

Environmental Statement Addendum

July 2026

Volume 1a

Land East of Knowsley Lane, Knowsley.

On behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd.

Date: 20/07/2026 | Pegasus Ref: P21-3399

Document Management.

Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by:	Reason for revision
1	30/06/2026	EB	IH	
2	08/07/2026	EB	IH	Updated to red line boundary
3	20/07/2026	EB	IH/GL	Further correspondence from the council

Contents.

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Assessment Scope and Methodology of the ES Addendum.....	5
3. The Application Site.....	10
4. Proposed Development & Alternatives	11
5. Socio Economics and Health	13
6. Landscape and Visual.....	14
7. Ecology and Biodiversity	16
8. Cultural Heritage.....	27
9. Transport and Access.....	32
10. Air Quality	34
11. Noise and Vibration.....	35
12. Flood Risk and Drainage.....	39
13. Summary/Conclusions of Updated Assessment of Environmental Effects.....	40
14. Glossary	47
15. References	56

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction to this Addendum to the Environmental Statement

- 1.1.1. Pegasus Group, acting on behalf of the Applicant, submitted an Environmental Statement (ES) relating to a planning application on Land East of Knowsley Lane, Knowsley (the “Application Site” or “Site”) to Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council (KMBC) in August 2025 (planning application reference 25/00486/OUT). The application sought outline permission for (hereafter referred to as the ‘Proposed Development’):

“Outline planning application (including details of access into the site but not within the site with all other matters reserved for future approval) for the erection of up to 700 dwellings (C3 Use Class) with vehicular access from Knowsley Lane together with public open space, landscaping, sustainable urban drainage systems and other associated works”

- 1.1.2. The ES was prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2017 (2017 No. 571) (as amended) and presented the findings of a series of studies that evaluated the potential significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development.
- 1.1.3. Following this submission, the ES and planning application documentation was circulated to both statutory and non-statutory consultees, with consultees providing formal responses to KMBC where desired.
- 1.1.4. Whilst no formal request for further information under Regulation 25 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017 has been made, following consultee comments further assessment in relation to ecological matters and further design work has been undertaken and has led to some minor amendments to the Proposed Development. The amendments are in relation to, the inclusion of the 15m buffer around the onsite ancient woodland shown on the parameters plan, the reduction of the height parameter on development parcels in the north eastern corner and along the southern boundary, the amendment to the size and alignment of the south eastern development parcel, and amendment to active travel provision. The red line boundary for the Site has also been amended to reduce the Site area by 0.15 hectares (ha), to remove a small area of land along the northern Site boundary. An updated Site Location Plan is provided as Figure 1.1A.
- 1.1.5. Following the submission of the ES there has been further information provided to KMBC following consultee comments and also following further assessment work. This ES Addendum seeks to provide a summary of this additional information and, where relevant, to provide an update to the assessment or commentary.
- 1.1.6. The amendments do not change the overall conclusions of the submitted ES, however it has been considered robust to present the amendments and commentary where within this Addendum to the ES as “any other information” (EIA Regulations 2017). “Any other information” is defined as *“any other substantive information relating to the ES and provided by the applicant”* (Regulation 2)
- 1.1.7. Such additional information submitted voluntarily by an applicant must be treated in the same way as information formally requested by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in respect of ES. Therefore, although no ‘formal’ request for further information has been made by KMBC, this ES Addendum is submitted under Regulation 25 of the 2017 EIA Regulations ‘*Further information*

and evidence respecting Environmental Statements'. Accordingly, KMBC should consult on this additional information in full accordance with the requirements of Regulation 25.

- 1.1.8. This Addendum should be read in combination with the original ES submitted in August 2025 and further information which has been submitted to KMBC following the submission of the planning application, a full list of this information is provided in the following section overleaf. Other documents outside the ES also provide information in relation to 'none EIA' disciplines and have been updated as necessary following the scheme changes and consultee comments.
- 1.1.9. As with the original ES, the consultants who have contributed to the preparation of this ES Addendum are considered to be competent experts, in accordance with the EIA Regulations. Information demonstrating their expertise is referenced in the Competency Statement at the front of the original ES.
- 1.1.10. The updated information provided with this Addendum includes:
- Figure 1.1A Site Location Plan
 - Figure 4.1A Parameters Plan
 - Figure 4.2A Illustrative Framework Plan
 - Figure 4.3A Illustrative Landscape Masterplan
 - Appendix 7.11A Arboriculture Assessment
 - Appendix 7.12A BNG Report and BNG Metric (Rev B)
- 1.1.11. The figures in the above list have been updated with the new red line boundary for the Site. Given the very minor change to the red line and the scale at which other figures are presented within the August 2025 ES these have not been updated and remain valid for the purpose of the assessment.

2. Assessment Scope and Methodology of the ES Addendum

2.1. Scope of this Addendum to the ES

- 2.1.1. The purpose of this Addendum to the ES is to present the minor amendments to the Proposed Development and review the technical assessments previously undertaken to confirm whether there are any resultant changes to the assessment of likely significant effects and/or proposed mitigation measures. The overall scope and methodology follows that of the August 2025 ES.
- 2.1.2. This Addendum therefore reviews the updated proposals against each technical discipline, providing updated assessment or commentary where necessary.
- 2.1.3. Following the submission of the ES there has been further information provided to KMBC, prior to the preparation of this ES Addendum, following consultee comments and also following further assessment work. A summary of this further information is provided in the below table.

Table 2.1A Summary of Updated Information Provided to KMBC

Relevant Discipline	Date Provided	Summary of Information
Ecology	October 2025	ES Appendix 7.6 Red Squirrel Report – appendix provided as was not available at the time of submission ES Appendix 7.5 Bat Survey Update – Appendix updated following further survey work undertaken following the submission. ES Chapter 7 Ecology and Biodiversity – Chapter updated following the updated survey results. Non-Technical Summary – updated following updates to the Ecology Chapter of the ES.
Noise	January 2026	Noise Response to consultation comments received by Environmental Health
Heritage / Landscape	January 2026	Heritage Rebuttal to consultation comments received. Amends to landscape mitigation including further woodland planting along the eastern boundary with Stanley Grange Business Village and extended depth to the woodland planting along the southern boundary.

		Photomontage showing a 20m landscape buffer from the southern boundary (viewpoint 4). Photomontage showing a 30m landscape buffer from the southern boundary (viewpoint 4).
Ecology	January 2026	Technical note response to comments from MEAS (December 2025) – To provide further consideration and provision of additional information relating to irreplaceable habitat, bats, breeding birds, wintering birds and biodiversity net gain. Figure 7.4 Priority habitats and ancient woodland within 1km update – Updated to reflect new ancient woodland designations. Revised Statutory BNG metric (Rev A) – To reflect changes in strategic significance of woodland, ponds, native hedgerows, and native hedgerows with trees and area of Individual trees. In response to comments from MEAS (December 2025). Bird Habitat compensation Strategy – Addendum to the Wintering Bird Report and Breeding Bird Report appendices to provide further information and detail on compensation measures for both breeding and wintering birds. In response to comments from MEAS (December 2025).
Ecology / Landscape	February 2026	Response provided to KMBC Environmental Sustainability Service (ESS). Tree Retention Plan provided.
Transport	April 2026	Transport Note provided following a meeting with the LPA and the Local Highway Authority (LHA) to discuss offsite improvements and active travel improvements.
Heritage	April 2026	Series of further photomontages provided from viewpoint 4 with a landscape buffer at 20m, 30m, 40m & 60m from the boundary edge. A 20m landscape buffer is included within illustrative design as part of the August 2025 ES, the photomontages showing the additional buffers were used to demonstrate the negligible difference in views between the 20m and the larger landscape buffers. Additional viewpoints from Home Farm (Viewpoint 1 and 2) were also provided.

Ecology	May 2026	Draft Recreational Management Plan – Sets out measures to ensure that the ancient woodland within and adjacent to the Site does not deteriorate as a result of increased recreational activity associated with the proposed development. In response to further comments from MEAS (March 2026). Ancient woodland impact assessment – Standalone ancient woodland impact assessment. In response to further comments from MEAS (March 2026).
Heritage	June 2026	Planning & Heritage Addendum Note – Heritage Impacts & Wider Planning Balance
Ecology	July 2026	Additional documentation to secure breeding and wintering bird offsite mitigation. In response to further comments from MEAS (March 2026). Revised Statutory BNG metric – To reflect updates to landscape plan and BNG strategic significance in line with newly adopted LNRS (provided as part of this Addendum)

- 2.1.4. This Addendum reviews the updated information and where relevant provides updated assessment or commentary to the technical assessment provided within the August 2025 ES.
- 2.1.5. The intention of this Addendum, in accordance with the EIA Regulations, is to provide relevant updated information/assessment which is directly relevant to reaching a reasoned conclusion on the likely significant effects. It is not intended to substitute the original ES; this Addendum should therefore be read in combination with the original ES submission.
- 2.1.6. The format of Chapters contained in this ES Addendum are numbered in accordance with the chapter numbers of the August 2025 ES for ease of reference. Any figures or appendices that have not been subject to change are as previously presented in August 2025 ES. Where a figure or appendix has the suffix 'A' at the end of its reference it is proposed that this supersedes the previously submitted document or plan.
- 2.1.7. The ES Addendum is structured as follows:
- Chapter 1: Introduction to the Addendum
 - Chapter 2: Assessment Scope and Methodology (this chapter)
 - Chapter 3: The Application Site: Updated to reflect minor change to red line boundary.
 - Chapter 4: Proposed Development & Alternatives: As a result of further design work following consultee comments, minor amendments have been made to the Proposed Development, which has resulted in minor modifications to the Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A), Illustrative Development Framework Plan (Figure 4.2A) and the Illustrative

Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A). These minor amendments are set out in this Addendum Chapter 4.

- Chapter 5: Socio Economics and Health: no updates required – refer to August 2025 ES. The minor amendments do not impact the conclusions of the previous assessment. Impacts have previously been assessed and conclusions remain valid.
- Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Assessment: The minor amendments do not impact the conclusions of the previous assessment. Impacts have previously been assessed and conclusions remain valid. Following consultee comments the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A) has been updated and commentary is provided for this.
- Chapter 7: Ecology and Biodiversity: Commentary is provided on the minor amendments to the Proposed Development and also following the further information provided since the submission of the original ES. The assessment provided within the ES has been updated to include further assessment for ancient woodland and additional mitigation measures in response to consultee comments which have **reduced the effect stated within the August 2025 ES from not-significant negative to neutral for some receptors**.
- Chapter 8: Historic Environment: The minor amendments to the Proposed Development do not alter the assessment or overall conclusions of the August 2025 ES. Further information was provided to KMBC following consultee comments which has **reduced the effect stated within the August 2025 ES for the Curtilage Listed Home Farm from moderate adverse to minor adverse**.
- Chapter 9: Transport and Access: no updates required – refer to August 2025 ES. The minor amendments do not impact the conclusions of the previous assessment. Impacts have previously been assessed, and conclusions remain valid. Commentary on the further information provided is included.
- Chapter 10: Air Quality: no updates required – refer to August 2025 ES. To confirm there have been no changes in traffic flow data assessed as part of the air quality assessment which would significantly affect the conclusions. Impacts have previously been assessed and conclusions remain valid.
- Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration: no updates required – refer to August 2025 ES. To confirm there have been no changes in traffic flow data assessed as part of the noise assessment which would significantly affect the conclusions. Impacts have previously been assessed and conclusions remain valid. Commentary on the further information provided is included.
- Chapter 12: Flood Risk and Drainage: no updates required – refer to August 2025 ES. The minor amendments do not impact the conclusions of the previous assessment. Impacts have previously been assessed and conclusions remain valid.
- Chapter 13: Summary: Provides a summary of the Addendum and for clarity confirms the mitigation and enhancement measures identified within each of the environmental disciplines included within the August 2025 ES and this ES Addendum, and a conclusion on whether there are any likely significant residual effects.
- Chapter 14: Glossary: no updates required but included for reference.

