
APPLICATION NO: 23/02378/REM **CASE OFFICER:** Clare Appleyard

WARD: Whiston & Cronton **PARISH:** Whiston Town Council

LOCATION: Land South of Lickers Lane, Windy Arbor Road, Halsnead Garden Village, Whiston

PROPOSAL: RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION PURSUANT IN PART TO PLANNING PERMISSION 20/00399/OUT AND THE SUBSEQUENT S73 APPLICATION REFERENCE 23/02755/FUL FOR THE ERECTION OF 239 NO. DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS - APPROVAL SOUGHT FOR APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT, SCALE AND ACCESS TO ADJACENT LAND.

Site Description

The application site forms part of Halsnead Garden Village. Halsnead has national significance as one of the first 14 sites in England awarded Garden Village Status by the Government in 2017. It is a strategic housing and employment site which will deliver approximately 1600 homes, approximately 22.5ha of employment land, 33 hectares of strategic greenspace and a country park.

The original outline and s73 applications included two land parcels: one parcel accessed off Lickers Lane and one smaller parcel accessed off Windy Arbor Road, which was a former garden centre. This small land parcel does not form part of this reserved matters application. The larger land parcel relates to an approximately 9.4 ha site which is located south of Lickers Lane and takes its access off Lickers Lane. This reserved matters application relates to this larger land parcel.

The site itself comprises land formerly used for agriculture (arable fields) with woodland and grassland, which has a gentle gradient due west. The site extends down to the Halsnead Park caravan park to the south with Lickers Lane wood stretching along most of the northern boundary of the site, excluding the northeast corner. The site is bound by fields with mature trees to the west, and beyond this lie residential properties on Main Drive. Windy Arbor Road playing fields are to the northwest. Fields also lie due south with Lickers Lane bounding the north of the site with residential properties lying north on both sides of Lickers Lane. The site has a number of residential properties directly bounding the site to the north/northwest, which are accessed from Lickers Lane. The site is bounded to the east by land currently under consideration for the erection of 120 homes under planning application reference 22/00600/FUL.

Proposal

The proposal seeks approval of the reserved matters (approval, layout, scale, access to adjoining land and landscaping) for the parcel of land served off Lickers Lane. The proposal is for the erection of 239 dwellings (of which there are 8 flats) with associated works. The housing mix comprises 8 1-bed units, 50 2-bed units, 137 3-bed units and 44 4-bed units. Access will be off Lickers Lane.

Consultations

Whiston Town Council – Whiston Town Council strongly oppose the proposals. The increase in properties and the lack of infrastructure to accommodate Halshead Garden Village will impact residents. The ongoing issues with highways, lack of schools, lack of GP surgeries and the impact on the environment are a cause for concern and therefore the Town Council cannot support the proposals.

Merseyside Fire and Rescue – No objections raised.

Coal Authority – No objections raised. A condition is recommended to ensure that the coal mitigation works are secured.

Environmental Health – No objections raised subject to conditions relating to noise, contaminated land (risk assessment, submission of remediation scheme, implementation of remediation scheme, reporting of unexpected contamination, materials management plan, importation of soil/material) construction management plan and construction hours.

Local Highway Authority

No objections subject to a condition restricting boundary treatments/hedges to less than 0.6m within the visibility splay, a condition to ensure parking, serving and manoeuvring is laid out in accordance with the approved plans and a condition to secure the siting and elevation details of cycle storage.

National Highways – No objections raised.

United Utilities – No objections raised. The applicant's attention is drawn to a sewer that crosses the site. An informative is recommended.

Natural England – No comments to make.

Housing Strategy – Site requires 25% AH provision. No tenures have been provided. There is currently a need for 1-, 2- and 4-bedroom accommodation. Inclusion of level access wet room/showers would be welcomed. More 1 bedroom apartments would be welcomed. It has been queried if further information has been provided on how the proposal meets policy CS17.

Fusion 21 – A social value contribution of £21,510 is required.

Merseyside Police – No objections although concern raised about rear parking which is used to serve a number of properties and further information has been requested in relation to the security of the plot nearest to the cycle/pedestrian path that leads to Lickers Lane. The houses backing onto land waiting to be developed is

a security risk and 2.4m fencing should be erected. It is recommended that the developer build to the Secured by Design Award. Fencing should be 1.8m high. Queries also raised about who is managing the greenspace.

St Helens Council – No objections raised.

Active Travel England – No objections raised. ATE are keen for a new crossing to be provided via a s278 to promote connectivity. ATE has confirmed that they understand the details for the Lickers Lane access junction details have been approved via the outline planning consent and cannot be revisited. However, notwithstanding this, ATE advises the LHA to pursue an appropriate s278 agreement for the creation of appropriate crossings compliant with Chapter 10 LTN 1-20.

ATE have confirmed that they are satisfied with the active travel provision and connections. The site is considered to be permeable with adjoining land connectivity. Confirmation of suitable materials is important.

In terms of details relating to active travel infrastructure, ATE has reviewed the landscape drawings and are satisfied with the seating and wayfinding provision. The applicant is providing Sheffield stands at the nodes which is welcomed.

Active travel mode share targets should be included in the Travel Plan although it is recognised that this has already been conditioned through the outline.

ATE wish to see an informative on the planning permission raising awareness of the above.

Landscape/Trees (Environmental Sustainability) – Concern has been raised about the layout, entrance feature and compliance with the Masterplan. Concern has also been raised in relation to connectivity and circulation, the type and location of play space and whether the extent of play space meets the standard open space calculations. Concern has been raised about the retaining features and gabion baskets should be focussed on the southern area of Halshead. Tree size and SUDs design have also been raised as issues and a more naturalised design should be incorporated into the SUDs. Cross sections and use of aquatic planting to enhance biodiversity have been requested. Information has been provided in relation to levels and concern has been raised that the village green layout does not comply with the Masterplan/Design Guide. It is recommended that the design of the Village Green is reconsidered and the area for the village green is increased such that the green is a 'set piece' of welcoming community space.

Concern has been raised about how the surface water drainage connects the Tier 1 watercourse network from Mellors pond into Big Water.

It is recommended that the pumping station is moved to the edge of the greenspace to minimise any unnecessary loss or break up of the greenspace areas.

Conditions are recommended to secure the design of the footpath through Lickers Lane woodland and full details of the play equipment are required. A condition is also advised to seek details of the planting on the western edge of the greenspace

as this will need to respond to what is being developed on the adjacent site.

.

Housing Strategy

This is an AH scheme and Housing Strategy has requested tenure details. There is a high level of housing need for 1, 2 and 4 bed properties, all for affordable/social rent. Request has been made for the applicant to support the Council in meeting this housing need and it is requested that more one bed units are provided in the scheme. It is also requested that the applicant considers inclusion of level floor wet/shower room facilities in proposed apartments to meet those requiring level access.

LLFA - No objections.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 397 neighbours. It has also been advertised by Site Notice and a Press Notice. No objections from local residents have been received.

Planning History

23/02755/FUL VARIATION OF CONDITIONS: 3 (APPROVED PLANS CONDITION); 13 (UTILITY BUILDINGS AND COMPOUNDS CONDITION); 15 (WILDLIFE INFORMATION PACK CONDITION); 17 (TRAVEL PLAN CONDITION); 19 (EV CHARGING POINTS CONDITION); 24 (EAST TO WEST VEHICULAR ROUTE PROVISION, LICKERS LANE LAND PARCEL); 25 (EASTERN HIGHWAYS CONNECTION, LICKERS LANE LAND PARCEL); 27 (HIGHWAYS CONNECTION CONDITION, WINDY ARBOR ROAD PARCEL) TO ALLOW THE OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION TO BE BROUGHT FORWARD IN TWO (OR MORE) RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATIONS RATHER THAN ONE RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR THE WHOLE SITE. THIS S73 VARIES PLANNING APPLICATION 20/00399/OUT (OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 277 DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3) AND AN APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 100 UNITS FOR OVER 55S TOGETHER WITH NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS TO LICKERS LANE AND WINDY ARBOR ROAD, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS, APPROVAL SOUGHT FOR ACCESS WITH ALL OTHER MATTERS RESERVED). – under consideration.

20/00399/OUT OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 277 NO. DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3) AND AN APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 100 UNITS FOR OVER 55'S (USE CLASS C3) TOGETHER WITH NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS TO LICKERS LANE AND WINDY ARBOR ROAD, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS (INC. DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS) (APPROVAL SOUGHT FOR ACCESS - ALL OTHER MATTERS RESERVED) – Approved 1st August 2023

POLICY CONTEXT

Paragraph 11 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019), an extract from which is set-out below, states that:

“Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up to date development plan, permission should not usually be granted. Local Planning Authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.”

