

From: David Staniland <David.Staniland@bdp.com>
Sent: 18 March 2025 13:40:29 UTC+00:00
To: "Osborne, Lee" <Lee.Osborne@knowsley.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: External Mail: RE: 24/00643/FUL - land at Okell Drive

Hi Lee

I forwarded the EHO's comments (blue) onto my client's Acoustic Consultant, Spratt and Hamer, who have responded as follows (green):

In the BS4142 assessment, why was a penalty of 6dB used in the previous report for this site (application ref 20/00360/FUL (by Soundtesting, Ref 14309 Version 3)) and none was used for the noise assessment report by Spratt and Hamer for the current application?

The new version takes a more comprehensive approach, taking into account the nature of the source, not necessarily under the scope of BS4142. The penalty correction for impulsivity was previously applied to account for door slams. Door slams have been assessed undertaking a maximum level L_{Amax} event assessment. It is deemed a more representative scenario as door slams should not be a regular occurrence.

Why is there a difference in the total noise impact assessment (vehicles) for this report when compared to the previous report (submitted under 20/00360/FUL), for the LA_{eq} 1hour. The figures in the report under 20/00360/FUL were 41dBA for the parent and 31dBA for the staff, which produced a combined of 41dBA. In the report submitted for this application, the figures were 49dBA (parent) and 40 dBA (staff), which produced a combined of 50dBA. The previous report also appeared to use more vehicles in the assessment, so it is not clear why noise values increase significantly. An explanation for this would be appreciated. The assumption is that the vehicle noise measurements taken during the assessment at Rockbourne Avenue were used for both assessments, could this be confirmed?

The previous version of the report was undertaken during the pandemic. In order to provide a more robust scenario, previously measured data from vehicle movement was used. This resulted in slightly higher levels, which therefore provides a more conservative scenario.

Why were different sound power level values of the cars used for the different reports (this application report vs the previous one)? In the most recent report, a sound power level of 77dBA (section 7.2.1) is used but in the previous one (20/00360/FUL) it was 82dBA (Table 9). It is assumed that this could be the distance the measurement was taken from but this information has not been provided in the report for this application, please confirm the distance.

As per previous response. Sound Power Level comes without distance inherently. 77dBA SWL was calculated from a slow-moving car measured at 3m within a carpark, whereas higher levels would represent faster moving cars.

It would have been helpful to see the impact of the noise on the residential properties both before and after the installation of the noise barrier – the previous report (20/00360/FUL) had a height of 1.83m (15kg/m²) barrier behind the resident's gardens and a 2m barrier along the nursery Garden. Why is a 1.5m (10kg/m²) barrier along the residential gardens now proposed?

Calculations show that a less onerous mitigation i.e. slightly lower fence would be sufficient and a bit less intrusive to incorporate for both the nursery and the neighbours. Typically, 10kg/m² is the minimum required mass of the acoustic barrier. Anything above this value is acceptable but not necessarily more effective.

Although only a small difference, why are the vehicle noise measurements higher at the façade than they are in the middle of the garden?

The garden benefits from barrier attenuation, parts of the façade - e.g. first floor windows - are not protected by the barrier.

Please can you forward the above onto your EHO and let me know if they have any further queries.

Thanks

David Staniland
Senior Planning Consultant

T [+44 \(0\)161 828 2275](tel:+44(0)1618282275)

BDP.com

BDP.

Built Original.

From: Osborne, Lee <Lee.Osborne@knowsley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 March 2025 12:16
To: David Staniland <David.Staniland@bdp.com>
Subject: RE: External Mail: RE: 24/00643/FUL - land at Okell Drive

Hi David

I will input the extension of time to the file.

Kind Regards

Lee

Lee Osborne

**Senior Planner
Planning**

Telephone: [0151 443 2395](tel:01514432395)

Knowsley Council , Huyton Library , Civic Way , Huyton , Knowsley , L36 9FB



From: David Staniland <David.Staniland@bdp.com>
Sent: 14 March 2025 11:51
To: Osborne, Lee <Lee.Osborne@knowsley.gov.uk>
Cc: Nejla Delkic <Nejla.Delkic@bdp.com>
Subject: RE: External Mail: RE: 24/00643/FUL - land at Okell Drive

Hi Lee

Thanks for confirming that I had understood the comments correctly.

An EOT to 04.04 is agreed – I agree this in my email below.

I have forwarded the EHO's comments to my client's acoustician, so will confirm their timescales separately, once they've had a chance to digest.

Thanks

David Staniland
Senior Planning Consultant

T [+44 \(0\)161 828 2275](tel:+44(0)1618282275)

BDP.com

BDP.

Built Original.

From: Osborne, Lee <Lee.Osborne@knowsley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 March 2025 11:25
To: David Staniland <David.Staniland@bdp.com>
Subject: RE: External Mail: RE: 24/00643/FUL - land at Okell Drive

Hi David

BNG agree with the cautionary approach, and Highways have no objections but request conditions as noted. EH have queries regarding the noise report as raised. I have not had

Arboriculture comments regarding the trees, previous applications can be referred to for guidance with regard this (although I will chase up further).