- Chapter 15: References: no updates required but included for reference.
- Non Technical Summary (NTS): an updated version of the NTS which covers all ES matters is provided separately as a standalone document

2.1.8. The ES Addendum has been compiled using a range of sources and with inputs from technical specialists. The organisations inputting to this ES Addendum remain the same as those who inputted to the August 2025 ES and are considered to be competent experts, in accordance with the EIA Regulations. Information demonstrating their expertise is referenced in the Competency Statement at the front of the original ES.

2.2. Availability of Addendum ES

2.2.1. This Addendum to the ES (and the original submission) should be made available by Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council (KMBC) for public viewing during normal office hours at the below address. For details of where and viewing times please contact KMBC.

Knowsley Metropolitan Borough
Council,
Planning Services,
Municipal Buildings,
Huyton,
Knowsley,
L36 9UX

Telephone: 0151 443 2381

Website: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/planning-and-development>

2.2.2. Additional copies of the Non-Technical Summary (“NTS”) (no charge) and ES Volume 1a (£50 including postage) are available from Pegasus Group, Pegasus Group, Central House, Queen Street, Lichfield, WS13 6QD. The Addendum to the ES can also be obtained in CD format for £10 from the same address. Please quote code P21-3399 when seeking a copy of the ES information.

2.2.3. Comments on the planning application should be sent to the KMBC Planning Department, located at the Council Offices, at the address / details given above. Please do not send comments to Pegasus Group, the Applicant or the consultants who have contributed to this ES as these may not be taken into consideration.

3. The Application Site

- 3.1.1. There has been a minor update to the red line boundary as shown on the updated Site Location Plan included as Figure 1.1A. The Site red line has reduced by 0.15 hectares (ha) which has reduced the overall Site area from 33.75ha to 33.6ha. The reduction of the red line excludes a small area along the northern boundary of the Site, this area was proposed for retained vegetation.
- 3.1.2. Given the amendment to the red line is minor and there are no changes to the existing primary use of the Site, the description of the Application Site provided in Chapter 3 of the August 2025 ES is considered accurate and remains relevant.
- 3.1.3. Refer to Chapter 3 of the August 2025 ES.

4. Proposed Development & Alternatives

4.1. Introduction

4.1.1. Chapter 4 of the original ES (August 2025 Volume 1) set out the description of the Proposed Development and its construction, along with providing a Parameter Plan (Figure 4.1).

4.1.2. As noted in the Introduction of this Addendum, minor amendments have been made to the Proposed Development following updates to the design following correspondence with consultees. This Addendum Chapter sets out these further amendments and provides an updated Parameter Plan (Figure 4.1A) which replaces the previous Figure 4.1. Following the minor updates to the design the Illustrative Development Framework Plan (Figure 4.2A) and Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A) have also been updated, which replaces the previous Figure 4.2 and 4.3 respectively. The figures have been updated to include the minor amendment to the red line boundary.

4.2. Proposed Development Amendments

4.2.1. The formal description of the Proposed Development as set out in the planning application and Chapter 4 of the August ES 2025, remains unchanged as follows:

“Outline application (including details of access to but not within the site) for the erection of up to 700 dwellings together with public open space, landscaping, new vehicular access junctions, active travel links, sustainable urban drainage systems and other associated infrastructure.”

4.2.2. The Land Use Quantum as set out in Chapter 4 of the August 2025 ES has been updated to capture the minor updates to the Proposed Development including the reduction in height parameter in the north eastern development parcel and in the southern section of the Site and the removal of the emergency access point (in the north east corner).

Table 4.1A: Land Use (updated to capture minor updates)

Parameter *	Land Use	Description
Built Form (approx. 20.66 ha) (including access and movement)	Residential Dwellings including internal road infrastructure	Up to 700 residential dwellings comprising a range of heights, with a maximum height of 12.5m above proposed ground levels across the majority of the Site, with a reduced maximum height of 9m in the north eastern development parcel and in the southern parcel. Areas includes roads, public realm, footpaths, private drives, gardens, incidental open space and other associated infrastructure
	Vehicular Access Points	Two vehicular points of access/egress to/from the Site are proposed via Knowsley Lane (B5202), which will be connected to one another by a primary vehicular corridor (alignment within built form parcel to be determined at detailed stages)
	Pedestrian/cycle and other access	Retained access/egress for cyclists and pedestrians to/from the Site. Additional indicative locations of potential pedestrian, cycle, active travel is also proposed.
Green Infrastructure (approx. 8.67 ha)		Including amenity green space, children’s play provision, landscape planting, retained hedgerows/trees (where

Parameter *	Land Use	Description
Retained Woodland including 15m buffer (approx. 4.27 ha)		feasible), footpaths/cycleways, drainage/sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and associated utilities and service infrastructure. Additional incidental areas of green infrastructure will be incorporated into the built from parcels and are not included in this quantum. Existing woodland onsite to be retained and a 15m buffer applied.

* Based on Figure 4.1A Parameter Plan

4.2.3. Following further consultee comments and further design work, the below minor amendments have been made to the Proposed Development:

- The illustrative alignment of the internal road and the development parcel in the south eastern corner has been amended following comments from the KMBC landscape and ecology officer (ESS team). The indicative road alignment has been adjusted to move slightly further north and the development parcel has been adjusted to be more square in shape with the illustrative road alignment feeding into the northern extent of the parcel.
- The height parameter has been adjusted for the north eastern development parcel, reducing from a maximum of 12.5m to 9m from above proposed ground levels. The 9m height parameter has also been extended in the southern development parcel.
- A 15m buffer zone is proposed around ancient woodland (as stated in the August 2025 ES) and is now demonstrated on the Parameters Plan, confirming no development is proposed in this area.
- The detail of the site access junctions and in particular the active travel provision and crossing facilities across Knowsley Lane have been revised.
- Emergency and active travel access to Parklands located in the north east corner has been removed. A further range of active travel and bus improvements have also been discussed and agreed in principle.
- Development density has been defined for the north eastern parcel with the western side of the parcel to have a density of less than 30 dwellings per ha and the eastern side to have a density of less than 25 dwellings per ha.

4.2.4. To reflect the above minor amendments, the Parameters Plan (which has been assessed against baseline conditions within each environmental discipline) has been updated and included within Figure 4.1A. The Illustrative Framework Development Plan (Figure 4.2A) and the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A), which demonstrate one way in which the development could be built out, have also been updated to reflect the above changes. Further landscape planting along the eastern and southern boundaries has been incorporated to strengthen screening in these areas and also to provide a dark corridor to benefit commuting and foraging bats. These amends have been made following consultation with the relevant consultees following the planning application submission.

4.2.5. Each environmental discipline considered in the previous ES has been reviewed in light of the above minor scheme amendments, with additional commentary provided, where necessary, as set out in Chapter 2, Assessment Scope and Methodology of the ES Addendum.

5. Socio Economics and Health

5.1. Proposed Development Amendments

- 5.1.1. The amendments to the Proposed Development as set out in Addendum Chapter 4 are minor modifications relating to requested changes by consultees in regard to transport, heritage and ecological effects and a reduction in the Site red line and do not effect Socio Economics and Health. As such the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES remain valid in relation to Socio Economics and Health.

5.2. Further Information Provided to KMBC

- 5.2.1. No further information has been provided to KMBC in relation to Socio Economic and Health matters.

6. Landscape and Visual

6.1. Proposed Development Amendments

- 6.1.1. The amendments to the Proposed Development as set out in Addendum Chapter 4 are minor modifications to the Proposed Development and the Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A). This includes a reduction in the height parameter for development in the north eastern corner and along the southern boundary, an amendment to the shape and indicative road alignment of the southern parcel, minor amends to the active travel provision, the inclusion of a 15m buffer around the ancient woodland within the Site and a reduction in the Site red line. Overall, these changes do not alter the assessment, conclusion or proposed mitigation as set out in the August 2025 ES, and as such the assessment provided remains valid in relation to the LVIA.
- 6.1.2. It is acknowledged that minor amendments have been made to the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A) following correspondence with the KMBC and consultees (in relation to heritage and ecological matters which are covered in greater detail in Chapter 8 and Chapter 7 of this Addendum respectively) to strengthen the screening along the southern and eastern boundaries to reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development from the surrounding heritage assets and also the update to the red line. The figure has been updated to included further woodland planting along the eastern boundary with Stanley Grange Business Village and the depth of the woodland planting along the southern boundary with Knowsley Park has been extended. It is noted that these changes have been made from a heritage and ecological perspective to reduce the visibility to the surrounding heritage assets and provide a dark corridor for foraging and commuting bats, and have not been made to reduce any impact from a landscape and visual perspective. As such, this does not alter the assessment, conclusion or description of mitigation as set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices in relation to the LVIA.

6.2. Further Information Provided to KMBC

- 6.2.1. Further information was provided to KMBC's Environment Sustainability Service (ESS) Team in January 2026, April 2026 and then at a meeting held in May 2026 to agree the position going forwards. A Response Tracker was provided to KMBC summarising this correspondence. For the purpose of this Addendum the key points which have led to updates to the Proposed Development include:
- The 15m no development buffer was added to the parameters plan to clearly demonstrate no development is proposed within the buffer following comments provided by ESS. It should be noted this was always proposed as part of the design of the Proposed Development described within the August 2025 ES. This has now been added to the Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A) to provide confidence in its inclusion in the design.
 - ESS noted there are too many rear and side facing properties located against proposed public open space, especially in relation to the ancient woodland on the north and southern side, noting this will cause problems for the estate moving forwards with the lack of natural surveillance. Following this comment the design has been amended and the development parcel and indicative road alignment in the south eastern section of the Site amended so that the roadway is located to the north of the parcel. This change is included on Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A) and the accompanying illustrative plans (Figure 4.2A and Figure 4.3A).

- Other points were raised by ESS and were either dealt with within the design code or related to the detailed design and will therefore will be dealt with at Reserved Matters stage.

6.2.2. Overall, these changes do not alter the assessment, conclusion or proposed mitigation as set out in the August 2025 ES, and as such the assessment provided remains valid in relation to the LVIA.

7. Ecology and Biodiversity

7.1. Proposed Development Amendments

- 7.1.1. The amendments to the Proposed Development as set out in Addendum Chapter 4 are minor modifications to the Proposed Development and the Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A). This includes a reduction in the Site red line boundary, a reduction in the height parameter for development in the north eastern corner and along the southern boundary, an amendment to the shape and indicative road alignment of the southern parcel, minor amends to the active travel provision, and the inclusion of a 15m buffer around the ancient woodland within the Site.
- 7.1.2. It should be noted that the 15m buffer around the ancient woodland within the Site was proposed as part of the design described within Chapter 4 of the August 2025 ES, but has now been added to the Parameters Plan to provide confidence in its inclusions within the design of the scheme.
- 7.1.3. As a result of consultation with Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (MEAS) the scheme design was amended to further increase the woodland and scrub habitat buffer adjacent to the retained hedgerow (H6) which connects the onsite woodland to Knowsley Park. This will result in a wider corridor which could allow for a 20m dark corridor at the road crossing connecting the onsite and offsite woodland. The dark corridor is located to the south east of the ancient woodland within the Site and is shown on the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A).
- 7.1.4. These minor updates to the Proposed Development have not altered the conclusions of the August 2025 ES in relation to Ecology matters.

