

Dear Lee,

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPROMISING ERECTION OF UP TO 204 HOUSES WITH PARKING TOGETHER WITH CONSTRUCTION OF VEHICULAR/PEDESTRIAN ACCESSES OFF STONEY LANE, PEDESTRIAN ACCESS OFF CUMBER LANE, SUB-STATIONS, FOUL WATER PUMP STATION, SUDS BALANCNG POND AND ASSOCIATED PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS.

PLANNING REFERENCE 25/00672/FUL

In response to the comments received from Nicola Hayes on behalf of MEAS, dated 10th March 2026, in relation to the application above, please find our responses below with any relevant information or updated documents attached.

Comments and/or Queries

EIA Screening

Please see attached the following document(s):

- 17-500-R1-2 - Glen Dimplex, Prescott - Phase I and II GSA Residential Development - June 24 – FINAL
- 17-500-R2-1 - Glen Dimplex Prescott - Phase II GSA (Internal Structure) - April 2025
- 17-500-R4-1 - Glen Dimplex Prescott - Ground Gas Addendum - Sept 2025

In conjunction with the document(s) above, please see our responses below in *italics*:

6. High levels of contamination have been recorded on site particularly chlorinated solvents within the groundwater. Owing to the operational nature of the site at the time of Phase I and II GeoEnvironmental Assessment (E3P, June 2024), much of the site has not been assessed including the footprint of the main building structure (which was not subject to a site walkover or intrusive works). I am concerned that activities in this area may have had the greatest impact on land and groundwater quality. I advise that further information and assessment is required, including consultation with the Environment Agency. As such this EIA Screening Opinion may need to be revised on receipt of that additional information.

In-line with the attached full Site Investigation Reports, you now have copies of the appendices you've requested. Upon review, please let us know if you have any further queries or comments.

Ecology – PEA

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

9. The PEA (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Glen Dimplex Factory Ysobella Cox, United Environmental Services Ltd, 23 September 2025, UES05069/01), includes large areas of Other Developed Land, however the relevant habitat description within Section 3.2.4 includes over 60 plant species. It is therefore possible that these areas should be mapped as separate habitat types in line with UK Habs, clarification is required prior to determination.

UES have advised that other developed land comprises the vast majority of the site however, as per UKHab guidance, where vegetation cover is less than 10% over a sealed surface it should be mapped as u1b. In this instance, the sealed surface comprises concrete associated with the factory. Vegetation is encroaching through cracks, but in no area does its cover exceed 10% (except in areas that are mapped as grassland or woodland, for example).

Ecology – Bat Scoping Survey

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

10. The Bat Scoping Survey Glen Dimplex Factory (Joshua Howell, United Environmental Services Ltd, 23 September 2025, UES05069/03) has identified Building 7 as holding moderate roosting potential, however, is not clear if the building is considered to hold maternity potential; clarification is required prior to determination. Following receipt of this clarification I will then advise further on the acceptability of survey effort and mitigation measures.

UES have advised that there is no evidence to suggest the building supports a maternity roost of any bat species. No evidence of roosting bat activity was found within the building despite a thorough assessment of all accessible areas with an endoscope and torch, including the loft void. Two surveys were conducted as per BCT guidelines for a building with moderate suitability to support roosting bats. No bats were found to be roosting on site. The building is not considered to hold maternity potential.

Ecology – BNG

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

11. The submitted BNG Information is currently unacceptable due to the following reasons. The following amendments are required prior to determination.
 - a. Strategic significance has been assigned as “Area/compensation not in local strategy”. Strategic significance has been assigned for the Liverpool City Region and is detailed within the LCR BNG Guidance Note. In line with this guidance note

the habitats Other Neutral Grassland and Urban tree should be assigned strategic significance “Formally identified in local strategy”.

The BNG Statement/Report will be updated to suit the comments above upon confirmation of a finalised layout based on our revised submission of the Coloured Layout, Plan Ref: 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A).

- b. The habitat description for Other Developed Land lists over 60 plant species. This level of botanical diversity suggests that the area may not meet the definition as set out in UK Habs. It is therefore possible that these areas should be mapped as separate habitat types, rather than being grouped under Undeveloped Land – clarification is required.

UES have advised that the description is accurate, please refer to our response on Item 9 above.

- c. The created habitats are shown on the submitted Landscape Masterplan, however the biodiversity statement has used an earlier version of the plans, (Taylor Wimpey, November 2025, PP01.09, P2); whilst there do not appear to be any material changes that would impact the BNG, clarification is required.