In this regard the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy was adopted in January 2016, although certain saved policies of Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP) remain operational as part of the Statutory Development Plan and are still given weight in reaching a decision under the provisions of paragraph 213 of the latest NPPF. The Joint Merseyside and Halton Waste Local Plan was adopted in 2013 and is also part of the development plan. The NPPF is considered to be up to date national planning policy. The development plan is considered sufficiently up to date such that the tilted balance need not apply. The following policies are relevant to the determination of this application and a flat balance approach is therefore necessary.

The site is allocated for residential development (as a Sustainable Urban Extension) within the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy to help meet the borough’s development requirements up to 2028. The relevant adopted policies for the assessment of the application are listed below.

Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, 2006)

T5 – Location of Major Traffic Generating New Development

T7 – New Development and Walking & Cycling Routes

T8 – Transport Assessments

T9 – Travel Plans
DQ2 – Security in the Built Environment
DQ4 – Trees and Development
ENV2 – Noise and Vibration
ENV3 – Light and Pollution
ENV5 – Contaminated Land

Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy (2016)

SD1- Sustainable development
CS1 – Spatial Strategy for Knowsley
CS2 - Development Principles
CS3 – Housing Supply, Delivery and Distribution
CS7 – Transport Networks
CS8 – Green Infrastructure
SUE1 – Sustainable Urban Extensions and Safeguarded Land
SUE2 – Sustainable Urban Extensions – Development Principles
SUE2c – Sustainable Urban Extensions – South of Whiston and Land South of M62
CS15 – Delivering Affordable Housing
CS17 – Housing Sizes and Design Standards
CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development
CS20 – Managing the Borough’s Historic Environment
CS21 – Greenspaces and Trees
CS24 - Managing Flood Risk
CS26 – Waste Management
CS27 – Planning for and Paying for New Infrastructure

Supplementary Planning Documents

Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010)
Design Quality in New Development SPD (2016)
New Residential Development SPD
Trees and Development SPD (2016)
Halsnead Garden Village Masterplan SPD

Merseyside Waste Local Plan (2013)

WM8 – Waste Prevention and Resource Management
WM9 – Sustainable Waste Management Design and Layout for New Development

- 8.4 Also of relevance is the Halsnead Garden Village Design and Local Distinctiveness Guide that was adopted in May 2020. This does not have the status of a Supplementary Planning Document but is a material consideration in determining the application. This guide sets out detailed design requirements across the site.

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT

Principle of the Development

Local Plan Core Strategy Policy SUE1 identifies 9 sites which have been allocated for residential or employment uses to meet development requirements, of which the Halsnead Garden Village site 'South of Whiston' is identified for primarily residential use. SUE2 sets out key policy parameters for new development within Sustainable Urban Extension sites. New development should demonstrate compliance with these parameters in order to be acceptable. Indicative considerations for each site are further listed at Appendix E of the Core Strategy. Policy SUE2 also explains that:

'the Council will prepare a Supplementary Planning Document, which will propose a spatial development framework for the site, together with further details of development and infrastructure requirements, and; planning permissions will only be granted where they are consistent with a single detailed Masterplan for the whole of the Sustainable Urban Extension which is approved by the Council'

This policy confers significant weight to the Halsnead Garden Village Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document for the wider Sustainable Urban Extension, outlining their important role in determining acceptability of this application.

Policy SUE2c of the Local Plan relates specifically to the South of Whiston and Land South of M62 site and confirms that residential development in this location should deliver: safe and convenient highway access; provision for public transport; walking and cycling; public open space within a wider Green Infrastructure network; key infrastructure and services. This policy provides site specific development requirements with which this application should deliver in order to accord with the policy.

The application site has the benefit of outline planning permission granted as part of application 20/00399/OUT (referred to as the 'outline consent' in this report). The outline permission allowed up to 277 properties and an apartment development of up to 100 units on the site which comprised of the two land parcels, one accessed off Lickers Lane and one accessed off Windy Arbor Road. The current proposals are for 239 dwellings on the land parcel served off Lickers Lane only.

The principle of residential development on the site has previously been accepted and the proposals are within the parameters approved in application 20/00399/OUT and therefore the principle of the development is acceptable. It is noted that Whiston Town Council and an objector have raised objections on the grounds of the impact of the proposal on schools, GP surgeries, the environment and infrastructure in the local area which will result in detrimental impacts on local residents. Concerns regarding highways impacts, congestion and the delivery of this amount of housing have also been raised. However, the principle of the development, including traffic generation associated with the proposal, has been determined via the outline consent and cannot be revisited at reserved matters stage.

The outline consent sought developer contributions for this development which have been secured via s106. These included contributions towards health and education provision and local and strategic infrastructure provision. No further obligations are required in connection with the reserved matters application and this application is concerned with considering the detail. The proposal is considered to be compliant with policy CS27 of the Local Plan Core Strategy.

Comprehensive Development

The need to ensure that planning permissions within the allocation deliver and facilitate comprehensive development of Halsnead Garden Village is a clear priority within the Council's Local Plan Core Strategy Policy SUE2 which states:

“Development within Sustainable Urban Extensions must [...] demonstrate a comprehensive approach to the development of the relevant Sustainable Urban Extension and to infrastructure provision (excerpt from Policy SUE2 part 1b) [...] Planning permissions [for the site] must be linked to any necessary legal agreements [...] which facilitate the comprehensive delivery of all phase of development within the Sustainable Urban Extension in accordance with the single detailed masterplan.”

It follows that the need to ensure comprehensive development is also a strategic objective of the Halsnead Garden Village Masterplan SPD. Paragraph 8.5 states that:

“the Council will need to be satisfied that development of individual parcels will not sterilise or frustrate delivery of other parts of the site [...] all parcels will need to be sufficiently coordinated with appropriate green, social and physical infrastructure delivered at the correct time to support successful comprehensive development”.

Strategic objective SO2 of the Halsnead SPD requires that effective collaboration and partnership working ensuring that development is designed and implemented to ensure the comprehensive delivery of Halsnead as a whole, including the timely and coordinated provision of physical and community infrastructure.

Paragraph 5.62 of the Masterplan SPD states that: - *“every application should demonstrate how it would assist in overall delivery, and not compromise or prejudice, wider development of Halsnead as a Garden Village; this will include alignment with the infrastructure requirements and delivery principles set out in this SPD”.*

The proposal includes the provision of Main Drive which links Lickers Lane to the development and the internal road network facilitates connectivity to adjoining land parcels. The applicant has engaged with the adjoining developer to ensure the links allow comprehensive development and the amended plans allow future land parcels to build houses fronting onto a continuation of Main Drive which is welcomed. The applicant has submitted details to show

comprehensive links to adjoining land parcels to satisfy condition 37 on the outline consent. This promotes future connectivity to adjacent sites.

The applicant has demonstrated a comprehensive approach in delivering the site and therefore, the proposal complies with the requirements of Policies SUE2 and SUE2c and the requirements of the Masterplan SPD.

Appearance, Design, Layout and Masterplan Compliance

Policy SUE2 is clear in its requirement that proposals must demonstrate a comprehensive approach to development and be of a high design quality. The Halsnead Garden Village (SPD) has been prepared for the site and in addition Policy SUE2c sets out further requirements which the development should deliver and is further supported by the Halsnead Garden Village Design and Local Distinctiveness Guide.

The Masterplan sets out the Council's requirements for the layout in respect of street hierarchy, location of open space and overall design quality. The design and layout of the proposal also falls to be considered in respect of Policy DQ2 of the Replacement UDP and Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan: Core Strategy. Of relevance in considering the design and layout of the development is the Design Quality in New Development SPD. All these policies and SPDs share the same aim: to ensure that an acceptable level of quality in the development is achieved and to enhance local distinctiveness, accessibility and identity.

The site is located within the character area identified as 'North Halsnead' within the Halsnead Masterplan SPD. This is one of three character areas within the wider Halsnead Garden Village site. The Halsnead Garden Village Design and Local Distinctiveness Guide ('the Design Guide') sets out parameters for the development including requirements for the design of public realm, street design and hierarchy, green infrastructure, design guidance for sustainable urban drainage systems and hard landscaping design parameters. These factors all contribute towards creating a unique identity and sense of place for Halsnead. The Design Guide also builds on further design requirements for the character areas including palettes of materials and planting guidance.

Layout

The Masterplan SPD sets out detailed design guidance in relation to character area 2: North Halsnead. In particular, the key requirements are discussed below and how they have been incorporated into the scheme. .

The site fronts Lickers Lane and this is an opportunity for the development to integrate with the existing residential community of Whiston. The application site includes Lickers Lane woodland to the north which is proposed to be enhanced with the inclusion of a footpath through the woodland and additional planting. The entrance includes a new entrance wall feature with planting and this opens up onto a spine road (Main Street) which runs north to south and offers views through the development. The site includes heavy tree screening

to the east of the access road which retains the character of Lickers Lane whilst offering an attractive gateway into the site with the access wall and planting feature. This complies with the Masterplan SPD which requires enhanced street frontage and interaction with Lickers Lane.

