

Dear Jo,

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

PLANNING REFERENCE 25/00672/FUL

In response to the comments received from Helen Bradshawe on behalf of Environmental Health & Consumer Protection, dated 2nd March 2026, in relation to the application above, please find our responses below with any relevant information or updated documents attached.

Comments and/or Queries

Contaminated Land

Please see attached the following document(s):

- 17-500-R1-2 - Glen Dimplex, Prescott - Phase I and II GSA Residential Development - June 24 - FINAL

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

The majority of the site could not be assessed as the site was still operational at the time of the Phase I & II Site assessment (2024), the potential contamination under the large building complex is completely unknown. An area of significant chlorinated solvent contamination has been identified south of the building with groundwater concentrations suggesting DNAPL may be present (under a sandstone aquifer, zone 3 SPZ). Wells were installed around the periphery of the site and worryingly VOC/SVOC have been recorded in the east, west and south of the site (albeit in lower concentrations), suggesting a large significant migrating source. There is a school to the south and residential properties on the western boundary with the risk of off-site migration being a concern as well as a potential risk to future occupiers.

Consultation with the Environment Agency is required in relation to the DNAPL within the groundwater.

*Appendices IV to IIIIX of the below report are missing, including logs and laboratory certificates. Please provide the information to ensure we are able to conduct a detailed review.

Phase I & II Geoenvironmental Site Assessment, e3p, Reference:17-500-R1-2, Dated June 24.

The investigative report recommended the following further investigations; however comments in relation to the report are to be forward separately on receipt of the appendices.

- Further intrusive ground investigation, including delineation of VOC impacted soils and groundwater and determination of any potential PFAS/PFOA, Explosive Compounds and Propellant contamination.
- Further intrusive ground investigation of inaccessible areas (main factory structure and outbuildings);
- Human Health Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) of VOC impacted soils (subject to findings of further phases of intrusive ground investigation);
- Controlled Waters DQRA of VOC DNAPL plume.
- Plot-specific foundation schedule (upon receipt of the final development levels);
- Geotechnical Design Report (GDR), including settlement analysis.
- Geotechnical Earthworks Specification (infrastructure);
- Remediation and enabling works strategy; and
- Specification for Mitigation of Hazardous Ground Gases & Verification Plan.

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

Noise

Please see attached the following document(s):

- P25-360-F02 - Glen Dimplex, Noise Contour Plots
- P25-340 - Calculation Sheets

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

1. Please provide contour maps for day and nighttime sound levels within the gardens and proposed properties with and without mitigation.

The attached Noise Contour Plans include the following:

- *Ground floor (1.5 m) external noise contours for the daytime and night-time periods, with and without the proposed mitigation; and*
- *First floor external noise contours (4.5 m) with the proposed mitigation in place.*

For clarity, the modelling presents external free-field noise levels only. At first floor level the influence of the proposed acoustic barriers is negligible, and therefore barrier and no-barrier scenarios are effectively the same at 4.5 m height. On this basis, separate first floor "without

mitigation” contours have not been provided, as they would not differ materially from the “with mitigation” results.

2. Please provide the assessment details for the open window assessment and confirm the sound levels within the bedrooms / living rooms for the development.

Our acoustician, at Hepworth Acoustics, has confirmed they’re not entirely clear what is meant by an “open window assessment” in this context, as the report does not propose (or rely upon) compliance with internal noise criteria with windows open.

However, as set out in Section 2.16, the internal noise criteria have been adopted based on windows closed, with alternative means of ventilation provided (for example trickle ventilators and/or background ventilation to meet Building Regulations ventilation requirements).

Accordingly, the report’s internal assessment is based on achieving the relevant internal sound level criteria with windows closed. Attached are the calculation sheets underpinning the proposed mitigation/facade specification (including the assumed external levels and the resulting internal levels for bedrooms and living rooms) for the representative worst-case facades/plots.

3. The mitigation in figure 2 details acoustic barriers to be positioned near to the entrance of the hospital car park, however the noise levels within this area are not discussed within the report.

The mitigation shown on Figure 2 in the Acoustic Report (acoustic barriers/fencing in the vicinity of the hospital car park access) is proposed to control road traffic noise from Stoney Lane within the external amenity areas, rather than to mitigate noise generated within the hospital car park itself. The noise modelling indicates that, without the recommended mitigation, the most exposed gardens would be approximately 1 dB above the upper guideline value of 55 dB L_{Aeq} for external amenity areas. With the recommended 2.0 m high acoustic fence, noise levels within the most exposed gardens are reduced by approximately 7–8 dB, resulting in levels that are below the desirable guideline value of 50 dB L_{Aeq} .