Hedgerow losses – Updated impact assessment

- 7.1.5. As a result of the update to the active travel provision there is an increase in the amount of hedgerow proposed to be removed. Therefore an updated assessment is provided to cover this additional loss of hedgerow, this was also requested in comments from KMBC Environment and Sustainability Service (ESS) (dated 1st July 2026).
- 7.1.6. The Proposed Development will result in the permanent loss of approximately 350m of species-poor, predominantly hawthorn hedgerow, principally to facilitate site access arrangements. This represents an increase of 261m of hedgerow loss compared to that assessed within the August 2025 ES, increasing the extent of loss from approximately 89m (6.6% of the hedgerow resource recorded within the Site) to 350m (equivalent to approximately 23.17% of the recorded hedgerow resource).
- 7.1.7. None of the hedgerows affected meet the criteria for designation as an 'Important Hedgerow' under the Wildlife and Landscape Criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997. Furthermore, species-poor hawthorn hedgerows are a common and widespread feature within the surrounding local landscape and are well represented in the wider area. The affected hedgerow (H1) was found to support limited ecological function, supporting only low levels of breeding bird and bat activity and no notable wintering bird interest. Consequently, notwithstanding the increase in the extent of hedgerow loss, the ecological value and function of the affected habitat remains unchanged from that assessed within the August 2025 ES.
- 7.1.8. Therefore, the conclusions of the August 2025 ES remain valid and the revised hedgerow losses are not considered to materially alter the nature, magnitude or significance of the predicted effects. The impacts associated with hedgerow loss are therefore considered to remain in line

with the August 2025 ES, resulting in a Not Significant Adverse effect at the Local scale prior to compensation measures secured through the Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.

Breeding and Wintering Birds

- 7.1.9. The breeding bird assemblage associated with the Site is considered to constitute an Important Ecological Feature (IEF) of Local importance. Breeding bird surveys recorded only a single observation of a notable species (Song thrush) associated with H1 on 5 June 2025. Furthermore, wintering bird surveys did not record any notable wintering bird species utilising H1. Although the wider farmland bird assemblage associated with the Site is considered to be of Local importance, H1 was not identified as supporting a significant component of the bird IEF and its loss is not considered to alter the conclusions of the August 2025 ES.

Bats

- 7.1.10. Foraging and commuting bats associated with the Site are considered to constitute an IEF of Local importance. No significant commuting corridors were identified in association with H1 during the surveys and bat activity surveys recorded only sporadic commuting activity by pipistrelle bats along H1. The affected hedgerow was therefore considered to make only a limited contribution to the bat IEF and its loss is not considered to alter the conclusions of the August 2025 ES.
- 7.1.11. Accordingly, notwithstanding the increase in the extent of hedgerow loss, the ecological value and function of the affected habitat in relation to both bird and bat IEF remains unchanged from that assessed within the August 2025 ES.

Arboriculture Assessment

- 7.1.12. The Arboriculture Assessment provided as Appendix 7.11A has been updated to include the updated Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A) and to reflect the increase in the loss of hedgerow to accommodate the proposed active travel route. A section has also been added to the report to provide a definition of a veteran tree as considered within the assessment following comments from KMBC ESS provided on the 1st of July. It should be noted the oak tree in the south west corner of the Site will be retained with an appropriate development standoff included, this was included in the previous issue of the Arboriculture Assessment (Appendix 7.11). The overall conclusions of the report remain unchanged from the previous issue.

7.2. Further Information Provided to KMBC

Red Squirrel Survey, Bat Survey and Updated Ecology Chapter (October 2025)

- 7.2.1. At the time of submission for the August 2025 ES bat and red squirrel surveys were ongoing. Additional bat activity surveys were undertaken in August 2025 and hair tube surveys for red squirrels were undertaken in August 2025. These were then subsequently provided alongside the updated Ecology ES chapter to KMBC in October 2025.
- 7.2.2. With regard to red squirrel, the woodlands on Site provide suitable habitat for both red and grey squirrel. Surveys of suitable habitat found a single squirrel drey within W2 and potential squirrel feeding remains in the form of eaten hazel nuts around a number of trees within W1. Due to the prevalence of grey squirrels in the area, and lack of recent records despite regular monitoring for the presence of red squirrel, it was considered likely that these signs are due to the presence of grey squirrel rather than reds. Nevertheless, a hair tube surveys were undertaken in August 2025 to confirm the presence or likely absence of red squirrel. A total of twenty tubes (10 tubes

in each of the eastern and western woodland parcels) were deployed on 1st August 2025, checked for hairs and re-baited on 12th August 2025. All tubes were retrieved from Site on 21st August 2025.

- 7.2.3. No tubes had red or grey squirrel hairs present. As such, no evidence for red squirrel has been identified, and it is therefore considered likely that this species is absent from the Site. Red squirrels are therefore scoped out of further assessment and the suggested mitigation measures removed.
- 7.2.4. The updated Bat Survey Report has resulted in no change to the assessment or the conclusions presented within the Ecology Chapter of the ES. The proposed bat box provision as enhancement for foraging / commuting bats was also removed as this is no longer considered relevant.

Ecological Technical Note (January 2026)

- 7.2.5. In January 2026 a Technical Note was provide to KMBC in response to comments received from Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (MEAS) dated 2nd December 2025 regarding Ecology Chapter 7 of the August 2025 ES. These comments requested further consideration and provision of additional information relating to irreplaceable habitats, bats breeding birds, wintering birds and biodiversity net gain. A summary of the key points from the Technical Note is as follows:
- Clarification of a 15m buffer from the ancient woodland within the Site. This buffer is included within the design of the Proposed Development described in Chapter 4 of the August 2025 ES. To provide confidence that this has been embedded within the design it has been included on the updated Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A).
 - Recommendation for detailed Recreational Management plan and Detailed Lighting Scheme to be provided at reserved matters or full planning application stage.
 - An updated Ancient Woodland assessment was provided (a summary of this is provided in the following section).
 - Clarification on assessment of bat assemblage importance, noting that this would not change the assessment of impacts or recommended mitigation as set out in the August 2025 ES.
 - Amendment to the illustrative design of the scheme to include a 20m dark corridor for bats. Figure 4.3A, has been updated to include this with increased woodland and scrub habitat proposed. The 20m dark corridor connects the onsite and offsite woodland and enhances the habitat for foraging and commuting bats.
 - Summary of BNG calculations (Rev A) were provided following changes outlined in the revised Statutory BNG Metric. To reflect changes in strategic significance of woodland, ponds, native hedgerows, and native hedgerows with trees and area of individual trees. This has resulted in a slight loss on hedgerows and an overall increase in habitat gain.
 - Clarification on assessment of woodland condition was provided, this does not change the effects or recommended mitigation as set out within the August 2025 ES.

Ancient Woodland – Updated Assessment

- 7.2.6. Following an update to the Magic Map Ancient Woodland Layer since submission (see updated Figure 7.4 provided in January 2026), the assessment of impacts to ancient woodland has been updated.
- 7.2.7. The following woodlands are included within the assessment, with four additional woodlands (in bold):
- Howards Pits and Knowles' Pits located within the Site;
 - Knowsley Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS) located adjacent to the southern and eastern boundaries;
 - Little Wood LWS located approximately 290m west;
 - Meakins Pits LWS located approximately 496m northwest;
 - **Syder's Grove located approximately 40m north;**
 - **Little Wood Lodge located approximately 94m south west;**
 - **Admiral's Belt located approximately 461m south; and**
 - **Pinfold Wood located approximately 365m north.**
- 7.2.8. An additional visit to Little Wood and Syder's Grove woodlands was undertaken on 8th May 2026 in order to inform an opinion of the current recreational pressures and management practices within these woodlands. Following this a standalone Ancient Woodland Impact Assessment was provided to MEAS in May 2026. Table 7.1A below provides a summary of the Ancient Woodland Impact Assessment.

Table 7.1A: Summary of Likely Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effect on Ancient Woodland

	Knowles' Pits	Howard's Pits	Knowsley Park	Syder's Grove wood	Little Wood
Construction Impacts	Accidental damage, pollution and soil compaction. Airborne dust Lighting impacts	Accidental damage, pollution and soil compaction. Airborne dust Lighting impacts	Airborne dust Lighting impacts	N/A – scoped out due to distance	N/A – scoped out due to distance
Operational Impacts	Recreational impacts (physical damage, compaction, trampling, littering and dog fouling). Lighting impacts	Recreational impacts (physical damage, compaction, trampling, littering and dog fouling). Lighting impacts	Lighting impacts	Recreational impacts (physical damage, compaction, trampling, increased littering and dog fouling).	Recreational impacts (physical damage, compaction, trampling, increased littering and dog fouling).
Likely Significant Effect (prior to mitigation)	Not-Significant Negative Effect	Not-Significant Negative Effect	Not-Significant Negative Effect	Not-Significant Negative Effect	Not-Significant Negative Effect
Mitigation	Provision of a CEMP for Ecology to address construction impacts. Provision of a Recreational Management Plan New home owner packs will be distributed	Provision of a CEMP for Ecology to address construction impacts. Provision of a Recreational Management Plan New home owner packs will be distributed	Provision of a CEMP for Ecology to address construction impacts. Provision of a detailed lighting scheme New home owner packs will be distributed highlighting the	Contribution to existing management/ maintenance of woodland. New home owner packs will be distributed highlighting the pressures and sensitivities of the	Contribution to existing management/ maintenance of woodland. New home owner packs will be distributed highlighting the pressures and sensitivities of the



	highlighting the pressures and sensitivities of the surrounding ancient woodlands. Provision of a detailed lighting scheme. Provision of a HMMP	highlighting the pressures and sensitivities of the surrounding ancient woodlands. Provision of a detailed lighting scheme Provision of a HMMP	pressures and sensitivities of the surrounding ancient woodlands.	surrounding ancient woodlands.	surrounding ancient woodlands.
Residual Effect	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible/Neutral	Negligible/Neutral
Enhancement	Management to enhance from poor to moderate condition.	Management to enhance from poor to moderate condition.			

7.2.9. Following implementation of the mitigation measures as described above, no significant impacts to ancient woodland have been identified. As no residual significant negative effects to ancient woodland have been identified, no degradation or loss of ancient woodland is considered likely as a result of Proposed Development.

7.2.10. Therefore, whilst the assessment and proposed mitigation have been updated from the August 2025 ES, the overall conclusions remain valid for ecology matters.

Bird Habitat Compensation Strategy

7.2.11. A Bird Habitat Compensation Strategy was provided in January 2026 as an addendum to the Breeding Bird Survey and Wintering Bird Survey (Appendix 7.3 and 7.4 respectively of the August 2025 ES). This provided further information on proposed compensation measures for both breeding and wintering birds. This document outlines offsite bird compensatory habitat provision via the creation of set aside habitat on land within the local area. This includes two potential options:

- Option 1 – Skylark plots and wintering provisions
- Option 2 – Set-aside creation

7.2.12. A further document will be provided to KMBC which outlines the location of farmland to be targeted (or options on farmland), how the compensation will be secured and how long the compensations will be secured for.

Draft Recreational Management Plan

7.2.13. The Draft Recreational Management Plan (DRMP) was provided to KMBC in May 2026 following further comments from MEAS received in March 2026. This document outlines current habitat condition, recreational use and pressures.

7.2.14. The DRMP provides an outline management and monitoring strategy to ensure that the ancient woodland within and adjacent to the Site does not deteriorate as a result of increased recreational activity associated with the Proposed Development.

7.2.15. The document sets out the following information:

- The location of sensitive areas within the woodlands (e.g. areas of ancient woodland indicator species and important plant communities) and any protection measures for those areas;
- Visitor management proposals including details of any proposed footpath provision or access provisions;
- Further details of fencing such as the types of fencing deemed most appropriate and the proposed extent of fenced areas;
- How the enhanced areas of the woodland will be safeguarded;
- Provision of dog waste bins including proposed number and locations deemed most appropriate.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Metric (June 2026)

- 7.2.16. A further update of the BNG metric is provided within this Addendum (Appendix 7.12A) and BNG Metric (Rev B) which reflects updates to the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A) and updated in line with the newly adopted Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).

Updates to the August 2025 Ecology Chapter

Mitigation

- 7.2.17. Following the submission of further assessment to KMBC additional mitigation is proposed, which includes the provision of a detailed Recreational Management Plan, provision of offsite breeding and wintering bird compensatory habitat and provision of a contribution toward existing management of recreational impacts to offsite ancient woodland. Table 7.10 from the August 2025 ES is included below (Table 7.2A) and has been updated to reflect the further mitigation proposed (further proposed mitigation shown in red text).