The BNG Statement/Report will be updated to suit the comments above upon confirmation of a finalised layout based on our revised submission of the Coloured Layout, Plan Ref: 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A).

- d. The Condition Assessments supplied within the Habitat Creation Tab, do not correspond with the habitat in the row, and some Condition Assessments are absent; these are required.

The BNG Statement/Report will be updated to suit the comments above upon confirmation of a finalised layout based on our revised submission of the Coloured Layout, Plan Ref: 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A).

- e. A condition assessment has not been provided for the proposed other broadleaved woodland creation; this is required to ensure that the proposed condition is ecologically feasible.

The BNG Statement/Report will be updated to suit the comments above upon confirmation of a finalised layout based on our revised submission of the Coloured Layout, Plan Ref: 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A).

- f. The metric states that 62 small trees are to be planted in areas of public open space, however this does not appear to match the latest landscaping plan, additionally it appears that individual trees have been planted within areas of woodland creation which is not in line with guidance 2 – clarification on which trees have been included in the metric is required.

The BNG Statement/Report will be updated to suit the comments above upon confirmation of a finalised layout based on our revised submission of the Coloured Layout, Plan Ref: 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A).

g. The Hedgerow Creation tab includes only species rich native hedgerow at 0.1234 km. The Landscaping Masterplan shows 0.473 km of species rich native hedgerow. The planting schedule also lists H1, H2 and H3, which are non-native hedgerows. The Landscaping Masterplan (Taylor Wimpey, November 2025, PP01.09, P3) does not separate these hedgerow types or show clearly which sections fall within public open space. Clarification is required.

The BNG Statement/Report will be updated to suit the comments above upon confirmation of a finalised layout based on our revised submission of the Coloured Layout, Plan Ref: 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A).

h. The sustainable urban drainage system does not appear to have been included in the metric appropriately, the Biodiversity Statement refers to this area as a pond, however the area appears to be fully seeded within the Landscaping Masterplan and appears to have been included within the Metric as other neutral grassland. The proposed seed mix for the area is RP11 – Hurrell's Seeds – which only includes 3 grass species. This area should be categorised as Urban – Sustainable drainage system, the metric and accompanying report requires updating to reflect this.

The BNG Statement/Report will be updated to suit the comments above upon confirmation of a finalised layout based on our revised submission of the Coloured Layout, Plan Ref: 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A).

Ecology – Breeding Birds

In conjunction with the comments received in orange, please see our responses below in *italics*:

12. The PEA includes compensation and enhancement measures, in Appendix 8 – Landscape Design For Birds (Ecology Plan, Taylor Wimpey, 3rd December 2025, Drawing number 22970-ECO-01-A), However, the following further information and amendments are required.

- a. The timings and details of installation
- b. The removal of boxes from newly planted trees, as these are unlikely to be able to support a bird box for a number of years.

It is recommended that these amendments are secured by condition.

CONDITION

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of bird boxes to include number, type and location on an appropriately scaled plan as well as timing of installation, has been provided for approval and implemented in accordance with those details. Evidence of implementation (i.e. photographs) will need to be provided to the Local Planning Authority to enable discharge of the condition.

The Ecology Plan has been updated in accordance with the comments above. To way find, the timings and details of installation has been included in a new bullet point under General Notes. Bird boxes have been removed from newly planted trees as requested.

Please note that we will submit this revised plan upon confirmation of a finalised layout based on our revised submission of the Coloured Layout, Plan Ref: 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A).

Ecology – Terrestrial Mammals

13. The habitats on site are suitable for hedgehog (a Priority Species) and Local Plan policy CS8 applies. The following reasonable avoidance measures should be put in place to ensure that there are no adverse effects on them:

- A pre-commencement check for hedgehog mammals;
- All trenches and excavations should have a means of escape (e.g. a ramp);
- Any exposed open pipe systems should be capped to prevent mammals gaining access; and
- Appropriate storage of materials to ensure that mammals do not use them.

These measures can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

These measures have been included within Section 7.3 Ecology & Nature Conservation of our submitted CEMP document, specifically Section 7.3.2 under Hedgehog RAMS. We would therefore like to request that the CEMP form part of the Approved Plans list, rather than a condition that requires discharge.

14. Hedgehog is a Priority Species and Local Plan policy CS8 applies. In order to maintain habitat connectivity for hedgehogs, I recommend hedgehog highways (13cm x 13cm gaps) should be installed into any close board fences on site. This can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

This recommendation has been included in the submission pack. The 13x13cm gaps are shown on the Boundary Treatment Detail drawing reference SF47, and the hedgehog highway route is shown on the Boundary Treatment Plans. We would therefore like to request that these drawings form part of the Approved Plans list, rather than a condition that requires discharge.

15. In line with the new biodiversity duty and NPPF (paragraph 187), I advise the applicant should provide biodiversity enhancements such as bird nesting boxes / native shrub planting and bee bricks. This can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

This recommendation has been included in the submission pack, as detailed on the Ecology Plan, reference 22970-ECO-01-Ecology Plan. We would therefore like to request that these drawings form part of the Approved Plans list, rather than a condition that requires discharge.

Archaeology

Please see attached the following document(s):

- 1416_Glen.Dimplex.Prescot_HRA_v1.2 130526 compressed
- Glen Dimplex_CEMP V2

In conjunction with the document(s) above, please see our responses below in *italics*:

18. As no DBA has been issued in support of this application, and as the current building on site has historical associations with the First World War, I advise that the applicant be required to undertake a programme of historical research and assessment of significance which investigates the development of the former munitions factory and the contribution it made to the war effort. In doing so the significance of the building on site should be considered and the potential for the archaeological remains of the 18th century house to be present. Such research should be secured by means of the following condition:

No development or demolition shall take place until the applicant or their agents, has secured the implementation and submission of a report on a programme of historic research and assessment. That programme of historic research and assessment should be undertaken in accordance with a Project Design which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to works taking place. The Project Design must include the following five steps:

- a. A programme and methodology of research and assessment.
- b. A programme for post-investigation reporting to include production of a final report of the significance of the historic building and archaeology.
- c. Provision for appropriate publication and dissemination of the history of the historic building.
- d. Provision for archive deposition of the report and records of the site investigation.
- e. Nomination of a competent person or persons / organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved Project Design.

The Historic Research & Assessment Report has been produced by GHC Archaeology & Heritage in collaboration with Alison Plummer of MEAS.

The scope and final report has been approved by Alison Plummer as part of our Prior Approval application, ref: 26/00137/DEMCON.

21. I advise that Section 7.8 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the Construction Environment Management Plan (dated 09.12.25) is not acceptable and should be revised based on the outcome of the programme of historic research and assessment, as detailed above. The revision of the CEMP can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

The CEMP document has been updated and submitted for approval with the request that we no longer require a pre-commencement planning condition.

Low Carbon Development

25. The applicant has submitted an Energy Report (Award Energy Consultants, December 2025) and an Energy Layout (Drawing Ref: 22970-EL-1008). The report details how the scheme will follow a fabric first approach in line with the energy hierarchy. PV panels are also to be included to reduce the development operational energy demand. There is an inconsistency between the report and the Energy Layout drawing. Whilst the report states that gas boilers are to be used the drawing includes the location of Air Source Heat Pumps for each dwelling. I advise that the use of low and zero carbon technologies is in line with Local Plan Policy CS22 (Sustainable and Low Carbon Developments) however clarification is required on how the properties are to be heated. The provision of this information can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

I can confirm that in-line with the Energy Statement produced by Award Energy Consultants, dependent on the implementation of Future Homes Standard, all dwellings will be heated by gas.

The Energy Layout drawing, as submitted, shows indicative positions of Air Source Heat Pumps should the implementation date of Future Homes Standard come forward or affect any plots onsite. They were included to show that we have considered their use and position onsite, should they be required.

Land Contamination

Please see attached the following document(s):

- 17-500-R1-2 - Glen Dimplex, Prescot - Phase I and II GSA Residential Development - June 24 – FINAL
- 17-500-R2-1 - Glen Dimplex Prescot - Phase II GSA (Internal Structure) - April 2025
- 17-500-R4-1 - Glen Dimplex Prescot - Ground Gas Addendum - Sept 2025

In conjunction with the document(s) above, please see our responses below in *italics*:

26. A response on the Phase I and II Report will be provided directly to Environmental Protection once I have received all the appendices.

In-line with the attached full Site Investigation Reports, you now have copies of the appendices you've requested. Upon review, please let us know if you have any further queries or comments.

I trust the information I have submitted in response to the comments received from MEAS provide the requested clarifications and information.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in grey ink, appearing to read 'Bardsley', enclosed within a large, loopy circular stroke.

Brandon Bardsley
Senior Design & Planning Executive

E: brandon.bardsley@taylorwimpey.com
M: 07393 607 569