For completeness, even in the unlikely event that traffic flows associated with the hospital access were assumed to be materially higher than the flows elsewhere on Stoney Lane (for example, doubled), this would represent an increase of approximately 3 dB on the contribution from that element of traffic. Given the predicted margin provided by the barrier, the resulting garden levels would still be expected to remain below the upper guideline value of 55 dB L_{Aeq} , and the conclusions of the assessment would not change.

4. There is a car park associated with the learning disabilities centre to the south of the site, was this area assessed?

The car park associated with the learning disabilities centre to the south of the site was not included as a formally modelled noise source within the assessment, as it is not considered likely to be a significant contributor to site noise levels in the context of the existing acoustic environment.

Notwithstanding this, an outline calculations were undertaken to confirm this. A conservative scenario was assumed in which all 25 parking spaces closest to the site boundary are subject to an arrival and a departure within a single one-hour period. This is considered a robust assumption, given it would typically be expected that spaces are occupied for most of the working day, with little activity at weekends.

Based on a receiver location at the centre of Plot 17's garden, the calculated one-hour level from this car park activity is approximately 42 dB $L_{Aeq,1hr}$. This is more than 8 dB below the existing ambient level during the survey periods and approximately 3 dB below the representative daytime background level of 45 dB L_{A90} . On this basis, car park activity is not expected to be a significant source of noise at the proposed dwellings and would not affect the conclusions of the assessment.

5. Within the L_{Amax} figures, was the ambulance sirens accounted for, considering the ambulance station is opposite the proposed development?

Regarding the ambulance station opposite the site, the L_{Amax} values reported are based on the measured survey dataset and represent typical, repeatable peaks within the prevailing acoustic environment during the survey periods. Emergency vehicle sirens were not included as a separate "design case" because they are intermittent and operationally variable, and their use depends on driver judgement and immediate traffic conditions.

In particular, it would not be expected that sirens would be activated as ambulances leave the station as a matter of routine. Sirens are typically only used once a vehicle encounters a situation where an audible warning is necessary (for example at junctions, in traffic, or where other road users need to be alerted), and it would also be expected that siren use is minimised overnight unless required for safety.

Accordingly, while occasional siren events cannot be ruled out, they are not expected to occur with sufficient frequency during the night-time period to materially affect the representative L_{Amax} baseline or the overall conclusions of the assessment. In any case, the proposed dwellings would not be expected to experience greater peak noise exposure associated with the ambulance station than existing residential properties along Stoney Lane.

Construction Management Plan

Please see attached the following document(s):

- CEMP V2
- 22970-BRP-01_Build Route (Rev A)

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

1. Response times to complaints is stated as an acknowledgement in 2 days and a response time of 7 days. In relation to issues of noise and dust please confirm that once the complaint is known to the site that these are addressed immediately to prevent further issues.

A note has been added in Section 4.2.

2. What will the height of stockpiles be on site?

A note has been added to Section 7.4.2 regarding assessment and creation of stockpiles.

3. Section 7.4 details Formby Bypass, typo?

Yes, updated.

4. Ensure that mains power is available at the earliest opportunity where temporary generators are used overnight. In the case that temporary generators need to be used overnight then hybrid generators are the preferred choice so to prevent the potential for noise complaints.

A note has been added in Section 7.5.2.

5. Vehicles used regularly on site, for example forklift trucks / JCB's, must have white noise / broadband reversing alarms fitted.

A note has been added in Section 7.5.2.

6. Ensure that radios are not used unless they are kept to a low level which does not cause annoyance.

A note has been added in Section 7.5.2.

7. If piling is to be carried out further information needed with regards to the type of piling to be done, its duration and any vibration monitoring that will be carried out.

The type of piling to be carried out is Vibro, as detailed in the CEMP. Piling works will be carried out throughout the duration of the works due to ongoing remediation works.

8. Will there be a permanent water supply on site?

Yes, there's an existing potable water supply to site.

9. Cutting or grinding of materials on site shall be done whilst using an effective water suppression system.

A note has been added in Section 7.4.2.

Proposed Conditions

Noise

No part of the development hereby permitted shall commence until a scheme for the protection of the dwellings from noise from the Liverpool / Manchester railway line, and industrial/commercial areas surrounding the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be based on the findings of an approved noise survey or noise modelling procedure. All works which form part of the scheme shall be completed before any of the relevant dwellings are occupied and retained at all times thereafter. Evidence of the agreed measures shall be submitted to the local planning authority prior to occupation of the properties.

The scheme shall ensure that noise exposure within living rooms and bedrooms and gardens does not exceed the relevant standards. Where windows are required to be kept closed to meet the indoor noise levels then an alternative means of ventilation shall be provided. A noise mitigation plan detailing the proposed mitigation on a plot by plot basis is to be submitted.