Table 7.2A (updated Table 7.10 from August 2025 ES) Summary of Mitigation Measures

Ref	Measure to avoid, reduce or manage any adverse effects and/or to deliver beneficial effects	How measure would be secured		
		By Design	By S.106	By Condition
1	Provision of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).			X
2	Provision of a Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA).			X
3	Provision of a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP).			X
4	Provision of a detailed lighting strategy for the Site.			X
5	Provision of a planting buffer for and connective habitat to priority woodlands adjacent and/or onsite.	X		
6	Provision of a planting buffer for and connective habitat to nearby LWS' and NIA.	X		
7	Provision of a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net gain.	X	X	X

8	Provision of Information packs to new residents including information on nearby Statutory and non-Statutory sites and priority woodlands and codes of conduct.			X
9	Provision of a detailed Recreational Management Plan.		X	X
10	Provision of offsite breeding and wintering bird compensatory habitat as outlined in the breeding and wintering bird habitat compensation strategy.		X	X
11	Timing restrictions on vegetation clearance and/or pre-works check.			X
12	Provision of habitat features for bats and breeding birds.			X
13	Provision of a contribution toward existing management of recreational impacts to offsite ancient woodland.		X	X

Residual Effects

- 7.2.18. Following further assessment and with the inclusion of further mitigation measures as outlined in the previous section, the following residual effects have been updated from the August 2025 ES:

Table 7.3A Summary of Updates to Residual Effects from the August 2025 ES

Receptor	August 2025 ES Residual Effect	July 2026 ES Addendum Residual Effect
Construction		
Offsite Ancient Woodland Knowsley Park	Not-significant negative	Neutral

Onsite ancient Woodland / Lowland Mixed deciduous woodland Howards Pits and Knowles' Pits	Not-significant negative	Neutral
Wintering birds	Not-significant negative	Neutral
Operation		
Ancient woodland offsite Syder's Grove and Little Wood LWS	Not-significant negative	Neutral
Ancient woodland offsite Knowsley Park LWS	Not-significant negative	Neutral
Onsite ancient Woodland / Lowland Mixed deciduous woodland Howards Pits and Knowles' Pits	Not-significant negative	Neutral

7.2.19. For all IEF, considered both in the August 2025 ES and also in the updated information which has been provided to KMBC potential impacts during construction and operation have been appropriately mitigated by the measures outlined above and the residual effects on the identified receptors in the above table are predicted to be at least Neutral and no significant effects are anticipated on any IEF.

Conclusions

7.2.20. Following correspondence with MEAS the following updates have been made:

- The 15m buffer is now shown on the Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A) to provide confidence in its inclusion with the design.
- A dark corridor for foraging and commuting bats has been incorporated into the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A).
- Additional assessment of ancient woodland has been provided, including updating to show the locations of the four additional ancient woodlands included within the assessment.
- BNG metric has been updated.
- Bird Habitat Compensation Strategy provided.

- Draft Recreational Management Plan provided.

7.2.21. Whilst this further information has provided additional assessment and further proposed mitigation, overall, the conclusions presented within the August 2025 ES in regard to ecology matters remain valid.

8. Cultural Heritage

8.1. Proposed Development Amendments

8.1.1. The amendments to the Proposed Development as set out in Addendum Chapter 4 are minor modifications to the Proposed Development and the Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A). This includes a reduction in the Site red line boundary, a reduction in the height parameter for development in the north eastern corner and along the southern boundary, an amendment to the shape and indicative road alignment of the southern parcel, minor amends to the active travel provision, and the inclusion of a 15m buffer around the ancient woodland within the Site. Other than a minor change to the conclusions for the Curtilage Listed Home Farm, the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices remain valid in relation to heritage matters.

8.1.2. Further to the amendments to the Proposed Development and the Parameter Plan (Figure 4.1A), the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A) has been updated to strengthen woodland planting along the southern and north eastern boundaries. These measures have been included to reduce the visibility of the Proposed Development from Knowsley Park and have been made in response to consultee comments, discussed in greater detail in the following section and accompanying appendices. Although the changes have the intention of reducing the visibility of the Proposed Development with the nearby designated heritage assets, they have only changed the conclusions associated with the Curtilage Listed Home Farm, and have otherwise further reinforced the mitigation for the other identified heritage assets where relevant.

8.2. Further Information Provided to KMBC

8.2.1. Following the submission of the planning application, further information on heritage matters has been provided to KMBC, including:

- January 2026 – Heritage Rebuttal accompanied by amends to elements of the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan and Photomontages showing a 20m and 30m landscape buffer from the Sites southern boundary.
- April 2026 – further Photomontages provided which incorporated further woodland planting along the southern boundary and a reduced development height to 9m for the southern parcel within the location of the open section of woodland planting. The Photomontages demonstrate a landscape buffer at 20m, 30m, 40m and 60m, and commentary was provided alongside these.
- June 2026 – Heritage and Planning Addendum Note – confirming changes made to the Proposed Development as a result of the previous correspondence, which include a reduction in the development height to 9m for part of the southern boundary and strengthening of woodland planting along this boundary, and setting the heritage effects and how these should be considered within the wider planning balance for the Proposed Development. This document has since been updated to account for the minor amendment to the red line and site area.

8.2.2. A Heritage Rebuttal was provided to KMBC on the 27th January 2026 to provide commentary and response to consultation comments received on the Proposed Development. This document responds to comments made by:

- The Gardens Trust – 30th October 2025

- Growth Lancashire – 14th November 2025

- 8.2.3. The Gardens Trust raised concerns for Knowsley Park associated with the ‘suburbanisation’ of the parkland’s setting, as well as the potential increased visibility in the future, should the estate tree management see further tree removal.
- 8.2.4. With regards to the *suburbanisation* point, the western side of the parkland has already seen substantial suburbanisation. These surrounds do not represent a relic of the original agricultural surrounds, which survive to a far greater degree to the north and east of the parkland.
- 8.2.5. The surrounding tree belts adjacent to the Site provide existing substantial and dense vegetation and the assessment presented in Chapter 8 of the ES demonstrated that visibility would be contained to one small section of a c.50m length of the southern boundary where there had been recent tree felling. To ensure there is limited visibility of any new dwellings the proposals have included a new belt of trees and denser areas of planting in the ‘gap’ along the southern boundary.
- 8.2.6. The Garden Trust refer to the potential for trees bounding the Site to be susceptible to ash die-back, requiring removal in the future, given the name of the woodland as Ash Plantation. A detailed botanical survey was undertaken on the Ash Plantation on 12th May 2025 as part of the Ecological Assessment in the original ES submission. Appendix 7.8 of the August 2025 ES included a list a species identified within the Ash Plantation, and it should be noted that no ash trees were noted within the woodland during the survey, with the canopy dominated by Sycamore trees.
- 8.2.7. The Garden Trust have requested additional tree coverage within the proposals, to mitigate against any further tree felling within Knowsley Park, which would increase visibility of the proposed dwellings. They also clarify within their conclusions that this should look at ***“strengthening the proposed tree planting along the southern and eastern boundaries of the development site.”***
- 8.2.8. The Heritage Rebuttal (Jan 2026) sought to challenge this request noting it is not reasonable or proportionate to mitigate against a future scenario of which there is no evidence to suggest will actually take place. The assessment of the proposals is required to be undertaken against the existing baseline conditions. The proposed works have already mitigated against the existing baseline conditions, which include the open section along the southern boundary. The proposals include a tree belt to screen visibility of the new dwellings, with development also set back from the parkland boundary with a 20m buffer. Importantly, the Garden Trust agree with the approach of this buffer, stating ***‘We agree the existing Landscape buffer currently provides a physical separation between the edge of the Grade II Listed Knowsley Park with its park wall, and the new dwellings, closing off and containing views within the parkland.’***
- 8.2.9. At the time of this correspondence, to further alleviate the concerns of the Gardens Trust the proposals were updated to include a denser section of trees along the open section of the southern boundary, and a plan showing this was included within the submission. With this enhanced mitigation, the proposals would ensure that there is highly limited to no visibility of the new dwellings within the open section, including in the winter months when the trees are not in leaf.
- 8.2.10. On the impacts to Knowsley Park, the Gardens Trust concluded that the works would cause ***“less than substantial harm, at the lower end of the scale, resulting from further loss of its agricultural setting and visual intrusion of the new development”***. The assessment provided

within Chapter 8 of the ES concurs with this, concluding the Proposed Development would result in **less than substantial harm** at the **low end of the scale of harm**.

- 8.2.11. In the comments provided by Growth Lancashire (14th November 2025) they have identified areas where they believe harm would occur and have provided a series of recommendations. Growth Lancashire provided comment on each of the heritage assets identified within the Heritage Technical Baseline and ES chapter, and for some assets suggest a higher level of harm than identified within the assessment. The following table provides an overview of the assessment within the 2025 ES chapter and the position of Growth Lancashire.

Table 8.1A The position of Pegasus Group and Growth Lancashire, concerning the heritage assets identified as having the potential to be affected by the proposals.

Heritage Asset:	Pegasus Group Position (as assessed within the August 2025 ES and associated heritage appendices):	Growth Lancashire Position:
Grade II* Listed Knowsley Hall	Less than substantial harm, at the low end of the scale of harm	<i>"Low to moderate less than substantial harm"</i>
Grade II Listed Knowsley Park Registered Park and Garden	Less than substantial harm, at the low end of the scale of harm	<i>"Moderate to high level of less than substantial harm"</i>
Curtilage Listed Parkland Wall	Less than substantial harm, at the low end of the scale of harm	<i>"Low level less than substantial harm"</i>
Curtilage Listed Home Farm	Less than substantial harm, at the low to middle range of the scale of harm	<i>"Moderate level of less than substantial harm"</i>
Curtilage Listed Home Farm Lodge	Less than substantial harm, at the low to middle range of the scale of harm	<i>"Moderate to high level of less than substantial harm"</i>
Curtilage Listed Ormskirk Lodge	No harm	<i>"Low level of less than substantial harm"</i>
Curtilage Listed Croxteth Lodge	No harm	<i>"Low to moderate less than substantial harm"</i>
Grade II Listed Littlewood Lodge	No harm	<i>"Negligible level of harm"</i>

Grade II Listed Croxteth Park Registered Park and Garden	No harm	<i>“Low level of less than substantial harm”</i>
Knowsley Conservation Area	Less than substantial harm, at the low end of the scale of harm	<i>“Low less than substantial harm”</i>

- 8.2.12. The Heritage Rebuttal (Jan 2026) provides further details on the heritage assessment and the rebuttal where the level of harm noted by Growth Lancashire is disputed.
- 8.2.13. To alleviate some of the concerns raised, tree planting has been strengthened along the southern and north eastern boundary of the Site, and updated sections of the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan were provided alongside the rebuttal to demonstrate this.
- 8.2.14. A series of Photomontages were also provided with the rebuttal, taken from viewpoint 4 along the southern boundary with Knowsley Park, demonstrating a 20m and a 30m landscape buffer from the southern boundary. The Photomontages demonstrated once the landscape mitigation planting has matured visibility of the Proposed Development from the southern boundary would be greatly reduced and the difference between a 20m and a 30m landscape buffer is negligible.
- 8.2.15. Overall, there has been a partial change in the conclusions of the heritage assessment provided in Chapter 8 of the ES, relating to the Curtilage Listed Home Farm only. The enhanced tree screening proposed resulted in a reduction in harm, from the lower to middle range of less than substantial harm, to the lower end of the scale of less than substantial harm. In ES terminology, it is concluded that the proposals will have a **Low Impact** upon the overall heritage significance of the Curtilage Listed Home Farm, an asset of **Moderate Value**, via a change in setting as part of the operational phase. This would constitute a **Minor Adverse Effect** and does not represent a Significant Effect.
- 8.2.16. There has been no change to the conclusions for any of the other heritage assets identified within the ES, and whilst there have been minor amendments to the proposed landscape mitigation this does not change the overall landscape strategy or the mitigation described within the ES. Other than the minor change to the conclusions for the Curtilage Listed Home Farm, the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices remain valid in relation to heritage matters.
- 8.2.17. On 30th of April 2026 a series of further Photomontages from VP4 were provided to KMBC following a request from Growth Lancashire for a development buffer of 40m and 60m from the southern edge to enable this to be understood. These photomontages captured amendments to the design which include a reduction in the height parameter for dwellings within the open section along the southern boundary, from 12.5m in height to 9m overall within this location. The amendments also included the updated landscape mitigation with extended woodland planting along the southern boundary. The Photomontages have been provided to demonstrate the updated development proposals and also to demonstrate the negligible difference in visual effect from this viewpoint between the 20m, 30m, 40m and 60m landscape buffers.
- 8.2.18. The continuous built form is visible at each buffer distance as part of the Year 1 views, with each including a degree of landscape screening from the treeline mitigation; however the difference in visual impact of the built form between 20m and 60m is negligible. It should be noted that all

Year 1 impacts are only temporary, to allow for the proposed landscape mitigation to mature. At Year 15, there is no clear visibility of the built form within the photomontages at the 20m buffer, with views screened by the enhanced landscape mitigation proposed. Therefore, it is our view that a 20m landscape buffer is sufficient alongside the proposed landscape mitigation.