The Masterplan SPD sets out that permeable thresholds between the site and Whiston Rail Station and Whiston Village should be created that are safe and attractive to use by pedestrians and cyclists. The Masterplan SPD also promotes the delivery of a clear connected street grid which maximises permeability and route choice making navigation easy.

The scheme offers good connectivity with adjacent land and a 3m cycleway is proposed running north-south along a tree lined Main Street which then heads west onto the east west part of Main Street, again tree lined, as set out in the Masterplan SPD. The scheme includes a hierarchy of streets that broadly complies with the Masterplan whilst also offering a good network of attractive routes to promote permeability through the development. Attractive routes are incorporated into the site as well as good connectivity with adjacent parcels and the existing Whiston residential area.

In terms of nodal points, the Council's landscape architect has raised concerns about the siting and number of nodes. However, the development has been heavily constrained by the location of mine shafts throughout the site. This has reduced the opportunity for nodal points to be sited exactly where the Masterplan SPD dictates. There is a gateway nodal point identified in the Masterplan SPD on Main Street close to Lickers Lane. Whilst a node has not been included here in terms of seating and landscaping, the proposal includes corner properties with dual frontages which offer an attractive feature and a node is incorporated further south. The scheme has two nodal points, one which intersects the junction between Main Street and the north south residential avenue, and one within the woodland area. There are also pockets of green space interspersed throughout the development aiding legibility.

The Masterplan SPD requires development to positively integrate with existing woodlands. The proposal includes development that fronts onto the woodland and dual fronted elevations where properties are sited on corner plots adjacent to woodland or greenspace areas. This provides opportunities for open surveillance in the interests of reducing the potential for anti-social behaviour and crime.

The Masterplan SPD promotes high density development, especially towards Lickers Lane, with the opportunity for apartments and an urban street character along a Main Street sequence connecting Lickers Lane and Windy Arbor Road, passing through a key central node having potential for a village green type space. The layout incorporates moderate density development and includes a village green adjacent to Main Street and a wider verge with tree planting to frame the entrance from Lickers Lane towards the village green area.

The landscape architect has commented that the village green is not large enough and has raised concerns about the SUDs design and the design of the

green. As the layout provides only limited detail, a condition is recommended to secure further information.

Other notable layout comments relate to the southern residential block which originally included rear facing properties backing onto one of the lanes. This resulted in a long wall boundary treatment with parking adjacent to rear gardens. This has been amended in the interests of promoting comprehensive development so that the properties rear gardens back onto the boundary of the site to the south and overlook the lanes in a traditional relationship. This is welcomed and helps to reduce opportunities for anti-social behaviour.

In terms of the layout of the small pockets of green space, the applicant originally envisaged play equipment within some of these spaces e.g. adjacent to the caravan park to the south. This has since been amended, with play equipment removed from the southern green buffer adjacent to the caravan park. The LPA requested that the village green includes some play equipment instead.

The village green itself has been amended such that the area includes planting, play equipment and a more naturalised SUD pond. It is noted that the village green does not fully align with the aspirations set out in the masterplan and the Design Guide in terms of its size and arrangement. However, the scheme does incorporate a village green which offers opportunities for play and dwell time and this is well overlooked. The applicant has positioned the play space within the central/southern area of the green which is in principle acceptable and it is well overlooked by properties surrounding the green. The scheme includes a community notice board and will be a focal point offering legibility and interest within the scheme. It is recommended that a condition is imposed to secure the final village green details and to ensure that the green has the opportunity to become a focal space which enhances sense of place.

The scheme includes a wider green planted verge to the east of the village green which provides a linear green space enhancing views through the garden village and contributing to the green credentials of the garden village as a sense of place.

The Landscape Architect had originally commented the extent of play provision. The Masterplan is clear in terms of play requirements and it is not considered that play space calculations are required in light of the POS contributions secured through the S106 and the pockets of open space that broadly align with the Masterplan SPD. A condition to request play details across all greenspace has been imposed. Concerns have been raised about the sizes of trees planted. Amended plans have taken on board comments on tree size and there are now trees between 20-25mm/30-35mm being proposed which is acceptable. No further comments were offered in regard to planting and as such, it is considered that the new landscaping details are acceptable.

The Landscape Architect has raised concerns about the SUDs design which have been made more naturalised within the amended landscape drawings. However, a condition to seek profile sections of the SUD ponds is

recommended. It has requested that the pumping station is moved to free up as much usable greenspace as possible. However, due to a sewer easement, this is not possible and the current location of the pumping station is therefore found to be acceptable. Planting around the substation will soften its impact.

Scale

In terms of scale, the proposal includes 131 two storey dwellings, a two storey apartment development comprising 8 units and a total of 100 2.5 storey dwellings. The scale of the development is considered to comply with the Masterplan SPD in the main as the North Halsnead character area is identified as an opportunity to provide predominantly 2-2.5 storey buildings. However, it does also identify that 3-4 storey development could be incorporated in localised areas along the Main Streets and to help terminate views at focal points such as the central node.

Whilst the development has avoided 3 and 4 storey property heights, it is considered that the scale is largely in line with the SPD and where views are terminated or buildings are used to frame focal points such as nodes or entrance gateways, 2.5 property buildings or rendered properties help aid legibility, framing the nodal points or entrances. The density is approximately 36 dwellings per hectare which aligns with the SPD but when allowing for infrastructure this reduces; the density is considered to be moderate and in keeping with the surrounding area. The low apartment numbers are reflective of market demand/developer requirements and is considered acceptable in the context of the wider ethos of the SPD.

Appearance

The applicant has submitted a materials strategy which sets out that they propose to use red/buff rural blend, red/blue multi blend and claret red blend facing bricks for the external facing materials. A combination of render and brick is proposed for focal dwellings e.g. to terminate junctions and at nodal points. However, the make of the brick and the finish of the render has not been specified. The applicant is proposing to use a light grey tile. Again, the tile profile, size and make has not been specified. As such, it is recommended that a condition is imposed securing the use of rough cast render, samples of materials to be submitted and approved where required and details of the door colours.

The external elevations of the dwellings will be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, comprising a combination of render and brick facades. The feature render facades will facilitate legibility across the development and use of brick detailing, feature porch canopies, bays, decorative window features such as brick lintels and good window proportions ensure an enhanced design is delivered that will help create a unique sense of identity and place.

Dual fronted properties will ensure corner plots relate well to both streets. The proposal includes a feature house type with a prominent brick chimney stack which offers an elevated design feature that also enhances sense of place.

The hard landscaping will reflect the Halsnead Garden Village Masterplan SPD and the Design Guide and will compromise the use of high-quality materials including tegular paving for the lanes to emphasise the street hierarchy. Given the hard landscaping will tie in with the s38 approvals process, a hard landscaping scheme condition is needed. The outline consent (condition 21) covers this. However, a condition to secure details of bins is recommended as the street furniture includes bins that do not comply with the Design Guide. This will seek to ensure a high-quality design is delivered and to protect visual amenity.

The boundary treatments consist of timber fencing 1.8m high, walls on corners plots and prominent areas and masonry retaining features with some gabion basket retaining features in less prominent locations. The gabion baskets propose to use sandstone and the more prominent retaining walls propose to use materials to match the dwelling to which it relates. Cheshire Railings are also proposed in parts of the site. A boundary treatment conditions is recommended to secure high quality boundary treatments that align with the design guide e.g. timber stained brown, railings painted black etc. This will ensure delivery of a high-quality designed scheme.

The key design principles of the scheme set out above are considered to comply with the requirements of the Halsnead Masterplan SPD and the Design Guide, subject to the imposition of conditions where necessary. The reserved matters proposal is considered to represent comprehensive development and, in terms of layout, appearance, access to adjoining land and scale is considered to comply with the relevant Core Strategy local plan policies, including policies CS2, SUE2, SUE2c and CS19 as well as guidance in the adopted SPDs including the Halsnead Masterplan SPD, New Residential Development SPD and the Design Quality in New Development SPD. The proposal is also considered to comply with UDP saved Policy DQ2.

Residential Amenity and Anti-Social Behaviour

In order for the proposal to be acceptable, it is important that it does not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of existing residents. Core Strategy Policies CS2 and CS19 seek to ensure that new development does not significantly injure the amenities of nearby residential neighbours. Saved Policy ENV2 of the Knowsley UDP seeks to ensure that new or existing developments are protected from new or existing noise sources and that, where necessary, effective mitigation measures are secured. The New Residential Development SPD also sets out criteria in relation to protecting residential amenity.

In relation to impacts on the amenity of existing residents, it is inevitable that some limited disturbance will occur as part of the construction process. This includes the need to alter the levels across the site as well as constructing the buildings themselves. Nevertheless, this would be for a temporary period only

and separate legislation¹ is in place to address any “statutory nuisance” experienced by residents.

