceptable impacts as a result of the development.
- 5.1.4 Key concerns identified during the consultation relating to traffic and highways impact will be addressed through the submitted Transport Statement. This has considered road safety, traffic volume, access requirements and suitability as well as routing for vehicles during both construction and operation. This will ensure there are no unacceptable impacts on the surrounding road network.
- 5.1.5 Other notable concerns include potential impacts associated with noise and vibration, which has been considered and assessed via a Noise Impact Assessment to ensure that noise and vibration can be appropriately managed and mitigated so as to not create adverse impacts on local residents.
- 5.1.6 Matters surrounding Development Plan Policy and the site selection process are dealt with in the Planning Support Statement. This identifies the extensive site selection process and methodology followed, and how the project meets the Development Plan Policy requirements, as well as being a key component in achieving wider environmental objectives.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
Questionnaire Form

manxutilities
bun shirvelshyn vannin

1. Do you support our plans for first-time sewage treatment for Garff?

- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| I do not support these plans | | | | I fully support these plans |

- (continue overleaf if required)

- ☐ Radio ☐ Newspaper ☐ Internet

☐ Word of mouth ☐ Local poster ☐ Social Media

- Please provide the first 4 characters at least of your postcode: I M

If not, can you provide a general indication of where you live? _____

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Poor and
difficult to understand | | | | very clear and
easy to understand |

- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| No they couldn't answer any questions | | | | yes – they answered all my questions |

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| No I do not understand
why the work is needed | | | | I understand clearly
why the work is needed |

- (continue overleaf if required)

- (continue overleaf if required)

Please place the questionnaire in the box provided.

Thank you!

Manx Utilities • PO Box 177 • Douglas • Isle of Man • IM99 1PS • British Isles

wardell-armstrong.com

STOKE-ON-TRENT

Sir Henry Doulton House
Forge Lane
Etruria
Stoke-on-Trent
ST1 5BD
Tel: +44 (0)1782 276 700

BIRMINGHAM

Two Devon Way
Longbridge Technology Park
Longbridge
Birmingham
B31 2TS
Tel: +44 (0)121 580 0909

BOLTON

41-50 Futura Park
Aspinall Way
Middlebrook
Bolton
BL6 6SU
Tel: +44 (0)1204 227 227

BRISTOL

3rd Floor
Brew House
Jacob Street
Tower Hill
Bristol
BS2 0EQ
Tel: +44 (0)117 203 4477

BURY ST EDMUNDS

Armstrong House
Lamdin Road
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP32 6NU
Tel: +44 (0)1284 765 210

CARDIFF

Tudor House
16 Cathedral Road
Cardiff
CF11 9LJ
Tel: +44 (0)292 072 9191

CARLISLE

Marconi Road
Burgh Road Industrial Estate
Carlisle
Cumbria
CA2 7NA
Tel: +44 (0)1228 550 575

EDINBURGH

The Tun
4 Jackson's Entry
Edinburgh
EH8 8PJ
Tel: +44 (0)131 555 3311

GLASGOW

24 St Vincent Place
Glasgow
G1 2EU
Tel: +44 (0)141 428 4499

LEEDS

36 Park Row
Leeds
LS1 5JL
Tel: +44 (0)113 831 5533

LONDON

Summit House
12 Red Lion Square
London
WC1R 4QH
Tel: +44 (0)207 242 3243

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

City Quadrant
11 Waterloo Square
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 4DP
Tel: +44 (0)191 232 0943

TRURO

Baldhu House
Wheal Jane Earth Science Park
Baldhu
Truro
TR3 6EH
Tel: +44 (0)187 256 0738

International office:

ALMATY

29/6 Satpaev Avenue
Hyatt Regency Hotel
Office Tower
Almaty
Kazakhstan
050040
Tel: +7(727) 334 1310