- 8.2.19. Growth Lancashire had also requested Photomontages from Home Farm, considering views from the western side of the complex facing to the west and north towards the Site. However, following further assessment, it was considered that this request was unreasonable and disproportionate. This decision was reached following the results of photography undertaken by the landscape team, provided with the further information provided to KMBC in April 2026. These images demonstrate the views from the western and northern edge are over a modern car park, with this area having a negative contribution to the significance of the Curtilage Listed Home Farm, through setting overall. There is only limited understanding of the open nature of the Site beyond the parkland boundary within these views, and no semblance of any agricultural character – there is no actual view of the ground surface itself only the space above it. The Site is not clearly appreciable as a notable buffer between the modern built form and the edge of Home Farm, particularly when facing northwards towards Parklands. It should also be noted that these do not constitute key views outwards from the complex which illustrate or allow the significance of this asset to be appreciated, with historic cartographic sources previously showing a line of dense trees along the boundary, which would have limited views outwards.
- 8.2.20. As part of the designs, a new dense line of tree screening along the eastern Site boundary adjacent to Home Farm has been included, which will help to contain views to the complex, and would result in an experience closer to how it would have been historically. Whilst it is anticipated there would be visibility of the new dwellings, the photography demonstrates that there is already strong visibility of modern dwellings along Parklands and Berry Hill Avenue.
- 8.2.21. From the enhanced landscape mitigation proposed along the north-eastern boundary of the Site, we have concluded a reduction in the effects for the Curtilage Listed Home Farm. It is concluded that the proposals will have a **Low Impact** upon the overall heritage significance of the Curtilage Listed Home Farm, an asset of **Moderate Value**, via a change in setting as part of the operational phase. This would constitute a **Minor Adverse Effect**, and does not represent a Significant Effect. Other than the Curtilage Listed Home Farm, the assessment presented within the August 2025 ES remains relevant and the conclusions remain unchanged. Although there have been minor amendments to the mitigation as shown on the updated Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A) this has not changed the overall landscape mitigation strategy presented within the original ES, but rather reinforced the original strategy.
- 8.2.22. A meeting was held on 20th May 2026 to discuss the further information which has been provided and a Planning & Heritage Addendum Note – Heritage Impacts & Wider Planning Balance has been provide to KMBC in July 2026. The Planning & Heritage Addendum Note reinforces the information already provided and provides an overview of how the heritage effect should be considered within the wider planning balance for the scheme. The Planning & Heritage Addendum Note does not provide any further heritage assessment or propose any further mitigation than has already been discussed in previous correspondence. As such, other than the reduction in adverse effects from enhanced mitigation identified as part of the operational phase for the Curtilage Listed Home Farm, the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices remain valid in relation to heritage matters.

9. Transport and Access

9.1. Proposed Development Amendments

- 9.1.1. The amendments to the Proposed Development as set out in Addendum Chapter 4 are minor modifications to the Site red line boundary and to the design of the Proposed Development following consultee comments, including from the Highway Authority, Knowsley Council, Active Travel England and National Highways.
- 9.1.2. The traffic generated by the Proposed Development is not predicted to change as a result of the updates, with the focus being very much the addition of further detail and certainty relating to active travel and public transport provision. These requirements are already listed as Embedded Mitigation schemes in Table 9.8 of the August 2025 ES.
- 9.1.3. Noting that the internal layout of the Site is in outline and could therefore change, the minor transport-related changes to the Proposed Development when comparing the originally submitted and latest Framework Plans, include:
- The removal of an active travel/emergency access to Parklands;
 - The inclusion of an active travel connection to Sugar Lane via Ross Close; and
 - Revised active travel provision along the Knowsley Lane frontage, including crossing points to bus stops, The Sanctuary Community Woodland and to Flukers Brook Lane.
- 9.1.4. Further agreements are in place relating to public transport provision. This includes the design parameters of the internal link road to allow for the movement of buses, the provision of 3 sets of bus stops along this route, and a contribution of £1.4 million to fund bus infrastructure and to maintain the 217 bus service for 5 years.
- 9.1.5. Further consideration has also been given to improvements to off-site active travel improvements to local destinations. These include provision across Home Farm Road, along Longborough Road, Sugar Lane, Tythebarn Road, Knowsley Lane and through Syders Grove.
- 9.1.6. As such the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices are not expected to change and remain valid in relation to Transport and Access.

9.2. Further Information Provided to KMBC

- 9.2.1. There has been a series of ongoing meetings, site visits and correspondence between the applicant, consultancy team and the various consultees who have reviewed the planning submission.
- 9.2.2. The following consultation responses were received following the submission of the planning application:
- WSP on behalf of National Highways (October 2025) – Transport Assessment Review;
 - Active Travel England (October 2025) – Consultation Response;
 - Liverpool City Region (December 2025) – Consultation Response;

- Knowsley Council Highways (January 2026) – Review of Submission; and
- WSP on behalf of National Highways (January 2026) – Technical Note Review.

9.2.3. The consultation responses raised a number of issues that required further consideration and agreement, with Astute providing a Technical Note to National Highways in March 2026, resulting in them removing their objection to the proposals without the need for any mitigation to the Strategic Road Network.

9.2.4. Discussions continued with Active Travel England and Knowsley Council Highways, resulting in the submission of a Transport Update report in April 2026. This provided further information on a number of matters, including:

- Further detail in relation to access across Knowsley Lane to Flukers Brook and the Sanctuary Community Woodland;
- Further detail in relation to active travel infrastructure on Home Farm Road;
- Information relating to the impact of transport infrastructure upon the existing hedgerows on Knowsley Lane;
- Proposals to provide active travel links to Ross Close (through Ross Close Playing Fields);
- Further discussion about the Stockbridge Lane capacity improvement scheme;
- Consideration to further off-site active travel improvements; and
- Discussion surrounding the future expansion of Knowsley Village Primary School.

9.2.5. The above discussions and submissions have provided additional detail in relation to the proposed transport infrastructure that was proposed in the supporting Transport Assessment (Appendix 9.1 of the August 2025 ES) and Transport and Access ES Chapter, rather than proposing anything new that would alter the environmental effects of the Proposed Development.

9.2.6. As such the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices remain valid in relation to transport matters.

10. Air Quality

10.1. Proposed Development Amendments

- 10.1.1. The amendments to the Proposed Development as set out in Addendum Chapter 4 are minor modifications the Site red line boundary and to the design of the Proposed Development following consultee comments. The traffic generated by the Proposed Development is not predicted to change as a result of the updates. As such the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices are not expected to change and remain valid in relation to Air Quality.

10.2. Further Information Provided to KMBC

- 10.2.1. No further information has been provided to KMBC with regard to air quality matters.

11. Noise and Vibration

11.1. Proposed Development Amendments

- 11.1.1. The amendments to the Proposed Development as set out in Addendum Chapter 4 are minor modifications to the Site red line boundary and to the design of the Proposed Development following consultee comments. The traffic generated by the Proposed Development is not predicted to change as a result of the updates. As such the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices are not expected to change and remain valid in relation to Noise and Vibration.

11.2. Further Information Provided to KMBC

- 11.2.1. A Noise and Vibration Response note was provided to KMBC on the 13th January 2026 providing responses to comments raised by Environmental Health. The response is summarised here for completeness.

- 11.2.2. Environmental Health noted:

The noise assessment states that all construction vibration effects are anticipated to be negligible as no piling is proposed, however a vibration assessment or monitoring is required in relation to the potential machinery used on site, for example vibratory rollers may be used for compacting the ground which can cause nuisance to surrounding residents."

- 11.2.3. Further assessment is provided within the January 2026 Noise and Vibration Response, noting no piling is proposed, and the other source for significant levels of vibration is vibratory compaction, assumed primarily as part of the road construction.

- 11.2.4. According to BS 5228-2, the thresholds at which cosmetic damage could occur in buildings (15 mm/s for light framed structures, or 50 mm/s for reinforced or heavy framed buildings) are significantly higher than the values for adverse human response to vibration. Consequently, the latter has been used to define impact magnitudes for construction vibration; as summarised in the following table.

Table 11.1A Impact magnitude for construction vibration assessment

Impact magnitude	Vibration level, PPV, mm/s	Description
High	> 10.0 mm/s	Vibration is likely to be intolerable for any more than a very brief exposure to this level in most building environments.
Medium	≤ 10.0 mm/s > 1.00 mm/s	It is likely that vibration above 1.00 mm/s in residential environments will cause complaint but can be tolerated over short periods if prior warning and explanation has been given to residents.

Low	$\leq 1.00 \text{ mm/s} \geq 0.30 \text{ mm/s}$	The threshold at which vibration might be just perceptible in residential environments. The upper value may cause complaint if prior warning is not given to residents.
Negligible	$< 0.30 \text{ mm/s}$	Vibration may be just perceptible in the most sensitive situations for most vibration frequencies associated with construction.

11.2.5. There is an empirical prediction method within BS 5228-2 for vibratory compaction, including both startup/ run down, and steady state conditions. As the details of the vibratory compaction method are unknown, the following conservative assumptions have been made within the prediction:

- Maximum amplitude of drum vibration: 0.8 mm
- Vibrating roller drum width: 1.5 m
- Scaling factor: 106 (33.3% probability of exceedance)
- Number of vibrating drums: 1

11.2.6. The minimum distance between the proposed roads and existing residential receptors is approximately 30 metres. The predicted peak particle velocities (PPV) at the worst-affected receptor are presented below on this basis.

Table 11.2A Predicted vibration levels from vibratory compaction

Condition	Resultant PPV, mm/s
Steady state	0.58
Start-up/run down	0.86

11.2.7. As presented, both during steady state conditions and during start-up/run down, the vibration level is predicted to have an impact magnitude no higher than Low. A Low magnitude of impact on a High sensitivity receptor equates to a Minor Adverse Effect which is **not Significant**.

11.2.8. To further reduce the Adverse Effect, engagement with residents is recommended to inform them of the proposed works and that some vibration may be perceptible at times but building damage is unlikely.

11.2.9. Use of non-vibrating ground compaction could also reduce associated vibration levels. Monitoring of the vibration levels during the road construction is recommended to check vibration levels during this phase of the works.

11.2.10. As such, the Noise Note has provided additional assessment to that provided within the August 2025 ES Noise and Vibration Chapter, although this is not considered to alter the conclusions or the assessment provided in the original ES and associated appendices in relation to noise and vibration matters.