During the construction stage, the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will contain a number of mitigation measures to control for environmental effects and minimise impacts on residential amenity. The CEMP will include details of the location of the compound and storage of plant and materials, management of deliveries, details of staff parking, control for mud transfer out of the site, pest control measures and methods for dust control amongst other measures. The outline consent included a CEMP condition and appropriately mitigates for impacts during construction.

In terms of the layout, the separation distances to the existing dwellings that directly bound the site are all considered to be acceptable. In particular, the separate distances between properties on Lickers Lane and the proposed dwellings and the caravans to the south and the proposed dwellings, all exceed recommended separation distances set out within the New Residential Development SPD. The proposed development incorporates two storey dwellings along the boundary with existing neighbouring properties. Internal separation distances between dwellings are all considered to be acceptable and where pinch points exist, these add interest to the layout design and help to frame streets. The majority of garden sizes of dwellings offer acceptable amenity space and in the main have acceptable depths. There are a few with slightly smaller gardens (less than 10m depth) but again these are very much in the minority and not unacceptable having regard to the layout and orientation.

Saved Policy DQ2 in the Knowsley UDP seeks to minimise the opportunity for crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) through sensitive design. The proposal has incorporated layout amendments to address some of the comments raised by Merseyside Police. This relates to the ensuring the houses front onto the lane to the south and ensuring good overlooking of green space areas. Merseyside Police has raised concern about rear parking areas within the development. Whilst not ideal, highways have also been included in discussions relating to rear parking. The parking areas have included some overlooking which has involved introducing dual fronted properties and ensuring fencing to the rear of plots 99-104, and other parking courts, have boundary treatments of walls with trellis to ensure some level of perceived overlooking is incorporated. On balance, this parking arrangement allows parking to be removed from the front of dwellings to increase planting to front gardens in the interests of offering a garden village aesthetic whilst also offering small pockets of parking. On balance, the parking in these parking courts is considered acceptable.

Merseyside Police have asked for 2.4 m high fencing to the rear of plots 41-52 for security purposes. However, a 1.8m fence is considered acceptable in this location, when taking into consideration the use of a retaining structure that will sit below the fence, which ranges up to 1m in height. As such, it is not considered that 2.4m high fencing is needed on top of retainers. The rear

¹ Environmental Protection Act 1990

gardens in this location are considered to be secure having regard to the fencing and the retaining wall to the southern boundary. It is also envisaged that new housing development will come forward on the land to the south that will provide an even more secure boundary.

Concern was raised about the security of the plot nearest to the cycle/pedestrian path that leads to Lickers Lane. This house has been sited such that it faces the path and has a dual frontage. A wall is shown on the approved plans around the garden of this plot and the delivery of the boundary treatments in accordance with the approved plans can be secured by condition. Additionally, a hedge will ensure the property has some defensible space to its frontage. The other boundary treatments are considered to be acceptable. In terms of the green space management, The applicant will be the overarching manager of the greenspace areas and this is considered acceptable.

In conclusion, the proposal would not be significantly detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of existing dwellings, subject to the conditions referenced above. The proposal, subject to appropriate planning conditions, complies with: the National Planning Policy Framework, the National Design Guide, Policies SD1, CS2, SUE2, SUE2c and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, Policy DQ2 of the Knowsley UDP, New Residential Development SPD; and Design Quality in New Development SPD, and the Halsnead Garden Village SPD and Design & Distinctiveness Guide.

Highway Impacts – Access, Circulation and Parking

Local Plan Core Strategy policy CS7 sets out the overall transport strategy for Knowsley and sets out criteria for new developments including the requirement for developments to meet adopted parking standards (as set out in the Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD). This policy promotes connectivity, delivery of sustainable accessible developments and seeks to deliver safe developments. This is also embodied in the Halsnead Masterplan SPD. The Halsnead masterplan SPD and the Design Guide set out more specific requirements in relation to highway design and hierarchy. Policy T5 of the Knowsley UDP seeks to ensure that any highway impacts are mitigated. The strategic highway issues and mitigation have been dealt with at the hybrid application stage. However, the more detailed locational and design requirements relating to the layout, access, circulation and parking are material considerations for the purposes of determining this application.

In accordance with the requirements within the Design Principles and the Halsnead Masterplan SPD, the scheme consists of a hierarchy of streets and lanes, from the spine route, and nodal points, which aid legibility across the development. The scheme also includes a shared footway/cycleway which continues and allows connectivity when future land parcels are developed. The proposal promotes sustainable travel. Active Travel England comments relate to the provision of an enhanced Travel Plan with sustainable mode targets; the outline consent secures the submission of a travel plan to promote sustainable transport use and an informative is recommended to make the applicant aware

of the additional ATE requirements. It is noted that an updated Travel Plan condition cannot be imposed on a reserved matters consent but these comments will be taken into account when the Travel Plan is submitted as part of the conditions on the outline planning permission.

Off street parking provision for the proposed dwellings is considered to be acceptable. Whilst it is noted that 4-bed dwellings have 2 spaces each rather than the recommended 3 spaces, this is considered to be appropriate given the sustainable location of the site, the links to sustainable transport modes and having regard to the fact that parking standards are maximums. No objection has been received from the LHA in regard to parking. The proposal is capable of complying with the Ensuring Choice of Travel SPD and is designed to ensure that the street scene is not dominated by parked cars.

The Highways Engineer has reviewed the application and confirmed that the proposal accords with the Design Guide and is acceptable from a highway safety perspective. A swept path analysis has been provided to demonstrate that a refuse vehicle can navigate the layout. The LHA has recommended that conditions are imposed for highway safety reasons and to promote access to sustainable modes of transport. A condition is recommended to secure cycle parking details for the dwellings and flats. It is noted here that this is also advocated by ATE. Another condition is recommended to ensure there are no obstacles/structures within the visibility splay and that there are no boundary treatments permitted above 0.6m in height. Finally, a condition is also recommended to ensure that the parking, servicing and vehicle manoeuvring areas are laid out in accordance with the approved plans.

It is noted that the reserved matters relate to the land parcel served off Lickers Lane. However, it is considered that this land parcel can be served safely off this junction.

ATE have submitted a response which includes reference to a new pedestrian crossing from the existing development (where the woodland path would exit) across to the residential area on the northern side of Lickers Lane. The area already has a crossing with dropped kerbs around Pennywood Drive. A path exiting the proposed development from the woodland would generate greater footfall and highlights the importance of a formalised crossing in this location. However, as this is a reserved matters application, it is not felt that Planning is the appropriate mechanism to deliver a crossing. The applicant has stated their agreement to provide this enhancement and the finer details of any crossing here can be decided, approved and delivered through any s278 agreement related to the junction improvement works.

ATE has also commented that they consider the scheme incorporates permeability and connections as well as including details on the landscape plan such as Sheffield stands in nodal areas. The Local Highways Authority are also happy with the access connections to adjacent land which promote comprehensive development. It is recommended that a timetable for implementation of the soft landscaping is included to secure its provision in line with the approved plans; hard landscaping condition 21 on the outline includes

a timetable for implementation so is covered by the principal permission. A wayfinding condition is also recommended in line with ATE comments.

Subject to the above conditions, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in relation to the design, layout, circulation, access, parking and highway safety. The development promotes sustainable design and alternative modes of travel. As such the proposal is considered to comply with policies CS2, CS19 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy, the Halsnead Masterplan SPD, Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD, the Design Guide and the NPPF.

Affordable Housing

Policy CS17 requires developments to incorporate an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, having regard to housing needs. Developments should show how the scheme contributes to the rebalancing of the housing market. This policy also seeks to ensure that design standards are met.

The affordable housing delivery mechanisms are set out in the s106 which was signed as part of the outline consent. This scheme proposes to deliver 100% affordable housing units. However, the s106 allows for the submission of an affordable housing scheme and allows the developer to deliver AH in line with either a 100% provision or a 25% provision, with tenure details to be submitted as part of the scheme to be approved via the s106.

The proposal is for the erection of 239 dwellings (of which there are 8 flats) with associated works. The housing mix comprises 8 1-bed units, 50 2-bed units, 137 3-bed units and 44 4-bed units. No units contain walk in showers/wet rooms. The Housing Strategy unit wanted to see more one bed units provided as well as walk in showers to meet housing need and avoid future adaptation costs.

In terms of standards, most of the dwellings will meet internal space standards prescribed by the Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard 2015 document. However, a few of the dwellings fall slightly short. For example, the one bed cottage flats have a 48sq metre internal size whilst the prescribed internal floor space set out for 2 people is set at 50m2 minimum. The internal floor space provision within these smaller units is only given very minor weight in the decision-making process, having regard to how close to the internal minimum the properties are.