Please agree the extension of time request by return email, and within that email it would be useful if you could give an indication of when a response to EH can be submitted.

Thank you

Kind Regards

Lee

Lee Osborne

**Senior Planner
Planning**

Telephone: [0151 443 2395](tel:01514432395)

Knowsley Council , Huyton Library , Civic Way , Huyton , Knowsley , L36 9FB



From: David Staniland <David.Staniland@bdp.com>
Sent: 14 March 2025 11:18
To: Osborne, Lee <Lee.Osborne@knowsley.gov.uk>
Cc: Nejla Delkic <Nejla.Delkic@bdp.com>
Subject: External Mail: RE: 24/00643/FUL - land at Okell Drive

CAUTION: This email originated from an external source. If you suspect a potential phishing email, report it via the IT Self Service Portal which can be found within the Quick Links section on Bertha

Hi Lee

For the avoidance of any doubt on my part, my reading of the below is that BNG and Highways are happy and it's just EH that require further comments / clarification.

Please can you confirm that you agree.

An EOT to 04.04 is agreed. We will respond re the EH's comments ASAP.

Thanks

David Staniland
Senior Planning Consultant

T [+44 \(0\)161 828 2275](tel:+441618282275)

BDP.com

BDP.

Built Original.

From: Osborne, Lee <Lee.Osborne@knowsley.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 March 2025 10:50
To: David Staniland <David.Staniland@bdp.com>
Cc: Nejla Delkic <Nejla.Delkic@bdp.com>
Subject: 24/00643/FUL - land at Okell Drive

Hi David

Regarding the above application after receiving consultee responses, I offer the following comments:-

BNG

The applicant's methodology regarding taking a precautionary approach to the BNG calculation due to the potential impact construction may have on the habitats present on site is accepted.

- The applicant has submitted a biodiversity net gain assessment, metric calculation and landscape plan which is acceptable and meets the required 10% net gain target. The onsite BNG within the landscape plan is not considered to be significant enhancement and the plan and its implementation can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition or as an approved document.
- Biodiversity net gain is a pre-commencement planning condition therefore a Biodiversity gain plan must be submitted to the LPA prior to development commencing. A biodiversity gain plan template can be found on the government website ([Biodiversity gain plan - GOV.UK](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain))
- The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:
 - (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
 - (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.
- The LPA, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission would be Knowsley Council.

- Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions are considered to apply.

Highways

Highways are satisfied that the proposed parking layout and provision would effectively manage demand without adverse impact onto the surrounding highway. A turning area has been incorporated into the car park layout, showing that vehicles could manoeuvre safely and efficiently. The applicant has also shown 4 cycle parking and 2 motorcycle parking bays; however, no detail is provided on the specification.

Highways note the presence of sustainable transport links to this site and surrounding area. Halewood Train Station is within 0.6m (14min) on foot, providing regular services into Liverpool, Warrington and Manchester. Bus stops are located on Church Road less than 11 min walk away, approximately 0.5m away on foot, providing services to Belle Vale and Liverpool. Highways are therefore satisfied that the nursery is accessible.

The site access would enter and exit from Okell Drive and would have a 6.0m radii and a 4.8m carriageway width, which is deemed acceptable by Highways. Visibility splays (2.4m x 40m) have been demonstrated in both directions from the site access, however, highways would require visibility splays of 43 metres by 2.4 metres in accordance with the 30mph speed limit of Okell Drive.

Requested Conditions

Requested conditions from highways are as follows:-

- Visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 4.3 metres provided at the proposed driveways exiting onto Okell Drive, to be provided clear of obstructions to a maximum height of 0.6 metres above footway/verge level.
- Development not brought into use until the areas indicated on the submitted plans to be set aside for parking, servicing, vehicular manoeuvring (including provision for pedestrians/cyclists) have been surfaced, drained and permanently marked out or demarcated in accordance with the details and specifications shown in plan ref: 24.027 002.
- The applicant has submitted an outline Car Park Management Plan, doc ref 2755-02-CPMP01. Update and provision of further information on the frequency and extent of the monitoring regimes and the trigger points required and action by the applicant when necessary to ensure overspill parking does not happen on nearby public highways. A record of the frequency and extent of the monitoring regimes including any actions taken, to be submitted annually for the first three years of operation.
- Long stay cycle parking provision (covered and secure) to be provided to an extent and specification agreed in writing.
- Construction Management Plan to be submitted and agreed prior to the start of works, and implemented at all times construction is taking place.
- Travel Plan to be submitted within three months of nursery first coming into use. The Plan should include immediate, continuing and long-term measures to promote and encourage alternative modes of transport to the single-occupancy car. An annual report should be submitted to the LPA no later than 1 month following the anniversary of the

first occupation of the development for a period of 5 years with the report including a review of the Travel Plan measures, monitoring data and updated action plan.

It is an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without the permission of the Highway Authority. If planning permission is granted the developer would be required to enter into an agreement under s278 of the Highways Act 1980 with the Council. The applicant is advised to contact Austin McGowan, t: 0151 443 2234, email:

Austin.McGowan@knowsley.gov.uk to discuss the matter further in such case.

EH

- In the BS4142 assessment, why was a penalty of 6dB used in the previous report for this site (application ref 20/00360/FUL (by Soundtesting, Ref 14309 Version 3)) and none was used for the noise assessment report by Spratt and Hamer for the current application?
- Why is there a difference in the total noise impact assessment (vehicles) for this report when compared to the previous report (submitted under 20/00360/FUL), for the L_{Aeq} 1hour. The figures in the report under 20/00360/FUL were 41dBA for the parent and 31dBA for the staff, which produced a combined of 41dBA. In the report submitted for this application, the figures were 49dBA (parent) and 40 dBA (staff), which produced a combined of 50dBA. The previous report also appeared to use more vehicles in the assessment, so it is not clear why noise values increase significantly. An explanation for this would be appreciated. The assumption is that the vehicle noise measurements taken during the assessment at Rockbourne Avenue were used for both assessments, could this be confirmed?
- Why were different sound power level values of the cars used for the different reports (this application report vs the previous one)? In the most recent report, a sound power level of 77dBA (section 7.2.1) is used but in the previous one (20/00360/FUL) it was 82dBA (Table 9). It is assumed that this could be the distance the measurement was taken from but this information has not been provided in the report for this application, please confirm the distance.
- It would have been helpful to see the impact of the noise on the residential properties both before and after the installation of the noise barrier – the previous report (20/00360/FUL) had a height of 1.83m (15kg/m²) barrier behind the resident's gardens and a 2m barrier along the nursery Garden. Why is a 1.5m (10kg/m²) barrier along the residential gardens now proposed?
- Although only a small difference, why are the vehicle noise measurements higher at the façade than they are in the middle of the garden?

In light of the above a further extension of time of three weeks (to 4 April) is suggested to allow you to submit information /revise the application as required and for such to be submitted and considered; forthcoming comments and considerations received to be forwarded to yourself. Please confirm the extension of time by return email.

Kind Regards

Lee

Lee Osborne

**Senior Planner
Planning**

Telephone: [0151 443 2395](tel:01514432395)

Knowsley Council , Huyton Library , Civic Way , Huyton , Knowsley , L36 9FB



This e-mail and any attachments are confidential. It may contain privileged information and is intended for the named recipient(s) only. It must not be distributed without consent. If you are not one of the intended recipients, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose, distribute, or retain this email or any part of it and do not take any action based on it.

Unless expressly stated, opinions in this email are those of the individual sender, and not of Knowsley MBC. Legally binding obligations can only be created for, or be entered into on behalf of, Knowsley MBC by duly authorised officers or representatives.

Knowsley MBC excludes any liability whatsoever for any offence caused, any direct or consequential loss arising from the use, or reliance on, this e-mail or its contents. We believe but do not warrant that this e-mail and any attachments are virus free. You must therefore take full responsibility for virus checking and no responsibility is accepted for loss or damage arising from viruses or changes made to this message after it was sent. Knowsley MBC reserves the right to monitor and/or record all e-mail communications through its network in accordance with relevant legislation.

[Email Disclaimer](#)

This e-mail and any attachments are confidential. It may contain privileged information and is intended for the named recipient(s) only. It must not be distributed without consent. If you are not one of the intended recipients, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose, distribute, or retain this email or any part of it and do not take any action based on it.

Unless expressly stated, opinions in this email are those of the individual sender, and

not of Knowsley MBC. Legally binding obligations can only be created for, or be entered into on behalf of, Knowsley MBC by duly authorised officers or representatives.

Knowsley MBC excludes any liability whatsoever for any offence caused, any direct or consequential loss arising from the use, or reliance on, this e-mail or its contents. We believe but do not warrant that this e-mail and any attachments are virus free. You must therefore take full responsibility for virus checking and no responsibility is accepted for loss or damage arising from viruses or changes made to this message after it was sent. Knowsley MBC reserves the right to monitor and/or record all e-mail communications through its network in accordance with relevant legislation.

[Email Disclaimer](#)

This e-mail and any attachments are confidential. It may contain privileged information and is intended for the named recipient(s) only. It must not be distributed without consent. If you are not one of the intended recipients, please notify the sender immediately and do not disclose, distribute, or retain this email or any part of it and do not take any action based on it.

Unless expressly stated, opinions in this email are those of the individual sender, and not of Knowsley MBC. Legally binding obligations can only be created for, or be entered into on behalf of, Knowsley MBC by duly authorised officers or representatives.

Knowsley MBC excludes any liability whatsoever for any offence caused, any direct or consequential loss arising from the use, or reliance on, this e-mail or its contents. We believe but do not warrant that this e-mail and any attachments are virus free. You must therefore take full responsibility for virus checking and no responsibility is accepted for loss or damage arising from viruses or changes made to this message after it was sent. Knowsley MBC reserves the right to monitor and/or record all e-mail communications through its network in accordance with relevant legislation.

[Email Disclaimer](#)