- 11.2.11. Environmental Health note an error in paragraph 11.5.7. of the August 2025 ES Noise and Vibration Chapter, which notes construction hours will be restricted to 7.30am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday. This is noted as an error in the text and should read construction hours will be restricted to 8am to 7pm Monday to Friday as stated within the August 2025 ES Chapter 4 paragraph 4.3.9. This does not change the assessment or the conclusions provided within the original ES and associated appendices in relation to noise and vibration matters.
- 11.2.12. The remainder of the comments from Environmental Health relate to points of clarification regarding the noise assessment and do not change the assessment or the conclusions of the August 2025 ES and associated appendices in relation to noise and vibration. The points of clarification are summarised below:

Table 11.3A Points of Clarification Provided in Response to Environmental Health Consultee Comments

Comment from Environmental Health	Response in Noise Note
Request the cumulative noise level from all fixed plant be controlled to at least 5dB below the representative background sound level and provide a proposed planning condition.	The proposed criteria within the ES chapter are based on achieving a low impact at the existing sensitive receptors in accordance with BS 4142:2014. This equates to a noise limit equal to the existing background sound level. The methodology within the ES chapter is not dependent on the resultant noise limits. Therefore, if more onerous limits are to be set by the Local Authority, no amendments to the ES chapter are considered necessary.
Please provide a map or table detailing the expected noise levels within gardens, at the façade of the houses, and within the properties with windows closed and opened. The internal noise levels have not been stated and the external noise levels state that limited areas close to Knowsley Lane are above 55dB LAeq,16hr, what are the actual levels?	The proposal is only outline and therefore locations of specific buildings and garden areas are unknown. It is therefore not possible to calculate specific sound levels within the garden areas or within the dwellings. It is understood that this is to be conditioned and therefore detailed calculations are to be provided to discharge the relevant condition.
A noise mitigation scheme to be submitted, detailing proposed mitigation on plot-by-plot basis	There is insufficient information at outline stage for this to be determined. This is therefore to be developed at detailed design stage. This is to be conditioned and therefore detailed calculations are to be provided to discharge the relevant condition.

Within Appendix 11.1, Table 3: Summary of attend results need to include the Nighttime dB LAeq,T and dB LA90,T.	These are presented within Appendix 11.1 of the August 2025 ES in Table 2, Figure 2, and Figure 3.
---	--

12. Flood Risk and Drainage

12.1. Proposed Development Amendments

- 12.1.1. The amendments to the Proposed Development as set out in Addendum Chapter 4 are minor modifications the Site red line boundary to the design of the Proposed Development following consultee comments. The proposed drainage strategy and flood risk assessment is not predicted to change as a result of the updates. As such the assessment and conclusions set out in the August 2025 ES and associated appendices are not expected to change and remain valid in relation to Flood Risk and Drainage.

12.2. Further Information Provided to KMBC

- 12.2.1. No further information has been provided to KMBC in relation to Flood Risk and Drainage.

13. Summary/Conclusions of Updated Assessment of Environmental Effects

- 13.1.1. Pegasus Group, acting on behalf of the Applicants, submitted an Environmental Statement (ES) relating to a planning application on land east of Knowsley Lane, Knowsley (the "Application Site" or "Site") to Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council (KMBC) in August 2025 (planning application reference 25/00486/OUT). The application sought outline planning permission for a residential development. Following this submission, the ES and planning application documentation was circulated to both statutory and non-statutory consultees, with consultees providing formal responses to KMBC where desired.
- 13.1.2. Whilst no formal request for further information under Regulation 25 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017 has been made, following consultee comments further assessment in relation to ecological matters and further design work has been undertaken and has led to some minor amendments to the Proposed Development. The amendments to the Proposed Development include a reduction in the height parameter for development in the north eastern corner and along the southern boundary, an amendment to the shape and indicative road alignment of the southern parcel, minor amends to the active travel provision, and the inclusion of a 15m buffer around the ancient woodland within the Site. The Sites red line boundary has also been reduced to omit a small area of land along the northern boundary with an overall reduction in Site are of 0.15ha from 33.75ha to 33.6ha.
- 13.1.3. These amendments have been updated on the Parameters Plan (Figure 4.1A) The Illustrative Framework Masterplan (Figure 4.2A) and Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (Figure 4.3A) has also been amended following the updates to the Proposed Development. The Site Location Plan (Figure 1.1A) has also been updated to reflect the reduction in site area.
- 13.1.4. Whilst these amendments are minor in nature, this Addendum has reviewed the updated proposals against each technical discipline included in the August 2025 providing updated assessment or commentary where necessary. This Addendum has also reviewed the further information provided to KMBC since the submission of the planning application, and has sought to summarise this information and review against the assessments provided within the August 2025 and where relevant provide updated assessment or commentary.
- 13.1.5. On review, it has been found that for the majority of disciplines the proposed amendments and further information provided to KMBC has not altered the assessment of likely significant effects, or mitigation measures proposed within the August 2025 ES. With the exception of Ecology and Biodiversity, where further assessment has been provided for Ancient Woodland and further information provided for wintering and breeding birds. Resulting in further mitigation proposed including the provision of a Recreational Management Plan, provision of offsite breeding and wintering compensatory habitat and provision of a contribution toward existing management of recreational impacts to offsite ancient woodland. The strengthening of the proposed landscape planting has also resulted in a decrease of effect to minor adverse (not significant) for the Curtilage Listed Home Farm. Table 13.2 from the August 2025 ES has been included overleaf and updated to reflect the additional proposed mitigation with updates made in red. This table outlines the likely significant residual effect, mitigation and enhancement measures identified within each of the environmental disciplines.
- 13.1.6. As concluded in the August 2025 ES, it is acknowledged that there are a small number of potential residual significant effects, with adverse significant effects limited to the landscape character of the Site, localised visual effects and localised construction phase noise. Beneficial

significant effects are anticipated in relation to construction phase employment and economic contribution and operational effects from wider economic benefits, housing, open space provision and health and wellbeing. All other effects with the inclusion of relevant mitigation identified within the August 2025 ES and this Addendum are considered not significant as a result of the Proposed Development.

- 13.1.7. The ES as a whole has demonstrated that the design of the Proposed Development has taken into account the potential environmental effects, and where necessary, mitigation measures form an integral part of the scheme so to ensure that the environment is suitably protected and any impacts from the Proposed Development are minimised as far as possible.
- 13.1.8. This ES Addendum has been voluntarily prepared in accordance with the EIA Regulations and constitutes '*any other information*' as defined in Regulation 2. Such additional information submitted voluntarily by an applicant must be treated in the same way as information formally requested by the Local Planning Authority in respect of an ES. Accordingly, KMBC should consult on this information in full accordance with the requirements of Regulation 25 '*Further information and evidence respecting Environmental Statements*'.

Table 13.2A Summary of Likely Significant Residual Effects and Proposed Mitigation and Enhancement measures
(additional mitigation measures as outlined in this Addendum are included in the table in red)

Environmental discipline	Measure to avoid, reduce or manage any adverse effects and/or to deliver beneficial effects	How measures would be secured			Residual significant effect?
		By Design	By S.106	By Condition	
Socio-Economics & Health	Financial contribution towards primary and secondary school provision		X		Yes – beneficial during construction in relation to employment and economic contribution and also in operation in relation to wider economic effects, housing, open space provision and health and well being.
Landscape and Visual	Retention of two central woodlands	X			Yes – adverse in relation to landscape character of the Site and localised visual effects
	Retention of the majority of existing field boundary hedgerows	X			
	Retention and enhancement of existing scrub	X			
	Creation of a green corridor to the south and east	X			
	Creation of green corridors along Knowsley Lane and Home Farm Road	X			

	Provision of a new central green space	X			
	Street tree planting	X			
	Creation of new areas of scrub in between existing woodlands	X			
	The long-term management of existing and proposed vegetation			X	
Ecology and Biodiversity	Provision of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).			X	No
	Provision of a Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA).			X	
	Provision of a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP).			X	
	Provision of a detailed lighting strategy for the Site.			X	
	Provision of a planting buffer for and connective habitat to priority woodlands adjacent and/or onsite.	X			
	Provision of a planting buffer for and connective habitat to nearby LWS' and NIA.	X			
	Provision of a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net gain.	X	X	X	
	Provision of Information packs to new residents including information on nearby Statutory and non-Statutory sites and priority woodlands and codes of conduct.			X	
	Provision of a detailed Recreational Management Plan.		X	X	
	Provision of offsite breeding and wintering bird compensatory habitat as outlined in the breeding and wintering bird habitat compensation strategy.		X	X	
	Provision of signage boards and dog waste bins.		X	X	
	Provision of offsite breeding bird compensatory habitat for skylark and Lapwing.		X		
	Timing restrictions on vegetation clearance and/or pre-works check.			X	
	Provision of habitat features for bats, breeding birds			X	

	Provision of a contribution toward existing management of recreational impacts to offsite ancient woodland.		X	X	
Cultural Heritage	Retention of two post-medieval woodland parcels	X			No
	Retention of existing field boundaries and hedgerows	X			
	Instatement of 20m landscape buffer along the southern and eastern boundaries	X			
	Inclusion of a public footpath along the landscape buffer	X			
	Installation of a woodland plantation along the southern Site boundary	X			
	Installation of tree plantings along the north-eastern Site boundary at Home Farm	X			
	Retention of the former section of Home Farm Road	X			
	Installation of trees at the eastern end of the former section of Home Farm Road	X			
	Geophysical Survey			X	
Transport and Access	Construction Environment Management Plan			X	No
	Active travel routes within the site and links to neighbouring streets			X	
	Pedestrian crossing facilities across Knowsley Lane along the site frontage			X	
	Providing missing dropped-kerbs and/or tactile paving at a number of junctions between Home Farn Road and Sugar Lane			X	
	Signalisation of School Lane exit onto Knowsley Lane including pedestrian infrastructure			X	
	Provision of right turn lane into Stockbridge Lane from Knowsley Lane and the provision of pedestrian infrastructure			X	
Air Quality	Provision of pedestrian and cycle access to the new development	X			No

	Use of all-electric heating to avoid the need for on-Site combustion		X		
	Diversion of bus route to serve the Proposed Development		X		
	Provision of electric vehicle charging points in accordance with relevant local policy	X			
	Travel Plan			X	
	Dust measures within a Dust Management Plan (potentially part of CEMP)			X	
Noise and Vibration	Construction noise: CEMP to be implemented			X	Yes – adverse localised construction phase noise
	Plant noise limits to be achieved.			X	
Flood Risk and Drainage	Operational, control and monitoring measures including a CEMP.			X	No
	Finished floor levels raised at least 0.15 m above adjacent ground levels, with ground levels sloping down from dwellings	X		X	
	Localised low spots within the Site topography where ponding of pluvial surface water is indicated to be retained within proposed landscaped areas. Where this is not feasible the Site reprofiled accordingly to remove such depressions.	X		X	
	Existing surface water overland flow paths originating off-site managed through the design of the Site.	X		X	
	Implementation of a surface water drainage strategy, including SuDS.	X		X	
Enhancements					
Landscape and Visual	Enhancements include specific design elements in relation to the internal landscape scheme. These elements would enhance the experience of residents and visitors to the Site, which would include incidental tree, shrub and amenity planting and seeding within and between the development cells. There are also areas of landscape design such as informal footpaths, incidental play opportunities, seating areas, paved spaces or similar, which would be incorporated into the design. These elements are set out on the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan at Figure 6.7 .				
Ecology and Biodiversity	Soft landscaping using native and ecologically valuable species would enhance the Site, avoid using non-native species with overly complex flower structure or those of an invasive nature such as cotoneasters. Provision of native, flower and fruit bearing species of local origin will provide an optimal foraging resource for a range of species				

	A variety of bird boxes could be installed within and on new buildings and trees adjacent to retained and created open space to increase availability of roosting and nesting sites; Whilst not recorded onsite, the county is known to support red listed willow tit as such it is not recommended that small hole nest boxes (26mm and 32mm) are provided onsite, due to the chance of increased competition from species typically bolstered by the provision of these types of nest boxes (i.e. blue tits), should willow tit be present in the wider area
	Deadwood piles could be created in areas of retained open space/ woodland to provide a habitat niche for amphibians and small mammals as well as deadwood for invertebrates such as saproxylic beetles
	Hedgerows are recommended as garden boundaries. Where fencing is used around gardens, hedgehog gaps should be included to provide a corridor through the built development
	The additional native broadleaved woodland, mixed scrub tree and hedgerow planting and management of retained and created habitats in accordance with guidance in the Biodiversity Net Gain Report submitted alongside this Ecology Chapter (Appendix 7.12) will provide an overall gain in the Biodiversity value of on Site habitats and will buffer priority habitats both on Site and adjacent and improve connectivity within and across the Site
Cultural Heritage	Interpretation boards positioned along the landscape buffer and footpath included within the embedded mitigation for the Grade II Listed Knowsley Park Registered Park and Garden, and the curtilage Listed Parkland Wall, Home Farm Lodge, and Home Farm. The interpretation boards would better reveal the significance of these heritage assets, illustrating their historic functional association with Knowsley Hall and its parkland.
Transport and Access	Creation of a network of additional active travel routes, running through the site, linking to neighbouring streets and providing key additional crossing points across Knowsley Lane.
Air Quality	A number of measures which will provide enhancements, either through minimising road traffic emissions or limiting exposure of new residential properties are included within the design of the Proposed Development. The effect of measures such as the Travel Plan, accessibility to public transport and electric vehicle charging, any benefits these provide in reducing vehicle movements, or encouraging the uptake of low emission vehicles will be an enhancement.

