



Friends of Ryebank Fields' view on the environmental impact of the proposed plans

<b>Developers' claims</b>	<b>Reality</b>
"Sustainable approach to the land"	It's not possible to build a development that is environmentally friendly if it involves the destruction of thriving ecosystems in a rewilded natural space.
"A third of the land retained"	Most of this is in the wooded area alongside Longford Park - hardly any of the rare, precious grassland would remain.
"Green roofs, allotments and community greens to support local biodiversity"	The majority of the thriving patchwork of habitats of grassland, trees and scrub would be destroyed, with devastating impacts on biodiversity.
"Buildings...certified Passivhaus; a tried and tested method of reducing carbon emissions from buildings"	While these would be environmentally friendly if constructed on brownfield land, Ryebank Fields is recognised by Manchester City Council as greenfield, and destroying hundreds of trees and acres of rare grassland habitat would add a huge carbon cost to the development.
"Ample space to walk, run, cycle and enjoy"	Most of the space in which the community can currently do these things would be built on, so our ability to take part in these activities would be severely impacted.
"Network of footpaths and cycle routes...will connect to the local active travel network and create safe routes to local shops, services, schools and public transport links"	These 'safe routes' don't exist and there are 111 parking spaces earmarked on the plans - in reality the development would add a large volume of extra traffic to the surrounding roads, making walking and cycling journeys significantly more dangerous.
Electric car club	The beautiful and thriving aspen grove - the only copse of aspen in Manchester - would be destroyed to make way for this.
Provision of some bee and bug hotels	These can't possibly compensate pollinators and insects for the loss of two fields full of wildflowers providing vital food and shelter, and the foraging opportunities for bats and birds who live on and pass through the fields.

<p>“Shared boundary with St John’s RC Primary School, as a learning wall with edible planting, and bee and bug hotels”</p>	<p>St John’s already have vegetable planters and could decide to include bee / bug hotels without the development taking place - the provision of these can’t compensate for the loss of wild green space on the children’s doorstep, the lost opportunity to learn about wild habitats and rewilding, the increased air pollution and traffic congestion or the safety risks of toxic materials being dug up next to the school if development goes ahead.</p>
<p>“...no adverse impacts [on habitats and wildlife] through development”</p>	<p>The destruction of the majority of their habitat and the creation of further light pollution would evidently have a very significant adverse impact on wildlife on the fields, as would the fact that both main footpaths cut through the wildlife corridor that exists along the Nico Ditch, effectively destroying its use as a corridor. The development would also interrupt the north - south wildlife corridor by cutting through the woods with a footpath and lighting.</p>