There are some minor limitations of the scheme not fully aligning with housing need although the proposal does have 8 1-bed, 50 2-bed and 44 4 bed properties. It is also noted that there is no set policy driven targets for housing mix nor numbers of houses with wet rooms. However, the proposal does contain a large number of 3-bed units (more than 50%) and there are no 1 bed or 2-bed properties with ground floor wet rooms/walk in showers. As such, this conflict with policy CS17 is given minor weight.

Trees and landscaping

Saved Policy DQ4 of the Knowsley UDP seeks to ensure that new developments include adequate tree and landscape provisions, whilst also seeking the protection or replacement of trees affected by development. Policy CS21 of the Local Plan Core Strategy has the same aims and sets out the principles for mitigation where tree loss is unavoidable. This approach is supported by the Trees and Development SPD.

The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment which also includes Method Statement information. The AIA identifies that W2, G1 and part of G2 need to be removed to accommodate the development. The G1 and G2 trees are low value C category trees whilst W2 has been classified as B2. However, removal of W2 is required to allow the siting of the access and properties framing the site entrance.

The Arboricultural Officer has raised no objections to the proposal and the landscaping proposals incorporate adequate replacement tree planting which aligns with the Design Guide and Halshead Masterplan SPD as well as policy CS21. A timetable for implementation of the soft landscaping scheme is recommended to ensure the landscaping scheme is delivered to serve the new residents. A conditions seeking the delivery of the soft landscaping is also recommended.

The proposal adequately seeks to incorporate tree planting and seeks to retain and protect the highest value trees within the site, these being located in Lickers Lane woodland to the north and trees located to the northeast of the site. Condition 31 requires any reserved matters application to comply with any mitigation set out in an updated AIA. As such, the tree protection is secured through the outline consent. The proposal is considered to comply with the NPPF, Saved Policy DQ4 of the Knowsley UDP and Policies CS19 and CS21 of the Local Plan Core Strategy.

Ecology

Policy CS8 of the Local Plan Core Strategy, at various points, aims to ensure that new development protects and enhances biodiversity, including the protection of designated sites, priority habitats and protected and endangered species. This is fully consistent with the aims of the NPPF. The application is accompanied by a comprehensive ecological assessment.

The applicant has submitted various documents relating to woodland and habitat management, ecology, trees and protected species surveys including: a bat emergence report; an extended phase one habitat survey; a GCN/amphibian appraisal; a habitat enhancement measures strategy; an environmental statement setting which considers the impact of the development on the LWS; a woodland management plan; a habitat management plan and a bat roost assessment.

It is noted that the survey work did not relate to Lickers Lane Woodland or Sandfield Park Woodland as these woodlands are predominantly retained. A smaller woodland was assessed and considered to have negligible potential for

roosting bats due to the young age of the trees and lack of potential roost features.

A sycamore (T1) was found to contain 7 PRFs and these were inspected. No signs of bat roost activity were found. No other PRFs were found within trees. As such, a condition has been recommended requiring a pre-start check of the tree identified as T1 in the 2020 AIA, by a licenced ecologist, prior to its felling. Additionally, a condition has been recommended to secure details relating to the siting of the woodland footpath through Lickers Lane Woods. This condition will need to identify any trees that require removal, protected species surveys, any mitigation required as well as surfacing and edging details of the path.

The applicant has submitted a CEMP which includes ecological mitigation measures during construction and this is normally controlled through a CEMP on the outline consent. Whilst the applicant is keen to carry out the development in a way that minimises ecological impacts, it is noted that the CEMP on the outline (condition 4) does not include ecological mitigation measures. However, as the reserved matters pertains to the detail, it is not appropriate to apply a new CEMP on this reserved matters consent.

It is noted that MEAS wishes to see the following details within the CEMP:

- A pre-commencement protected/priority species check;
- Invasive Species Method Statement for removal of Japanese knotweed, cotoneaster sp. and rhododendron. Note – a validation report demonstrating remediation of Japanese knotweed is requirement prior to works commencing;
- Brown hare RAMs;
- Badger / hedgehog RAMs;
- Amphibian RAMs;
- A sensitive lighting scheme avoiding light spill on retained and proposed habitats;
- Protection and pollution control measures for Lickers Lane Woodland LWS and other retained woodland areas on site. This should include avoidance and protection measures for construction of the proposed footpath through the LWS; and
- Avoidance of the breeding bird season (1 March to 31 August). Where this is not possible a breeding bird check will be required

This is recommended to be included as an informative as a CEMP condition should not be included on REM applications. However, the protection and pollution control measures for the Lickers Lane Woodland LWS during construction of the footpath can be required by the separate planning condition relating to the footpath details.

MEAS has recommended that a condition is imposed to secure the removal of Japanese Knotweed identified within the site; MEAS have recommended the submission of a method statement and validation report to deal with this invasive species. However, the LPA recommends that this is included as an

informative on the decision notice, as the removal of invasive species is required by other legislation and is not something that should be secured through planning as there should not be duplication of legislative processes. The applicant will be made aware of their obligations in this regard.

A HRA and assessment of impact to designated sites (including the LWS network) was undertaken by the applicant as part of the outline application. This impact assessment remains valid and as stated above the mitigation measures agreed at outline stage should be included and implemented through the WMP and HMP. Further, the 'wildlife information park' for new residents (condition 15 attached to the outline approval) also remains applicable to this REM application. MEAS has also confirmed their agreement with the ecological surveys. The three tests do not need to be carried out.

Various conditions on the outline also ensure that the REM application includes appropriate consideration of ecological impacts and these conditions are discussed within the conditions section of the report. These are intrinsically linked with this REM application and so regard is given to the fact that MEAS has confirmed all details relating to these conditions are acceptable.

Subject to the above conditions and having regard to the conditions on the outline permission that relate to this part of the development, it is considered that the proposal complies with policy CS8 of the Local Plan Core Strategy, the Halsnead Masterplan SPD and the NPPF. The proposal is also not considered to result in adverse impacts on the LWS.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policies CS2 and CS24 of the Local Plan Core Strategy combine to ensure that development will not cause an unacceptable risk of flooding and that surface water is drained in a safe and sustainable manner. Policy SUE 2 and SUE2c also set out that proposals should demonstrate a comprehensive approach to infrastructure provision and that having adequate drainage in place is key in achieving this.

The applicant has submitted a series of drainage strategy documents and a drainage strategy masterplan with their application. The LLFA and UU have not raised any objections to the proposal and detailed drainage design is dealt with under condition 5 of the outline. The proposed development site lies in flood zone 1 and the layout incorporates a series of SUDs basins/attenuation and bio-retention in the highway verges across the site. Surface water drainage will be a piped system that connects to a public surface water sewer that runs through the site. It is noted that the landscape architect has raised concerns about how surface water will get to Big Water and this was raised with the LLFA. The LLFA have stated that they are satisfied with the drainage strategy submitted. Regard has been given to land ownership in this context. Foul drainage will require a pumped outfall and will be offered to UU for adoption.

The proposal will not lead to increased flood risk on site or elsewhere with discharge rates restricted to greenfield runoff rates. It is therefore considered

that the surface water drainage proposals for the site are acceptable in principle and comply with Policies CS2 and CS24 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Impact on Heritage Assets

Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Local Plan Core Strategy, chapter 12 of the NPPF and Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2 (Historic England: 2015) all seek to preserve or enhance the Borough's historic and architectural assets and any archaeological remains. This includes both designated and non-designated heritage assets. Policies CS19 and CS20 of the Local Plan Core Strategy seek to ensure new development complements and enhances features of historic interest, preserves local distinctiveness and character through sensitive design as well as ensuring new development includes appropriate integration with the setting and immediate landscape.

Section 66(i) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to show special regard to the desirability of preserving and enhancing listed buildings and their settings, in exercising their planning functions. Considerable importance and weight should be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings.

The NPPF also provides guidance on the approach that should be taken in considering the impacts against the level of harm (if any) that has been identified to listed buildings and their settings. Paragraph 205 is of particular importance and in summary states that in considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset the greater the weight should be, irrespective of the scale of the potential harm. Paragraph 206 further requires that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, including that arising from development within its setting should require clear and convincing justification.

Irrespective of the level of harm, decision makers should give "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise.

There are a number of grade II listed buildings within the vicinity of the site: Carr House Farmhouse and the paddocks and the stables associated with Carr House; Gate Piers beside North East Lodge; North East Lodge; Sandfield House; Church of St Nicholas, Old Halsnead; and Snape Gate Barn. There are also non designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the site including: a Barn at Fairchild's Farm; a non-designated war memorial to the west of the site; Halsnead Park Wall abutting the site, Halsnead Park which includes features of importance including main drive, built remnant of Princes House Farm, Site of Halsnead Hall, walled garden and outbuilding; woodland clumps and belts, ponds and streams, a designed landscape and associated views, and the estate wall.