14. Glossary

Acronym	Definition
AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AAWT	Average Annual Weekday Traffic
ADO	Approved Document O
AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
AIA	Arboricultural Impact Assessment
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
AMCT	Annual Mean Concentration Target
ANC	Acoustics Noise Consultants
AOD	Above Ordnance Datum
AQAL	Air Quality Assessment Level
AQC	Air Quality Consultants
AQMA	Air Quality Management Areas
AVO	Acoustics Ventilation and Overheating
AW	Ancient Woodland
AWI	Ancient Woodland Inventory
Baseline conditions	The baseline conditions are the physical, chemical, biological, social, economic, and cultural setting in which the proposed project is to be located, and where local impacts (both positive and negative) might be expected to occur.
BESS	Battery Energy Storage Facility
BGS	British Geological Survey

BHS	Biological Heritage Site
BIA	Biodiversity Action Plan
BMV	Best and Most Versatile
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
BoCC	Birds of Conservation Concern
BS	British Standard
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CIEEM	Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management
CIEH	Chartered Institute of Environmental Health
CIRIA	Construction Industry Research and Information Association
COSHH	Control of Substances Hazardous to Health
Conservation Area	An area of special architectural or historic importance, the character of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.
CRTN	Calculation of Road Traffic Noise
CTMP	Construction Travel Management Plan
CWS	Country Wildlife Sites
DA	Drainage Assessment
DAFOR	Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional or Rare
DAS	Design Access Statement
dB	decibel
DBA	Desk-Based Assessment
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government

DEFRA	Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs
Designated Heritage Asset	A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated as such under the relevant legislation
DfT	Department for Transport
DMP	Dust Management Plan
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
EA	Environment Agency
EAL	Environmental Assessment Level
ECEMP	Ecological Construction and Environmental Management Plan
EcIA	Ecological Impact Assessment
EFT	Emission Factor Toolkit
Embedded mitigation	Where mitigation measures are proposed that are specific to an environmental theme (e.g. ecological measures incorporated into the landscaping scheme etc) and are purposely incorporated into the design
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	Process for identifying the likely significance of environmental effects (beneficial or adverse) arising from a Proposed Development, by comparing the existing environmental conditions prior to development (the baseline) with the environmental conditions during/following the construction and operation phases of a development should it proceed.
Environmental Statement (ES)	The document setting out the findings of an Environmental Impact Assessment
EPUK	Environment Protection UK
EU	European Union
FRDA	Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment
FTE	Full Time Equivalent

GCN	Great Crested Newt
GI	Green Infrastructure
GLIVA (3)	Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition
GP	General Practitioner
GVA	Gross Value Added
ha	Hectare
HDV	Heavy Duty Vehicles
HE	Historic England
HER	Historic Environment Record
Heritage Asset	An element of the historic environment that has a degree of significance. Heritage assets may be found in a variety of forms – buildings; standing, buried or submerged remains; settlements, places and landscapes.
HGV	Heavy goods vehicle
HIA	Health Impact Assessment
HMMP	Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan
HPI	Habitat of Principle Importance
HRA	Habitat Regulations Assessment
IEF	Important Ecological Feature
IAQM	Institute of Air Quality Management
IEMA	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation
INNS	Invasive Non Native Species

Integral mitigation	Where mitigation measures are proposed that are specific to an environmental theme (e.g. ecological measures incorporated into the landscaping scheme etc) and are purposely incorporated into the design
Inter-project Cumulative Effects	The combined effects of development schemes which may, on an individual basis be insignificant but, cumulatively, have significant effect
Intra-project Cumulative Effects	The combined effect of individual effects (for example noise, airborne dust or traffic) on a single receptor where deemed potentially significant (referred to as "in-combination" in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11 Environmental Assessment)
IOA	Institute of Acoustics
ISEP	Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals
JAQU	Joint Air Quality Unit
KMBC	Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)	Assessment which considers likely effects on landscape character and visual amenity arising from the Proposed Development.
LBAP	Local Biodiversity Action Plan
LAQM	Local Air Quality Management
LCA	Landscape Character Area (a regional landscape character area as identified within a local landscape character assessment)
LCT	Landscape Character Type (within the NCLCA an LCT is a subset of a larger LCA)
LDV	Light Duty Vehicles
LEA	Local Education Authorities
LGV	Light Goods Vehicle
LI	Landscape Institute
Listed Building	A building of special architectural or historic interest. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 gives the Department of Culture, Media and Sport on advice from Historic

	England, powers to list buildings of special architectural or historical interest. Listed buildings are graded I, II* or II with grade I being the highest. Listing includes the interior as well as the exterior of the building, and any buildings or permanent structures (for example, walls within its curtilage)
LITGN	Landscape Institute Technical Guide Note
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
LMP	Landscape Management Plan
LNR	Local Nature Reserve
LOAEL	Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LSOA	Lower layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) are made up of groups of Output Areas (OAs), usually four or five.
LV	Light Vehicle
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
MAGIC	Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside
MEAS	Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Mitigation by design	Where mitigation measures are proposed that are specific to an environmental theme (e.g. ecological measures incorporated into the landscaping scheme etc) and are purposely incorporated into the design
MIOA	Member of the Institute of Acoustics
National Character Area (NCA)	Natural England has identified 159 separate National Character Areas (NCA) within England. The NCA follow natural lines in the landscape, rather than administrative boundaries, and share similar landscape characteristics. NCA profiles are guidance documents which can help to inform the decision-making process.

NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	The NPPF replaces the majority of national planning policy documents (PPG/PPS) and many circulars, streamlining them all into one document. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It provides a framework within which local and neighbourhood plans can be produced reflecting the needs and priorities of the local area.
NBW	Nighttime Bat Walkover
NCN	National Cycle Route Network
NE	Natural England
NERC	Natural Environment and Rural Communities
NH	National Highway
NHS	National Health Service
NIA	Nature Improvement Area
NMH	No Main Habitat
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NOEL	No Observed Effect Level
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
NPSE	Noise Policy Statement for England
NTS	Non-Technical Summary
ONS	Office for National Statistics
OS	Ordnance Survey
PERT	Population Exposure Reduction Target
PM _x	Particulate Matter
POS	Public Open Space

PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PRA	Potential Roost Assessment
PRF	Potential Roosting Features
Public Rights of Way (PROW)	Routes on which the public have a legally protected right to pass and re-pass.
RDB	Red Data Book
Residual Effects	Impacts that remain following the implementation of mitigation measures
RM	Reserved Matters
RPG	Registered Parks and Gardens
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SINC	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
SOAEL	Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SPI	Species of Principal Importance
SRN	Strategic Road Network
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
Statutory	A legal requirement
SuDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage System
SUE	Sustainable Urban Extension
SWMP	Site Waste Management Plan

SZTV	Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility
TA	Transport Assessment
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TP	Travel Plan
UK	United Kingdom
UU	United Utilities
WCA	Wildlife and Countryside Act
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WHO	World Health Organisation
WWT	Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust
ZOI	Zone of Influence
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility

15. References

15.1. Introduction

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) Regulations 2017 (amended 2018).

15.2. Assessment Scope and Methodology

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017; Schedule 1 (18).

Patrick Stephenson Ltd (2025) Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Resources – Home Farm Lane Knowsley, L34 OEB.

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) Regulations 2017; Schedule 4 (8)

15.3. Application Site

Patrick Stephenson Ltd (2025) Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Resource – Home Farm Lane, Knowsley, L34 OEB.

15.4. Proposed Development and Alternatives

–

15.5. Socio Economics

British Medical Association (2025) Pressures in general practice data analysis. Available at: <https://www.bma.org.uk/advice-and-support/nhs-delivery-and-workforce/pressures/pressures-in-general-practice-data-analysis> (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

Department for Education (2022) Pupil yield from housing developments dataset. Available at: <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/pupil-yield-from-housing-developments/2022> (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

Department for Education (2023) Securing Developer Contributions for Education. August. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/64d0f70d7a5708001314485f/Securing_Developer_Contributions_for_Education.pdf (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2025) National Planning Policy Framework. London: DLUHC. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Knowsley Council (2016) Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. Adopted January 2016. Available at: <https://localplanmaps.knowsley.gov.uk/documents/knowsley-local-plan-adopted-core-strategy.pdf>

Knowsley Council (2020) Knowsley 2030 Strategy. August. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2024-09/Knowsley%202030.pdf> (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

Knowsley Council (2025) Knowsley Council Plan (2025–30). April. Available at: https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2025-06/Knowsley%20Council%20Plan%202025-2030_FINAL2.pdf (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

Knowsley Council (n.d.) Knowsley Parks and Greenspace Strategy. Available at: <http://apse-archive.org.uk/presentations/09/10/environmental-services-seminar/Parks-and-green-space-strategy.pdf> (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

LG Inform (n.d.) Police recorded crime – LGA Research Report. Available at: <https://lginform.local.gov.uk/reports/view/lga-research/lga-research-report-police-recorded-crime?mod-area=E08000011&mod-group=E12000002&mod-type=area> (Accessed: 16 June 2025).

Liverpool City Region Combined Authority (2024) Corporate Plan (2024–2028). July. Available at: <https://api.liverpoolcityregion-ca.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/Corporate-Plan-2024-28.pdf> (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

Office for Health Improvement and Disparities (n.d.) Local Authority Health Profiles. Available at: <https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/health-profiles/data#page/1/gid/1938132701/pat/6/ati/501/are/E08000011/iid/90366/age/1/sex/1/cat/-1/ctp/-1/yr/3/cid/4/tbm/1> (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

Sport England (n.d.) Active Lives Survey. Available at: https://www.sportengland.org/research-and-data/data/active-lives/active-lives-data-tables?section=adult_surveys (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

The Village Surgery – Aston Health (n.d.) Meet the Team. Available at: <https://www.astonhealth.nhs.uk/practice-information/meet-the-team/> (Accessed: 1 August 2025).

15.6. Landscape and Visual

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2023) National Planning Policy Framework. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Knowsley Council (2006) Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-11/Knowsley%20UDP%202006.pdf>

Knowsley Council (2016) Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-11/knowsley-local-plan-adopted-core-strategy.pdf>

Knowsley Council (n.d.a) Design Quality in New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-11/27-Design-Quality-in-New-Development-SPD.pdf>

Knowsley Council (n.d.b) Trees and Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-11/Trees-and-Development-SPD-Adoption-Version.pdf>

Landscape Institute (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. 3rd edn. London: Routledge.