All works which form part of the scheme shall be implemented in full in accordance with the scheme as agreed prior to first use.

The Noise Report by Hepworth Acoustic (ref: P25-340-R01, Dated: 10.11.25) sets out the requirements and the following plans show the mitigation measures included within the design and the scheme will be constructed in accordance with:

- *Boundary Treatment drawings (for acoustic fencing and screen walls)*
- *The Noise Report drawings (for enhanced glazing specifications and acoustic trickle vent requirements)*
- *Please review the comments above regarding the acoustic queries when referring to the requirements for windows being kept closed and alternative means of ventilation.*

In-line with the information provided, we would like to request to remove the need for this pre-commencement condition.

Fixed Plant Noise

We are happy to accept the wording of the proposed condition below, but note that the noise mitigation measures form part of the CEMP document, therefore is this required?

Fixed plant and machinery associated with the development shall be designed to a level that is at least 5dB(A) below the existing L_{A90} background noise level as measured during the relevant time period. Any tonal, impulsive and/or irregular noise would be addressed by imposing a penalty as per the methodology set out in BS 4142:2014+A1:2019, Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound. Noise limits for fixed plant are to apply at a position 1 metre from the closest affected window of the nearest noise sensitive property.

Contaminated Land

We have no comments and are happy to accept the proposed conditions below, noting upon review of the attached appendices and/or in conjunction with the remediation strategy some of these may be revised, reworded or removed – at such time we will review and confirm acceptance.

A. Risk Assessment

No development shall take place until an assessment of the risks posed by any contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This assessment must be undertaken by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner, in accordance with authoritative guidance (CLR 11), and shall assess any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site.

Moreover, it must include (were relevant):

- (i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
- (ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - human health,
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and
 - service lines and pipes,
 - adjoining land,
 - groundwaters and surface waters,
 - ecological systems,
 - archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

B. Submission of Remediation Scheme

Where land affected by contamination is found which poses unacceptable risks, no development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include an appraisal of remediation options, identification of the preferred option(s), the proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, and a description and programme of the works to be undertaken including the verification plan. As a minimum, the scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to its intended use.

C. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme shall be implemented and a verification report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the development (or relevant phase of development) being brought into use.

D. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported immediately to the Local Planning Authority. Development on the part of the site affected must be halted and a risk

assessment carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where unacceptable risks are found remediation and verification schemes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall be implemented prior to the development (or relevant phase of development) being brought into use.

E. Materials Management Plan

Prior to the reuse of site won materials ('waste' and non-waste) a Materials Management Plan, signed off by a Qualified Person, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The MMP shall demonstrate that any reuse of contaminated materials does not result in increased risk to the environment or human health.

F. Importation of Soil/Material

No soil is to be imported to the site until it has been tested for contamination and assessed for its suitability for the proposed development; a suitable methodology for testing this material should be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to the soils being imported onto site. The methodology should include the sampling frequency, testing schedules, criteria against which the analytical results will be assessed (as determined by the risk assessment) and source material information. The analysis shall then be carried out and evidence submitted to and approved in writing to by the Local Planning Authority.

Construction Management Plan

The wording of the condition below appears generic and doesn't account for the information already provided with the revised CEMP document and Build Route drawing supplied at submission. Please see comments below, ideally, we'd like to remove the need for this pre-commencement condition by supplying and agreeing the information prior to determination.

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority that details the means of mitigation of construction effects. This shall include but not be limited to the following:

1. Methods for the mitigation of noise and vibration from building works, including any piling works, and also from the operation of any temporary power generation or pumping plant which will operate overnight.
2. Methods for dust control and suppression.
3. Details of wheel washing facilities including location and type.
4. The areas for the storage of plant and materials.
5. Location of site compound.
6. Details of relevant pest control measures

All site works shall then proceed only in accordance with the approved management plan unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand with the Local Planning Authority.

All the information requested in this condition has been provided and I've summarised below what has been updated in response:

- *The revised CEMP document provides information relating to Items 1, 2 and 6.*
- *The revised Build Route Plan provides information relating to Items 3, 4 and 5.*

Demolition / Construction Hours

We have no comments and are happy to accept this condition as worded below:

No construction work shall take place outside the hours of 08:00-18:00 hours Monday to Friday, 08:00-13:00 hours Saturday and not at all on Sundays/Public Holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

I trust the information I have submitted in response to the comments received from Environmental Health & Consumer Protection provide the requested clarifications and information.

Your Sincerely,



Brandon Bardsley
Senior Design & Planning Executive

E: brandon.bardsley@taylorwimpey.com

M: 07393 607 569