The proposed development is required to have special regard to preserving the character of the listed buildings and their settings. The applicant has submitted an Updated Heritage Impact Assessment Report which considers the impact of the development on the designated and non-designated heritage assets within the vicinity of the site (as listed). In particular, this report assesses the significance of the assets and an impact assessment. The LPA concurs with impact assessment and the conclusion of the update HIA report.

The 2020 Impact Assessment submitted with the outline consent assessed heritage assets which were considered to be potentially affected by the development. The assessment identified 4 designated heritage assets as sensitive receptors: Church of St Nicholas, Sandfield Cottage, North East Lodge and the gate piers by NE Lodge. All four of these assets are of medium importance /value and moderate sensitivity with the level of potential impact to the significance of the assets ranging from negligible to minor adverse significance.

Overall, 8 non-designated heritage assts were identified as being potentially sensitive receptors to the proposed development. These were mainly related to the Halsnead Park estate and included: the historic routes through the landscape and in particular Main Drive; the remnants of Cock Glades; the former lodge, gate piers and flanking walls at the Windy Arbor Road/Main Drive junction; the Trout pond by Main Drive; the pond to the east of the caravan park; the historic remnants of Prince's House complex; the stone park wall; the historic tree belts and clumps along Lickers Lane; and the Site of ruin noted on 1850OS maps.

All 8 of these assets were considers to be low importance/value and of low sensitivity, but cumulatively the value of the surviving features of the estate were moderate sensitivity. The level of potential impact to the significance of the assets from the development proposed was concluded to be minor adverse. The harm identified relates to the suburbanisation of Halsnead Park as a result of the development and the impacts this will have on the assets, based on the evidential, historic and communal value of these assets. Retention of the wooded area does soften this impact.

The Updated HIA considers there are no additional impacts to the significance of the designated heritage assets as a consequence of the detailed design. As such, the previous conclusion which identified minor /slight adverse impacts to the significance of the two listed assets associated with Halsnead Park, NE Lodge and the gate piers at NE Lodge, remain valid. The scheme results in negligible impact to the significance of Sandfield House at detailed design stage. Again, this aligns with the 2020 assessment and no impact upon heritage significance was identified for the other designated heritage assets associated in the vicinity and around Halsnead Park.

The harm identified above to NE Lodge and the Gate Piers relates to the suburbanisation of Halsnead Park as a result of the proposal given the significance of the Lodge and gate piers derives from their parkland setting, the historic function and the formal entrance and relationship to the parkland. This

setting and visual relationship with the parkland contributes to its associated historic and architectural interest.

The Updated HIA concluded that the impacts would equate to less than substantial harm to heritage significance. In accordance with the NPPF, paragraph 208, the less than substantial harm identified should be weighed against the public benefits associated with the proposal. It is noted that the fact that this reserved matters application excludes the land parcel adjacent to Windy Arbor Road and as such, reducing the impact to the significance of St Nicholas Church.

The impact of the proposal on the non-designated heritage assets, which were identified as having low significance, is considered to result in a neutral to slight significance of impact. Whilst Halsnead Park is classed as of medium significance, the proposed reserved matters development would only result in minor adverse significance of impact. In accordance with the NPPF, paragraph 209, the decision maker must take a balanced judgment having regard to the scale of any harm or loss of significance, as well as having regard to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. Harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset is identified as being minor. When considering the significance of the non-designated heritage assets which are identified as low anyway, except for the moderate significance of Halsnead Park. Overall, therefore, this impact is given minor weight.

The reserved matters application site is a reasonable distance from the designated heritage assets and there is a degree of separation including vegetation and planting. It is considered that the allocation itself accepted some level of harm of the significance of heritage assets by the very nature of allowing development of the Halsnead park estate. The less than substantial harm identified is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits associated with the scheme. These public benefits include the development of an allocated site, affordable housing provision and the additional greenspace and woodland access associated with the development. The proposal will also contribute towards delivery of the tier 1 open space which will also have wider public benefits including associated health and wellbeing benefits to the local community. In terms of the impacts on the non-designated heritage assets, on balance these are outweighed by the significant weight given to the development of this allocated site for affordable housing and the associated provision of wider infrastructure including the Big Water tier 1 infrastructure, to which this scheme will contribute.

Policy CS20 of the Local Plan Core Strategy requires developments to preserve or enhance the Borough's historic assets and archaeological remains. MEAS has confirmed that the Archaeology and Heritage Desk Based Assessment and the Geophysical Survey Report previously submitted do not require updating for the reserved matters application. However, archaeological investigation (advised as a result of the previous survey findings) has not been undertaken in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation for the phase 2 works.

These matters are required by the archaeology condition included on the hybrid planning application and as such no further condition is advised and the proposed is considered to comply with policy CS20 of the Local Plan Core Strategy,

The proposal is considered to comply with policies CS19 and CS20 of the Core Strategy Local Plan and the provisions within the NPPF. Public benefits have been demonstrated to outweigh the identified harm to the designated heritage assets and the identified harm to the non-designated heritage assets are also considered to be outweighed. The requirement of S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to “...*have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*” has been fully considered in coming to this view.

Archaeology

There are no heritage assets recorded on the Merseyside Historic Environment Record within the proposed development site. The site is however crossed by the Township boundary between Lunt & Sefton which also forms the southern boundary of the site. The Township boundary between Lunt & Thornton forms the western boundary of the site. The south-western corner of the site (the junction of Lydiate Lane & Rakes Lane) forms the junction of the three boundaries. These features were subject to a programme of archaeological works by Allen Archaeology (2022).

As such, MEAS has advised that archaeology does not need to be considered further for this application and the proposal complies with policy CS20 of the Local Plan Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Sustainable and Low Carbon Development

Policy CS22 of the Local Plan Core Strategy seeks to promote sustainable and low carbon development. Inclusion of sustainable energy is also in line with the Halsnead Masterplan SPD. The applicant has submitted an electric vehicle charging point layout plan which makes provision for wall-mounted electric vehicle charging points to be provided for each dwelling. The outline application required details of the EVCPs and will secure delivery. No additional condition on the reserved matters application is required. The proposal is considered to comply with policy CS22 of the Local Plan Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Coal Authority

The Coal Authority has raised no objection to the amended proposal which removed plots within the south part of the site due to the existence of cabling which prevented investigatory/grouting works within a small section of the site. Previously the CA had raised concerns that the mitigation works were not secured by condition.

The applicant has undertaken various investigations and submitted drill and grout reports in support of their application and to ascertain what mitigation and grouting works are required. As such, it is recommended that a condition is imposed to secure the carrying out of these mitigation works in the interests of delivering a safe and stable development. Subject to the imposition of this condition, the proposal is considered to comply with policy CS2 of the Local Plan Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Other issues

Environmental Health requested conditions relating to contaminated land, noise, submission of a construction management plan and a construction hours restriction condition. These details are covered by the outline consent and are not necessary to repeat on the reserved matters decision notice. Sufficient control over these matters is therefore dealt with by the outline consent.

It is noted that Fusion 21 have asked for a social value contribution. This is being delivered via s106 in connection with the outline consent.

The applicant has submitted sufficient information to comply with Policy WM9 of the Waste Local Plan.

Conditions

Condition 6 (Habitat Management Plan)

MEAS has confirmed that the WMP is acceptable. MEAS has asked for evidence that the mitigation set out in the HMP has been undertaken. Given the condition does not specify the submission of evidence, this is not something that is considered to be enforceable. These details can be discharged in so far as they relate to this reserved matters application.

Condition 28 (Levels)

Full levels and retaining structure details have been submitted. The LHA has confirmed that these details are acceptable and this condition can be discharged, in so far as it relates to this reserved matters application.

Condition 29 (Updated Heritage Impact Assessment)

The Information submitted is sufficient to discharge this condition in so far as it relates to this reserved matters.

Condition 30 (Woodland Management Plan)

The applicant has submitted a Woodland Management Plan v.4 and this information is considered sufficient to discharge this condition in so far as it relates to this reserved matters application.

Condition 31 (Arboricultural Impact Assessment)

The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment v.2. The information is considered acceptable. However, a timetable for implementation

is required to discharge this condition in so far as it relates to this reserved matters application.

Condition 32 (Bat roost assessment/GCN report)

The applicant has submitted the following: Bat Emergence Report; Extended Phase One Habitat Survey; GCN/Amphibian Appraisal and Habitat Enhancement Measures Strategy; Bat Roost Assessment.

The applicant has submitted potential roost feature inspection surveys. However, this survey work does not relate to Lickers Lane Woodland or Sandfield Park Woodland as these woodlands are predominantly retained. A smaller woodland was assessed and considered to have negligible potential for roosting bats due to the young age of the trees and lack of potential roost features. A sycamore (T1) was found to contain 7 PRFs and these were inspected. No signs of bat roost activity were found. No other PRFs were found within trees. This condition can be discharged, in so far as it relates to this reserved matters, on the basis that a further condition is being included on the REM application to secure details relating to the woodland footpath through Lickers Lane Woods and subject to another condition on the REM requiring a pre-start check of T1 prior to any felling.

Condition 33 (Environmental Statement)

The applicant has submitted an Environmental Statement Phase 1 Habitat Survey. This requires a timetable for implementation for any mitigation. However, the detail is considered acceptable in so far as it relates to this reserved matters.

Condition 34 (Updated Noise Assessment)

The applicant has submitted an Updated Noise Assessment. This is satisfactory. However, a timetable for implementation is required to fully discharge this condition.

Condition 36 (tree planting)

This information has been submitted. Whilst a timetable for planting is required, this has been included on the REM for all soft landscaping so the LPA is happy to discharge this condition in so far as it relates to the REM consent.

Condition 37 (Servicing Plans/Active Travel)

An Active Travel and Movement Strategy has been submitted with the application. The LHA has confirmed that this is acceptable, in so far as it relates to this reserved matters. However, a timetable for implementation is required for full discharge in relation to this REM application.

Conclusion

The development plan is the starting point for decision making where applications that accord with the up-to-date development plan should be approved without delay. The relevant policies within the Local Plan Core Strategy and the UDP are considered to be consistent with the NPPF and as such, they attract full weight as development plan policies. The application

can be determined using the 'flat balance'.

Where there is conflict with the development plan, the application should be refused unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise. As identified in the above report there is some minor conflict with policy CS17 of the Local Plan Core Strategy as the proposal does not entirely align with housing needs due to the large proportion of 3 bed properties within the layout and due to no wet rooms being included in the one bed/2-bed dwellings. This conflict is given only minor weight, especially as the scheme does still include some 1, 2 and 4-bed units and there are no policy targets for a specific dwelling mix. If this were a market scheme, there would be a requirement for the provision of 60 AH units in line with policy CS15 of the Local Plan Core Strategy, so the number of 1, 2 and 4 bed dwellings would allow some level of provision that could be capable of aligning with policy CS17. The 106 allows for either 100% AH or a 25/75% AH to market housing scheme but it is likely to be 100% affordable. The scheme includes a small number of 1 bed units with internal floorspace slightly below space standards. The non-compliance with space standards is given very minor weight. The housing mix and its slight conflict with policy CS17 of the Local Plan Core Strategy is given minor weight. Overall, the conflict with policy CS17 is given minor weight against the proposal in the planning balance.

However, the development will provide affordable dwellings and will facilitate the bringing forward of this allocated site. This is given significant weight. The proposal will also contribute towards delivery of the tier 1 green infrastructure which will benefit the local community and facilitate access to greenspace which will have health and well being benefits for the wider community. This is given significant weight.

This application seeks approval of the reserved matters: layout, landscaping, access to adjacent land, scale and appearance. The proposal is considered to broadly comply with the Masterplan SPD. Whilst the village green does not present a 'set piece' of community greenspace, the village green does still offer an opportunity for well designed community greenspace and the wider verge adjacent to Main Drive towards the central node, facilitates green views through the development. Regard is also given to the extensive number of mine shafts across the site which has acted as a constraint to the layout.

The proposal incorporates elevated design in terms of the proposed house types, greenspace/nodal points and the layout. The scheme includes good connectivity, excellent cycle path links, good legibility, an interesting materials palette and facilitates comprehensive development.

Having regard to the above minor policy conflict, it is considered that there are material considerations that outweigh the identified minor conflict with the policies in the development plan. The proposal will in particular contribute towards meeting Knowsley's housing requirements and contribute towards the delivery of a set piece of green infrastructure at the heart of Halsnead Garden Village. Significant weight is given to these considerations and to the economic and social benefits associated with the scheme which outweigh the

conflict identified.

The environmental impacts including tree impacts, highway safety impacts, ecology impacts, accessibility, residential amenity, noise impacts and drainage can all be appropriately mitigated, where necessary, with planning conditions. These weigh neutral in the planning balance.

On balance, the proposed development is considered to comply with the development plan as a whole and is recommended for approval subject to the conditions listed below.

Recommendation

Approve subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

SCHEDULE 1

Plan Title	Plan Reference	Date Received
Site Layout	MR-M-DWG-03 REV SS	16.01.24
Landscape GA Plan Sheet 00	RG-L-00 REV G	23.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 01	RG-L-01 REV G	23.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 02	RG-L-02 REV G	23.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 03	RG-L-03 REV G	23.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 04	RG-L-04 REV F	16.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 05	RG-L-05 REV F	16.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 06	RG-L-06 REV F	16.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 07	RG-L-07 REV F	16.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 08	RG-L-08 REV F	16.01.24
Landscape Proposals GA Sheet 09	RG-L-09 REV F	24.01.24
Landscape Proposals Schedules Sheet 02	RG-L-02-02 REV E	23.01.24
Phasing	MR-M-DWG-11 REV I	16.01.24
Active Travel and Movement Strategy	MR-M-DWG-12 REV F	16.01.24
Refuse Collection Strategy	MR-M-DWG-08 REV F	16.01.24
Electric Vehicle Charging Provision	MR-M-DWG-06 REV G	16.01.24
Parking Strategy	MR-M-DWG-04 REV F	16.01.24
Lickers Lane Gateway Entrance Wall Detail	RG-L-03 REV D	16.01.24

House Type E (i) DETACHED (3B5P)	A-P19-016 REV P2	18.12.23
House Type W End (2B) Cottage Flat	A-P19-012 REV P3	18.12.23
House Type G DETACHED (3B6P)	A-P19-009 REV P3	18.12.23
House Type F End (4B7P)	A-P19-008 REV P3	18.12.23
House Type F Mid (4B7P)	A-P19-015 REV P1	12.09.23
House Type E DETACHED (3B5P)	A-P19-007 REV P3	18.12.23
House Type D End (3B5P)	A-P19-006 REV P3	18.12.23
House Type C End (3B5P)	A-P19-005 REV P3	18.12.23
House Type A Mid (2B4P)	A-P19-002 REV P2	12.09.23
House Type A End (2B4P)	A-P19-001 REV P3	18.12.23
House Type B End (2B3P)	A-P19-004 REV P2	19.09.23
House Type B Mid (2B3P)	A-P19-003 REV P2	12.09.23
Landscape Proposals Typical Details Sheet 03	RG-L-02-03 REV C	12.09.23
Landscape Proposals Typical Details Sheet 05	RG-L-02-05 REV C	12.09.23
Landscape Proposals Typical Details Sheet 04 (excluding litter bin)	RG-L-02-04 REV C	12.09.23
Landscape Proposals Specification Sheet 01	RG-L-02-01 REV C	12.09.23
Site Location Plan	DWG01	12.09.23
Finished Levels and Retaining Walls Sheet 1	HGV-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1401 REV P09	16.01.24
Finished Levels and Retaining Walls Sheet 2	HGV-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1402 REV P09	16.01.24
Finished Levels and Retaining Walls Sheet 3	HGV-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1403 REV P09	16.01.24
Finished Levels and Retaining Walls Sheet 4	HGV-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1404 REV P09	16.01.24

2. Notwithstanding the details on the submitted house type drawings, specifications and, where requested by the Local Planning Authority, samples of the materials proposed to be used in the external elevations of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing prior to any construction works above damp-proof course level, based on plan reference MR-M-DWG-13 Rev F 'Material Strategy'. For the avoidance of doubt, the material details and, where requested by the Local Planning Authority, samples shall include bricks, roof tiles, stone lintel colour, use of rough cast render and a colour specification for the render, and door colours. The dwellings shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a high standard of design is delivered.

3. Notwithstanding the detail shown on the Landscape Proposals, full details of the planting treatment to the western boundary of the public open space area (which, for the avoidance of doubt, includes the pumping station) shall be submitted to and approved in writing prior to occupation of the 50th dwelling. The details shall include a timetable for implementation and shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To promote comprehensive development.

4. The scheme of remedial investigation and works described in the reports listed below shall be undertaken in accordance with a timetable to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development of the works:

Mine Workings and Mine Shaft Treatment Report (report number 002 v2.0) dated 7th November 2023 by Wardell Armstrong;

Ground Investigation Report (report number RPT-003 V1) dated August 2023 by Wardell Armstrong

The works shall be completed in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a safe and stable development. The undertaking of intrusive site investigations, in accordance with the agreed timetable which should be agreed prior to commencement of development, is considered to be necessary to ensure that adequate information pertaining to ground conditions and coal mining legacy is available to enable appropriate remedial and mitigatory measures to be identified and carried out before building works commence on site. This is in order to ensure the safety and stability of the development, in accordance with paragraphs 189 to 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Prior to the commencement of any part of the woodland path through Lickers Lane Woods, full details of the siting of the path, path construction details to include depth of excavation, surfacing and edging and avoidance and protection measures during the construction of the footpath to protect the Local Wildlife Site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. To accompany the woodland path siting details, an ecological survey of the woodland (to include a Preliminary Roost Assessment) an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement setting out any trees requiring removal and root protection methodology, and any ecological mitigation measures relating to the route of the path, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to works commencing on the woodland path. The footpath shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved details and in

accordance with a timetable for implementation that has been previously submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of protecting trees, the LWS and habitat, to promote biodiversity and in the interests of visual amenity. NOTE: It is recommended that the footpath follows informal routes to minimise impacts on ground flora and trees.

6. A pre-start check of T1 (as identified within the Tree Survey and Indicative Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Tree Solutions Ltd, reference 20/AIA/KNOWSLEY/21) shall be carried out prior to its felling, and this should be carried out in full, under licenced bat ecologist supervision.

Reason: To promote biodiversity and to ensure protected species are not present.

7. Notwithstanding the bollards and knee rail fence shown on the approved drawings, full siting and elevation details of the knee rail timber fence adjacent to plot 104 (shown on landscape drawing number RG-L-05 Rev F) and the bollards to prevent vehicular access to the verge west of plot 104 and the footpath running to the front of plots 99-104 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their installation. The bollards and the knee rail fence shall be provided prior to first occupation of any of the plots numbered 99-104. For the avoidance of doubt no part of this fence shall be higher than 0.6m. The knee rail fence and the bollards shall then be erected in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of plots 99-104.

The boundary treatment adjacent to the parking courts shall be erected in accordance with the siting details shown on Site Layout plan drawing no. MR-M-DWG-03 REV SS. Full elevation details of the trellis and wall arrangement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their installations. The trellis and wall boundary treatment shall then be erected prior to first occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and in accordance with the approved details.

The boundary treatments and retaining structures, other than the knee rail fence and the boundary treatments adjacent to the parking court areas referred to above, shown on the Landscape Proposals Sheets 01-09 (identified within the approved plans list in condition 1) and shown on the Finished Levels and Retaining Walls Sheets 1-4 (identified on the approved plans list in condition 1) shall be erected in accordance with the approved details for each plot, prior to that plot being occupied. The 1.8m high fencing hereby permitted shall be closed boarded timber and shall be stained in a brown colour.

Prior to the construction of the entrance wall, shown on the plan entitled Lickers Lane Gateway Entrance Wall Detail (drawing no. RG-L-03 REV D), details and samples of the sandstone and coping/capping stones proposed to be used for the wall and piers, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, the wall shall be pointed using a lime based neutral coloured mortar and shall incorporate recessed joints. The entrance wall feature shown on the Lickers Lane Gateway Entrance Wall Detail plan reference RG-L-03 Rev D, shall be constructed in accordance with the approved samples and shall be completed prior to first occupation of any dwelling within the site.

The boundary treatment walls and the masonry retaining walls within the site shall be constructed in materials that match the dwelling to which it relates unless alternative wall materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their erection. The boundary treatment walls and masonry retaining walls shall then be erected in accordance with the approved details. The gabion baskets shall consist of a dark coloured metal frame and filled with sandstone, unless such alternative materials are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the use of any gabion baskets. The Cheshire Estate railing and gates shall be painted black.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to deliver an enhanced scheme incorporating high quality design.

8. Notwithstanding the approved plans, full details of the play equipment proposed within all the greenspace areas, including a timetable for implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted. The play equipment shall then be erected in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure appropriately designed play equipment is included in the development.

9. Notwithstanding the approved plans, full details of the village green to include the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted:

1. Play equipment details and materials/external finish;
2. Surfacing of the footpath and any areas of hard landscaping within the play area;
3. Levels details of the village green;
4. Boundary treatments within the play area
5. Community notice board(s);
6. SUDS design including a profile of the SUD pond and materials;

7. Landscaping details within the village green area including SUD pond planting;
8. Cycle parking;
9. Timetable for implementation;

The village green shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to aid legibility and to offer high quality well designed focal green space.

10. Prior to construction above damp-proof course level, full details of the bins and wayfinding signage proposed to be included in the development hereby permitted, or phase of development as previously agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, together with a timetable for implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt, these details shall have regard to the Design and Distinctiveness Guide.

A timetable for implementation of all soft landscaping (as set out in the landscape proposals in the plans listed in Condition 1 of this permission) across the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping shall then be undertaken in accordance with the approved timetable.

Reason: To ensure access to greenspace and landscaped areas is incorporated into the development and in the interests of visual amenity.

11. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes 1 A, E (where it applies to point (i) below, and F and Part 2A, or any amendments made to that Order, shall not apply to all dwellings for the following works:

- (i) No garages carports or side extensions shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwellings where those garages or car ports or side extensions utilise an approved parking space for that dwelling as shown on the approved layout plan;
- (iv) No hard standing space shall be constructed within the curtilage forwards of the principal front elevation of the dwellings hereby permitted;
- (v) No gates, walls, fences or other means of enclosure shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwellings forwards of the principal front elevations and between the elevation of any dwelling which lies adjacent to a highway, carriageway or footpath.

The above applies other than those expressly authorised by this permission, or pursuant to a condition, unless an application to the Local Planning Authority for planning permission for such has been granted.

Reason: The specific circumstances of the site warrant the Local Planning Authority to retain control over any further development in the interests of highway safety; to ensure a satisfactory development of the site in the interests of protecting the amenity of occupiers; visual amenity and to safeguard the character of the development.

12. Notwithstanding the submitted plans no part of the development, or phase of development as previously agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be occupied until exact scheme detail pertaining to the highlighted cycle storage for the flats and houses (as shown on Site Layout Drawing Number MR-M-DWG-03 REV SS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, these scheme details shall include elevations and siting and will need to be covered and secure. For the avoidance of doubt, providing cycle storage outside the physical boundaries of a property or garden will not be accepted. The cycle parking for each dwelling or flat shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation.

Reason: To promote sustainable transport modes.

13. Any boundary treatment or planting/hedges for plot 55 which fall within the visibility splay (2.4m x 25m) for the adjacent junction to the south shall be limited to a height of no more than 0.6m to ensure suitable visibility is maintained. The visibility splay in this location shall be kept free from any objects or structures.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

14. The dwellings, or phase of development as previously agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall not be occupied until the areas indicated on Site Plan Drawing Number MR-M-DWG-03 REV SS, set aside for parking, servicing, vehicular manoeuvring (including provision for pedestrians/cyclists) relating to that dwelling, have been surfaced, drained and permanently marked out or demarcated in accordance with the approved details. These areas shall then be retained for parking, servicing and vehicular manoeuvring thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

15. Prior to the construction of the SUDs ponds, section drawings through each SUD pond shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The SUD ponds shall then be constructed in

accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the timetable approved under condition 10.

Reason: In the interests of delivering effective drainage ponds that incorporate the design aspirations of the Design and Distinctiveness Guide and in the interests of visual amenity and safety.

**Signed Case
Officer²:**

C Appleyard

**Signed Authorising
Officer³:**

K Foster

Date:

26 January 2024

Informatives

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments received from UU, Active Travel England, MEAS and Merseyside Fire Authority.
- 3 Reasons for Granting Planning permission

The decision to grant this reserved matters consent has also been taken having regard to the policies and proposals set out below and to all materials planning considerations, including supplementary planning guidance:

Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, 2006)

T5 – Location of Major Traffic Generating New Development
T7 – New Development and Walking & Cycling Routes
T8 – Transport Assessments
T9 – Travel Plans
DQ2 – Security in the Built Environment
DQ4 – Trees and Development

² I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

³ I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

ENV2 – Noise and Vibration
ENV3 – Light and Pollution
ENV5 – Contaminated Land

Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy (2016)

SD1- Sustainable development
CS1 – Spatial Strategy for Knowsley
CS2 - Development Principles
CS3 – Housing Supply, Delivery and Distribution
CS7 – Transport Networks
CS8 – Green Infrastructure
SUE1 – Sustainable Urban Extensions and Safeguarded Land
SUE2 – Sustainable Urban Extensions – Development Principles
SUE2c – Sustainable Urban Extensions – South of Whiston and Land South of M62
CS15 – Delivering Affordable Housing
CS17 – Housing Sizes and Design Standards
CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development
CS20 – Managing the Borough's Historic Environment
CS21 – Greenspaces and Trees
CS24 - Managing Flood Risk
CS26 – Waste Management
CS27 – Planning for and Paying for New Infrastructure

Supplementary Planning Documents

Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010)
Design Quality in New Development SPD (2016)
New Residential Development SPD
Trees and Development SPD (2016)
Halsnead Garden Village Masterplan SPD

Merseyside Waste Local Plan (2013)

WM8 – Waste Prevention and Resource Management
WM9 – Sustainable Waste Management Design and Layout for New Development

This informative is only intended as a summary of the reasons for granting reserved matters consent. Should you require any further details relating to the decision, please contact Kevin Foster on 0151 443 2893.