Landscape Institute (2019) Visual Representation of Development Proposals. Technical Guidance Note 06/19. Available at: https://www.landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/LI_TGN-06-19_Visual_Representation-1.pdf

Landscape Institute (2021) Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations. Technical Guidance Note 02/21. Available at: <https://landscapewpstorage01.blob.core.windows.net/wwwlandscapeinstitute-org/2021/05/tgn-02-21-assessing-landscape-valueoutside-national-designations.pdf>

15.7. Ecology and Nature Conservation

Bat Conservation Trust (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines. 4th edn.

Bird Survey & Assessment Steering Group (2025) Bird Survey Guidelines for Assessing Ecological Impacts. Available at: <https://birdsurveyguidelines.org>

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA).

Cresswell, W.J., Birks, J.D.S., Dean, M., Pacheco, M., Trehella, W.J., Wells, D. and Wray, S. (2012) UK BAP Mammals: Interim Guidance for Survey Methodologies, Impact Assessment and Mitigation. The Mammal Society, Southampton.

Dean, M. (2021) Water Vole Field Signs and Habitat Assessment: A Practical Guide to Water Vole Surveys. Pelagic Publishing.

Dean, M., Strachan, R., Gow, D. and Andrews (2016) The Water Vole Mitigation Handbook. The Mammal Society Guidance Series. Edited by F. Matthews and P. Chanin. The Mammal Society, London.

Defra (2023) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides>

English Nature (2001) Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough.

GOV.UK (n.d.) National Planning Policy Framework: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/15-conserving-and-enhancing-the-natural-environment>

Harris, S., Cresswell, P. and Jefferies, D. (1989) Surveying for Badgers. Occasional Publication of the Mammal Society No.9. Mammal Society, Bristol.

IRZ GeoData (n.d.) Impact Risk Zone Tool. Available at: <https://irz.geodata.org.uk/IRZ/step3.php?irzcode=000000000000¬es=&location=417554,424273>

Knowsley Borough Council (2006) Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan: Saved Policies. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk>

Knowsley Borough Council (2016) Trees and Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Knowsley Council (2023) Knowsley Local Plan: Adopted Core Strategy. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-11/knowsley-local-plan-adopted-core-strategy.pdf>

Mersey Forest (n.d.) Our Plan. Available at: [https://merseyforest.org.uk/our-plan/Merseyside Biobank](https://merseyforest.org.uk/our-plan/Merseyside-Biobank)
(2024) Knowsley Leaflet. Available at: https://eas.merseysidebiobank.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/lcr_leaflet_knowsley.pdf

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. and McLeish, A.P. (2004) Bat Workers Manual. JNCC.

Stace, C. (2019) New Flora of the British Isles. 4th edn. C&M Floristics.

UKHab Ltd (2024) UK Habitat Classification Version 4.1. Available at: <https://UKHab.org>

15.8. Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2014) Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment. Reading: CIfA. Available at: <https://www.archaeologists.net/codes/cifa>

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2025) National Planning Policy Framework. London: DLUHC. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans. London: Historic England. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa1-historic-environment-local-plans/>

Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd edn). London: Historic England. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/>

Historic England (2019) Historic England Advice Note 12: Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets. London: Historic England. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/statements-heritage-significance-advice-note-12/>

Knowsley Council (2016) Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. Adopted January 2016. Available at: <https://localplanmaps.knowsley.gov.uk/documents/knowsley-local-plan-adopted-core-strategy.pdf>

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) (2019) Planning Practice Guidance (PPG): Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. Updated July 2019. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment>

15.9. Transport and Access

IEMA (2023) Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement. July.

Knowsley Council (2016) Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-11/knowsley-local-plan-adopted-core-strategy.pdf>

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2014) Guidance for Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements. March.

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2023) National Planning Policy Framework. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

15.10. Air Quality

AQC (2020a) Performance of Defra's Emission Factor Toolkit 2013–2019. Available at: [https://www.aqconsultants.co.uk/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=7fba769d-f1df-49c4-a2e7-](https://www.aqconsultants.co.uk/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=7fba769d-f1df-49c4-a2e7-3669c6814f1d)

AQC (2020b) Comparison of EFT v10 with EFT v9. Available at: <https://www.aqconsultants.co.uk/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=9d6b50e1-3897-46cf-90f1-3669c6814f1d>

AQC (2025) Calibrating Defra's 2021-based Background Maps against 2022, 2023 & 2024 Measurements.

British Geological Survey (2025) UK Soil Observatory Map Viewer.

Defra (2024) PM2.5 Targets: Interim Planning Guidance. Available at: <https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/pm25targets/planning>

Defra (2025a) Review & Assessment: Technical Guidance LAQM.TG22 May 2025 Version. Available at: <https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/LAQM-TG22-May-25-v2.0.pdf>

Defra (2025b) UK Pollutant Release and Transfer Register. Available at: <http://prtr.defra.gov.uk/map-search>

Defra (2025c) Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) Support Website. Available at: <http://laqm.defra.gov.uk/>

Defra (2025d) UK Air Compliance Data. Available at: <https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/compliance-data>

Defra Air Quality Expert Group (2020) Estimation of Changes in Air Pollution Emissions, Concentrations and Exposure during the COVID-19 Outbreak in the UK – Rapid Evidence Review. Available at: https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat09/2007010844_Estimation_of_Changes_in_Air_Pollution_During_COVID-19_outbreak_in_the_UK.pdf

IAQM (2018) Guidance on Air Quality Monitoring in the Vicinity of Demolition and Construction Sites v1.1. Available at: <https://www.iaqm.co.uk/guidance.html>

IAQM (2024) Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction v2.2. Available at: <http://iaqm.co.uk/guidance/>

KMBC (2006) Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

KMBC (2016) Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-11/knowsley-local-plan-adopted-core-strategy.pdf>

KMBC (2018) New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-11/New-Residential-Development-Updated-SPD.pdf>

KMBC (2024) 2024 Air Quality Annual Status Report (ASR).

Moorcroft, S. and Barrowcliffe, R. et al. (2017) Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning for Air Quality v1.2. London: IAQM. Available at: <http://iaqm.co.uk/guidance/>

The Air Quality (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2002, Statutory Instrument 3043 (2002). HMSO. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2002/3043/contents/made>

The Air Quality (England) Regulations 2000, Statutory Instrument 928 (2000). HMSO. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2000/928/contents/made>

The Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010, Statutory Instrument 1001 (2010). HMSO. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/1001/pdfs/uksi_20101001_en.pdf

The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union (2008) Directive 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32008L0050>

15.11. Noise and Vibration

Acoustics & Noise Consultants and Institute of Acoustics (2020) Acoustics, Ventilation and Overheating: Residential Design Guide (version 1.1). Available at: <https://www.association-of-noise-consultants.co.uk>

British Standards Institution (2003) BS 7745-1: Description and measurement of environmental noise. London: BSI.

British Standards Institution (2009) BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise. London: BSI.

British Standards Institution (2009) BS 5228-2:2009+A1:2014 Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 2: Vibration. London: BSI.

British Standards Institution (2014) BS 8223: Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings. London: BSI.

British Standards Institution (2014) BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound. London: BSI.

Building Regulations (2021) Approved Document O: Overheating. 2021 edition. London: HM Government.

Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (2010) Noise Policy Statement for England. London: DEFRA.

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (2021) Planning Practice Guidance. London: DLUHC and MHCLG.

Department for Transport and Welsh Office (1998) Calculation of Road Traffic Noise. London: HMSO.

Education Funding Agency (2014) BB93: Acoustic Design of Schools – Performance Standards. London: Department for Education.

Health and Safety Executive (2005) The Control of Noise at Work Regulations 2005. London: HSE.

Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2014) Guidelines for Environmental Noise Impact Assessment. Lincoln: IEMA.

Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2023) Guidelines: Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement. Lincoln: IEMA.

Knowsley Council (2006) Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan. Knowsley: Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council.

Knowsley Council (2016) Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. Knowsley: Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council.

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024) National Planning Policy Framework. London: MHCLG.

Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise (2017) New Residential Development. Acoustics & Noise Consultants, Institute of Acoustics, Chartered Institute of Environmental Health. Available at: <https://www.ioa.org.uk>

Standards for Highways (2020) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges: LA111 – Noise and Vibration. London: Highways England.

World Health Organization (1999) Guidelines for Community Noise. Geneva: WHO.

15.12. Water Resources

CIRIA (1994) Control of Pollution from Highway Drainage Discharges. CIRIA Report 142.

CIRIA (1995) Guidelines for the use of herbicides on weeds in or near watercourses and lakes.

CIRIA (1996) Infiltration Drainage – Manual of Good Practice. CIRIA Report 156.

CIRIA (2001) Control of Water Pollution from Construction Sites. CIRIA Report C532.

CIRIA (2004) Sustainable Drainage Systems: Hydraulic, Structural and Water Quality Advice. CIRIA Report C609.

CIRIA (2015) The SuDS Manual. CIRIA Report C753.

CIRIA (2017) Guidance on the Construction of Sustainable Drainage Systems. CIRIA Report C768.

DEFRA (1998) (amended 2002). Code of Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Water.

DEFRA (2005) Making Space for Water – Taking Forward a New Government Strategy for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management in England.

DEFRA (2025) Non-statutory National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems.

Department for Transport (2014) TAG Unit A3 Environmental Impact Appraisal.

Environment Agency (2020) National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England.

HM Government (2015) The Building Regulations 2010: Drainage and Waste Disposal – Approved Document H. [online] London: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/drainage-and-waste-disposal-approved-document-h>
House of Commons, 2014. Written Statement on Sustainable Drainage Systems (HCWS161).

Knowsley Council (2009) Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. [pdf] Knowsley Council, June. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/streets-roads-and-transport/roads/flood-risk-management>

Knowsley Council (2011) Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment. [pdf] Knowsley Council, June. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/streets-roads-and-transport/roads/flood-risk-management>

Knowsley Council (2012) Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. [pdf] Knowsley Council, October. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/streets-roads-and-transport/roads/flood-risk-management>

Knowsley Council (2016) Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. [pdf] Adopted January 2016. Available at: <https://localplanmaps.knowsley.gov.uk/documents/knowsley-local-plan-adopted-core-strategy.pdf>

Knowsley Council (2016) Sustainable Drainage & Surface Water Management: Technical Guidance for Developers, August.

Knowsley Council (2017) Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, October.

Knowsley Council (2017) Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment Addendum, November.

Land Drainage Act 1991 (as amended).

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024) National Planning Policy Framework. London: MHCLG.

Planning Policy Guidance (2024) Updated 14 February 2024.

Sewerage Sector Guidance (2020) Appendix C – Design and Construction Guidance v2.0.

Surface Water (River Ecosystem) (Classification) Regulations 1994.

Surface Waters [Dangerous Substances (Classification)] Regulations 1998.

The Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) (England) Regulations 2001.

The Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulations 2002.

The Environment Act 1995 (as amended).

The Flood and Water Management Act 2010.

The Food and Environment Protection Act 1985.

The Water Act 2003 (as amended).

The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017.

The Water Industry Act 1991.

15.13. Summary

Landscape Institute (2013) Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. 3rd edn. London: Routledge.

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 SI 571

Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

All Intellectual Property Rights (including but not limited to copyright) subsisting in or arising out of this document are owned by Pegasus Planning Group Ltd (Pegasus Group) and may not be copied, adapted, disseminated, redistributed, reproduced and/or otherwise used without a written licence. Pegasus Group accepts no liability for any use of this document other than for its original purpose and by the original client except in circumstances where approval for use has been supplied by Pegasus Group in writing. Any queries to be reported to Pegasus Group for clarification. Copyright © Pegasus Planning Group Limited. Use of this document is subject to the Terms & Conditions available @ pegasusgroup.co.uk

Lichfield

Central House, Queen St, Lichfield WS13 6QD
T 0121 308 9570
Birmingham@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Offices throughout the UK.

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



All paper sources from sustainably managed forests

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



[Pegasus_Group](https://www.linkedin.com/company/Pegasus_Group)



[pegasusgroup](https://twitter.com/pegasusgroup)



[Pegasus_Group](https://www.instagram.com/Pegasus_Group)

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK