

Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2026

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 Laura Howcroft on behalf of Merseyside Police, dated 29<sup>th</sup> June 2026, in relation our revised submission, specifically 22970-PL-1001- Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A), please find our responses below with any relevant information or updated documents attached.

Note, that as discussed with Laura Howcroft directly on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2026, these comments form our formal response and, to reduce the number of revisions and overlapping submissions, the updated drawings which accompany these amends will follow upon receipt of any further Highways or Design comments.

## Comments and/or Queries

### Landscape Management Plan

Please see attached the following document(s):

- WHI2508\_LMP\_P3\_Landscape Management Plan

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

The Landscape Management Plan (LMP) prepared by PGLA includes a management schedule which covers trees, shrubs and hedgerows. Section 2.3 of the main text of the LMP states "*Pruning: Prune to maintain correct shape of tree and prevent overhanging branches encroaching on paths or parking areas. Any growth that obscures windows, signs or sight lines should also be removed. Annual pruning to be carried out in the Autumn to remove dead wood and unbalanced growth*". Section 2.4 and 2.5 of the main text document refer to cutting and trimming of hedgerow and shrubs. My request is that height restrictions for shrubs and hedgerow, and minimum tree canopy heights are inserted at the appropriate sections of the LMP, so that these restrictions are embedded in the management of areas subject to the LMP (it is accepted that this will not apply to private residences). This will

contribute to ensuring that at least those planting features subject of the LMP do not impede visibility and therefore do not contribute to crime or the fear of crime.

With regard to landscaping to be provided at private residences, it is accepted that future management of those features is not in the Applicant's control. It is also accepted that residents may subsequently plant additional landscaping features. However the landscaping that is to be provided by the developer should be cognisant of the need to promote natural surveillance as far as possible. This could be achieved by considering trees that have canopies that do not drop below 2.5m from ground level, and hedging of a type that typically grows to 1m or so in height.

*The Landscape Management Plan has been updated to accommodate your comments on height restrictions, please see points 2.4.5, 2.4.7, 2.4.9, 2.9.1 and 2.9.2.*

*For clarity, in discussions with our Landscape Architect, your comments regarding the private curtilage planting are best controlled by maintenance recommendations to the homeowner. If we are to implement the restrictions based on species, this would diminish the placemaking element of the landscaping design by requiring dwarf plants which do not create harmonious boundary features, e.g. hedgerows. Therefore, we have included statements within the LMP that will provide maintenance recommendations to homeowners to promote the retention of natural surveillance as the hedgerows and trees mature.*

### **Cumbers Lane Re-design and Lighting**

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

The curves in the path and landscaping in the form of trees do not provide clear sightlines between each end of the path accessing Cumbers Lane. There does appear to be space to achieve a straighter path which would provide unimpeded sightlines, please can this be considered. Can the trees along this path (circled yellow on the below) be removed to also avoid sightlines being interrupted? Or if the trees need to stay at this location, please could species with canopies not below 2.5m (from time of planting onwards) be selected and their maintenance conditioned through the Landscape Management Plan? Could the path area be landscaped using low height shrubs and grass mixes? The aim is to provide as wide a space and as clear sightlines as possible.

The Taylor Wimpey response to Merseyside Police comments requests that bollard lighting is considered for the Cumbers Lane path route, as an alternative to the lighting column shown on Drawing SHD2828-SHD-HLG-GLEN-DR-EO-Lighting Layout-R0. Bollard lighting is not considered appropriate. The Secured by Design Residential Guide states:

*19.3 SBD does not advocate the use of bollard lighting to achieve lighting uniformity. Bollard lighting is purely for wayfinding and can be easily obscured or damaged. It should be avoided, as it can increase the fear of crime, because it does not project sufficient light at the right height to recognise facial features.*

Please also note that the guide also states: *19.4 Trees shall not be planted within 5 metres of a light source, as the branches can cause damage or reduce the effectiveness of the light. Seasonal variations shall be taken into account when designing planting schemes.*

I request that the lighting plan (SHD2828-SHD-HLG-GLEN-DR-EO-Lighting Layout-R0 dated 02/06/2026) is subject of a condition so that column lighting in this area is secured and that trees are not provided within 5m of the column lighting on the Cumbers Lane access path.

*As requested, and discussed on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2026, the gratuitous curves will be omitted from the path, and we will show a clear straight line of sight. The Landscaping Plans, when updated to the revised layout, will ensure that there are no trees planted within 5m of the lighting column.*

*We would therefore like to request that the lighting design is not subject to a condition and can form part of the approved documents list.*

### **Substation**

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

The revised plan has introduced a vulnerability to plots 13 and 14 by removing the hedgerow at the back of the substation. On the revised plan it appears that access can easily be gained to the sides and rear of the substation (to the area shown by the blue line) and in turn this would conceal anyone trying to gain access to the rear of properties 13 and 14. To address this vulnerability please can fencing (to an appropriate security specification) or hedgerow (a species suitable to discourage climbing) be provided to prevent access to the sides or rear of the substation. Please could this solution and the retention of it in perpetuity be secured by condition so that the highlighted vulnerability is mitigated for the long term.



*As agreed on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2026, the Landscaping Plans, when updated to the revised layout, will show a thorny hedge around the substation to deter climbing. The area around the*

*substation will fall under the Management Company/Utilities Management, therefore this will be retained and maintained in perpetuity.*

**Refuse and Cycle Store Location**

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

The response from the developer states that stores have been moved away from street-facing boundaries where possible, and that once properties are completed the location of such stores is in the control of the homeowner/occupier. Drawing 22970-PL-1001-Coloured Planning Layout (Rev A) includes numerous properties where storage structures are still located adjacent to street-facing boundary treatment (for example, plots 84, 83, 81, 79, 78, 77, 76, 75, 72, 71).

It is accepted that once homes are out of the control of the developer, that the location of garden storage facilities is determined by the homeowner/occupier. However, in light of the risk highlighted to the developer, it is recommended that when constructing the properties that the developer provides outside storage in appropriate locations in the first instance. If the locations of external storage facilities can be moved away from street-facing boundary treatments at any more properties, this is highly recommended.

*As discussed, and agreed directly on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2026, the refuse and cycle storage will be revised to suit your comments on plots where it faces the street and be a minimum of 1.5m away from the fenceline to reduce the risk of climbing.*

**Bicycle Storage**

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

I have reviewed document 'CYC 06\_Cycle Shed 1.76 x 0.75m'. The store shown on this document does not appear to be security rated and therefore I would not recommend that this specification is taken forward. I recommend that a product listed on the Secured by Design website is selected as these products have been tested to relevant security standards and fully certified by an independent third-party certification body accredited by the United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS). Suitable bicycle stores are listed on the [Secured by Design - Sheds & Outbuildings](#) webpage, under the 'Bicycle Storage' tab towards the end of the page.

*As discussed on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2026, the current shed specification in conjunction with the provision of a 'Sold Secure' Padlock is acceptable. Therefore, we will provide recommendations for such padlocks in our homeowner packs to ensure that these cycle stores are secure.*

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

Yours Sincerely,

**Brandon Bardsley**  
**Senior Design & Planning Executive**