

## APPENDIX B

### Earlsfield Park Supplementary Planning Document

#### Summary of Consultation

#### Introduction

- This document sets describes the consultation which has informed the preparation of the Earlsfield Park Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), summarises comments received, and explains what changes the Council has made to the SPD in response to these comments.
- The Council is required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 to prepare a consultation statement before adopting an SPD.

**Box 1: Extract from Town and Country (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012<sup>1</sup>**

#### **Public participation**

12. Before a local planning authority adopt a supplementary planning document it must—
- (a) prepare a statement setting out—
- (i) the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
  - (ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
  - (iii) how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document;
- (b) for the purpose of seeking representations under regulation 13, make copies of that statement and the supplementary planning document available in accordance with regulation 35 together with details of—
- (i) the date by which representations must be made (being not less than 4 weeks from the date the local planning authority complies with this paragraph), and
  - (ii) the address to which they must be sent.

- This statement is therefore the Council's response to these requirements, and explains the changes made for the adoption version of the SPD.

#### **Purpose of the SPD**

- The SPD sets out the Council's development, design and infrastructure requirements for the for the Earlsfield Park site, formerly known (and still referred to in Core Strategy policies) as Knowsley Lane Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE). This is to help landowners and developers comply with the Core

---

<sup>1</sup> Full regulations available online at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/made>

Strategy's policy requirements in preparing a masterplan and subsequent planning applications for the site.

- As set out in Core Strategy Policy SUE2, proposals for development will only be granted planning permission where they are consistent with a single detailed Council-approved masterplan for the whole of the Sustainable Urban Extension site.

### **Preparation of the SPD**

- The SPD has been prepared by Knowsley Council's Local Plan team.
- Appendices 1 and 2 set out the consultation responses received and changes made to the SPD as a consequence.

### **Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)**

- The 2012 Regulations do not require a Sustainability Appraisal to be carried out on SPDs. However, under separate regulations, the Council must formally consider (in a "screening document") whether each SPD requires a Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) and/or a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The screening documents conclude that the SPD does not require a full HRA or SEA.
- The screening documents have been made available alongside the draft SPD for public consultation. Comments on these documents will be invited from the statutory nature conservation bodies, including Natural England.

### **Public consultation**

- In accordance with the 2012 Regulations<sup>2</sup>, a previous version of this statement and the screening documents mentioned above were made available alongside the draft SPD for a six week consultation period, which ran from 13 April 2017 until 25 May 2017. Documents were available online (at [www.knowsley.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.knowsley.gov.uk/localplan)), and at Knowsley Council's One Stop Shops and public libraries. The consultation was publicised by e-mails or letters sent to the Council's Local Plan database of contacts (which includes statutory consultees), by letters sent to residents living within 250 metres of the site, as well as by posters displayed in local shops and services and through messages using the Council's news and social media channels.
- A drop-in session was held at Knowsley Lane Primary School on 3 May, and this was publicised at the same time as the consultation period was advertised. Council officers also held a briefing session on 4 April for people living within the SUE boundary and, at the request of Prescot Town Council, attended their meeting on 28 April to explain and answer questions on the draft SPD.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Regulations 12(b), 13(c), 35 and 36

## Next steps

- All comments received have been considered; these, the Council's response, and proposed changes to the SPD appear in Appendix 2 below. The amended SPD is now submitted to the Council's Cabinet for adoption; once adopted it will become part of the borough's planning policy framework and be used to help guide preparation of the SUE masterplan, and when determining planning applications for this site.
- This Consultation Statement will be published alongside the SPD when it is adopted.



## **Appendix 1**

### **People and organisations consulted in preparing the draft SPD ahead of public consultation**

#### **Within Knowsley Council**

- Head of Planning
- Group Manager (Development)
- Development Management Team Manager and officers
- Group Manager (Highways)
- Principal Engineer (Highways Development Control)
- Public Open Spaces Manager
- Performance & Business Intelligence officers (school place need forecasts)

#### **Outside Knowsley Council**

- Utilities providers
- ION Property Developments/Cushman & Wakefield (site developers)

## Appendix 2

### Summary of consultation responses received and changes made to SPD

#### Responses to pre-consultation draft SPD

This section briefly describes changes made before the formal public consultation period, and which therefore informed the draft SPD which was published for consultation.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Impact on draft SPD
Group Manager (Highways); Principal Engineer (Highways Development Control) (KMBC)	Advice provided on vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist access to SUE site; indicative junction requirements.	Draft SPD incorporated requirements in line with advice.
Utilities and infrastructure providers	Advice provided on capacity of energy, communications and water/sewerage networks.	Draft SPD included responses for information as Appendix.
Public Open Spaces Manager (KMBC)	Guidance provided on public open space requirements, potential scope of improvements to existing open spaces.	Draft SPD requirements reflect advice received.
ION Property Developments/Cushman & Wakefield	Pre-consultation draft SPD used to begin preparation of masterplan and development proposals.	No changes.

## Responses to consultation draft SPD (public consultation period)

This section summarises the comments made during the formal public consultation, sets out a brief response on behalf of the Council, and any change proposed to the SPD as a result of the comments.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
Resident MB	Building on Green Belt should be a last resort.	Site no longer in Green Belt since adoption of Local Plan Core Strategy in January 2016.	None
Canal & River Trust	No comments.	None.	None.
Resident KD	<p>Oppose plans to build on green spaces, used daily for outdoor activities such as walking .running and dog walking. What about impact on wildlife?</p> <p>Huyton is a deprived area and people need green spaces to escape the pressures of life - once destroyed they cannot be replaced.</p>	<p>Draft SPD includes requirements to provide and/or enhance public open spaces as part of development of the site. Land preferred for housing and development is privately owned and not publicly accessible. SPD Box KL2 requires the masterplan to be accompanied by a technical report identifying ecological constraints, potential impacts, and proposed mitigation measures; Box KL6 sets out requirements for open spaces, and Box KL11 sets out requirements for the retention and enhancement of wildlife habitats within the development.</p> <p>Attracting high-quality employment uses and creating jobs will help to tackle social deprivation in Huyton.</p>	None.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>	<b>Changes to SPD</b>
Environment Agency	No comments.	None.	None.
Resident MG	Against development – promises have not been kept on nearby regeneration schemes, with unfinished roads, parks not provided and litter everywhere. Why build on green belt when there are other sites available?	None directly, as not related to Knowsley Lane SPD. Response to be provided to writer on separate issues over which Council has some influence	None.
Historic England	Agree with Council's assessment that the document is unlikely to result in any significant environmental effects on the historic environment and will simply provide additional guidance on existing policies which have already been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal. As a result, endorse the conclusions that it is not necessary to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the document.	Comment noted.	None.
Resident CH	Recommend that the Council considers the procurement of an online engagement tool. Highlights that compiling submissions over an email is very time consuming and difficulties of deriving analytics from email submissions.	None, as not related to Knowsley Lane SPD. Separate response to be provided to writer in reply to issue raised.	None.
Resident JM	Concerned about proposed vehicular entrance to the woodland and playing fields shown as it is close to an already troublesome junction between Knowsley Lane and Stockbridge Lane. Considers that it	Agree that this is not a preferred location for access to the western part of the site, and that the existing access to the sports field is likely to be a better location.	Spatial development framework map to be updated to reflect this change.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
	would be much better at a distance between this junction and Primrose Drive.		
Natural England	<p><b>Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Highlight that the SPD could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development, consistent with any GI strategy because of its wide ranging benefits. Refer to the potential for green roof systems, green walls and new tree planting.</li> <li>Consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans.</li> <li>Seek to enhance the site's biodiversity by inclusion of bat roost or bird box provision.</li> <li>consider how new development might makes a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design.</li> </ul>	<p>While the draft SPD included references to Green Infrastructure, agree that additional information would be helpful.</p> <p>While the draft SPD includes references to biodiversity and habitats, with requirements for assessment of ecological constraints and mitigation, agree that additional information would be helpful.</p> <p>Comments noted – as for Green Infrastructure comment above.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Supporting text modified to include further detail on role and type of green infrastructure, possible biodiversity and landscape improvements along lines suggested (paragraph 4.20).</p> <p>Additional text added to KL11 (point 5) about provision of measures which support biodiversity.</p> <p>Additional paragraph added (5.18) to add information about desirable sustainability measures.</p> <p>Supporting text modified to include further detail on role and type of green infrastructure, possible biodiversity and landscape improvements along lines suggested (paragraphs 4.20).</p> <p>None.</p>
Resident JS	<p>i Highlights concern about loss of green belt.</p> <p>ii Doesn't consider that housing requirements are driven by local need. Rather, by government policy.</p>	<p>Site no longer in Green Belt since adoption of Local Plan Core Strategy in January 2016.</p> <p>Allocation of site for development not part of SPD consultation (issue settled on adoption of Core Strategy in 2016).</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
iii	Refers to a large site in Prescot earmarked for housing where there seems to be no progress in terms of actual home construction..	Different developers work at different rates and target different markets with sites; Council expects most allocated sites to be developed over 15 year lifespan of Local Plan.	None.
iv	Encouraged that the quality of any development is to be monitored, and a high quality prestigious housing and employment location is proposed.	Comment noted; one of SPD's key purposes is to try to ensure that development is of a suitably high standard.	None.
v	Notes that there are a considerable number of trees on the site, in particular those which screen the land to the west of George Hale Avenue. In addition, that there is a hedge along the whole of the lane, east of the Avenue, which screens the site from the road and should be retained.	Comment noted; SPD Box KL11 seeks retention and enhancement of existing trees and hedges where this is possible – while creating access points will require removal of hedge, general preference is to retain. Note also that Core Strategy and existing SPDs include policies relating to replacement of trees.	None.
vi	Notes that the playing fields and the Oak Plantation are to be excluded from development, yet in the plans from Cushman & Wakefield, small units are proposed for a part of the site adjacent to George Hale Avenue. Considers that it would preserve the integrity of that part of the site if it were to excluded from any commercial development as this would be consistent with the policy of protecting and enhancing the Lord Derby Playing Fields and Oak Plantation within the	Comment relates to developer masterplan rather than SPD; where masterplan or planning applications deviate from requirements of SPD developers will have to explain and justify this.	None.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
	<p>site. Notes that a pond is planned in the housing area, and notice will need to be taken of the watercourses which cross the site.</p>		
vii	<p>Notes that housing could be impacted on by noise from the motorway and that noise management is needed.</p>	<p>Noise impact of M57 identified as a constraint (Figure 2.1), requirement for technical report set out in SPD Box KL2, and requirements for noise mitigation set out in SPD Boxes KL5 and KL9.</p>	<p>Additional text added as paragraph 2.14 to provide additional explanation of noise and other constraints.</p>
viii	<p>Highlights traffic issues during the construction phase</p>	<p>Comment noted; while development work inevitably causes some disruption, Knowsley Council uses conditions (e.g. restricting working hours) to try to reduce impacts.</p>	<p>Additional text added as paragraph 6.10 to explain use of conditions on planning permission.</p>
ix	<p>Highlights likelihood that the housing. will be freehold rather than leasehold and the adverse implications of this.</p>	<p>Comments noted. While the Council is aware of concerns about sale of leaseholds, this is not a planning issue which can be dealt with in the SPD. One of the overall aims of the SPD is to encourage and secure development of high quality design and construction.</p>	<p>None.</p>
x	<p>10.Highlights additional need for pedestrian crossing provision on Knowsley Lane.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Initial information from Knowsley Council's highways planning officers is that one access point would be sufficient for the number of homes proposed in the SPD. Details of road access and</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
		pedestrian routes will be clarified through masterplan preparation and assessment of planning applications for the development.	
	xi Highlights preference for access to employment element to be directly onto the adjoining roundabout given congestion fears from current proposal.	Comments noted.	None.
	xii Highlights potential impact on local residents from a wider range of uses but potential wider benefits of a hotel..	This comment relates to developer masterplan rather than SPD; where masterplan or planning applications deviate from requirements of SPD developers will have to explain and justify this.	None.
Sport England			
i	Welcome the links made to other nearby playing fields and schools that offer other sporting opportunities in relation to the site. These provide opportunities for further investment based on the new need arising from future residents, which this SPD will enable.	The Council is keen to support and enhance the provision of playing pitches and other facilities for outdoor recreation and leisure, and the SPD reflects this.	None.
ii	Highlight that the Football Association has advised that the Lord Derby site is home to South Liverpool FC which is one of Liverpool County FA Charter Standard Development clubs with 19 plus teams. Therefore a key site for football. In addition there may also be a number of other games on the site.	As part of preparing the masterplan for this site, the Council is talking to Knowsley South FC (which occupies these pitches – not South Liverpool FC) and developers to identify exactly what improvements to sports facilities might be secured through	None.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
iii	<p>Queries public open space and sports provision requirements and need for approach to be based upon a playing pitch strategy (PPS) and built facilities strategy (BFS). Understand that the council is beginning work on a Playing Pitch Strategy PPS and reference should be made to it.</p> <p>Welcome support for cycling.</p>	<p>development of this SUE.</p> <p>The figures for public open space and sports pitch requirements are derived from the current standard-based Core Strategy policy and Developer Contributions SPD. The Council is preparing a Playing Pitch Strategy which may identify additional need, but for the time being the Core Strategy policies (which post-date the NPPF, and against which any planning application would be assessed) remain in place. The Council will liaise with Sport England on proposed future policy development resulting from the completion of its PPS, and of course will consult on planning applications as at present – an additional paragraph referring to the PPS will be added.</p>	<p>Additional paragraph (4.18) added referring to emerging Playing Pitch Strategy and possible future need to review policy requirement.</p>
iv	<p>Additional information provided on current best practice guidance.</p>	<p>Comments noted. References to guidance will be updated following Sport England advice.</p>	<p>References to guidance updated in response to information provided (paragraph 5.5).</p>
The Coal Authority	<p>The site for the Sustainable Urban Extension falls within the defined Development High Risk Area. Records indicate that there is a mine entry, and its resultant zone of influence, within, or within 20m of, the site</p>	<p>Comments noted. Additional information provided from CA response added to SPD. Existing evidence used in preparing the borough's Core Strategy, including</p>	<p>Additional constraints information added as para. 2.14.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
	<p>boundary. The site is also in an area of likely historic unrecorded coal mine workings at shallow depth.</p> <p>Disappointed to note that consideration of prior extraction of minerals has not been included within the noted criteria.</p>	<p>the Merseyside Minerals Study (2008), does not suggest that extraction of coal in those parts of Knowsley where unworked resources exist is likely to be viable (see Core Strategy Policy CS25).</p>	
Resident PK	<p>Buffer between new development and existing homes should be wider both to protect views and for ecological benefits. Hedgerows and green spaces valuable and deserve protection.</p>	<p>SPD doesn't specify how far new development should be from existing homes, but sets out design requirements in Box KL9 for sympathetic frontage to Knowsley Lane – details will need to be agreed in masterplan.</p> <p>SPD seeks to retain hedgerows where possible (KL9) and provision of green spaces with leisure, movement and ecology roles (KL9, KL10 and KL11). Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.</p>	<p>Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.</p>
Resident DK	<p>Buffer between new development and existing homes should be wider both to protect views and for ecological benefits. Hedgerows and green spaces valuable and deserve protection.</p>	<p>SPD doesn't specify how far new development should be from existing homes, but sets out design requirements in Box KL9 for sympathetic frontage to Knowsley Lane – details will need to be agreed in masterplan.</p> <p>SPD seeks to retain hedgerows where possible (KL9) and provision of green</p>	<p>Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
		spaces with leisure, movement and ecology roles (KL9, KL10 and KL11). Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.	
Resident JK	Buffer between new development and existing homes should be wider both to protect views and for ecological benefits. Hedgerows and green spaces valuable and deserve protection.	SPD doesn't specify how far new development should be from existing homes, but sets out design requirements in Box KL9 for sympathetic frontage to Knowsley Lane – details will need to be agreed in masterplan.  SPD seeks to retain hedgerows where possible (KL9) and provision of green spaces with leisure, movement and ecology roles (KL9, KL10 and KL11). Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.	Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.
Resident GK	Buffer between new development and existing homes should be wider both to protect views and for ecological benefits. Hedgerows and green spaces valuable and deserve protection.	SPD doesn't specify how far new development should be from existing homes, but sets out design requirements in Box KL9 for sympathetic frontage to Knowsley Lane – details will need to be agreed in masterplan.  SPD seeks to retain hedgerows where possible (KL9) and provision of green spaces with leisure, movement and	Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
		ecology roles (KL9, KL10 and KL11). Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.	
Resident RK	Buffer between new development and existing homes should be wider both to protect views and for ecological benefits. Hedgerows and green spaces valuable and deserve protection.	SPD doesn't specify how far new development should be from existing homes, but sets out design requirements in Box KL9 for sympathetic frontage to Knowsley Lane – details will need to be agreed in masterplan.  SPD seeks to retain hedgerows where possible (KL9) and provision of green spaces with leisure, movement and ecology roles (KL9, KL10 and KL11). Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.	Additional requirement added to KL11 seeking features which support biodiversity.
National Grid	No comments.	None.	None.
ION (submitted by Cushman & Wakefield)	<b>Role and Purpose of the SPD</b> Support the principle of a single detailed Council-approved master plan for the entire SUE, and consider that creating an overarching common identity will also strengthen the attractiveness of the proposed employment floorspace and new homes ensuring that the SUE is a success now and into the future.	Comments noted.	None.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
ii	<p><b>Vision and Development Objectives</b></p> <p>Support the Council's vision and development objectives.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to deliver a new breed of employment park to meet current and future demands of the local and city region industrial and commercial market – currently a lack of supply of the type, size and quality of floorspace to meet the requirements of key LCR economic sectors as well as local and regional small and medium enterprises looking to grow.</p>	Comments noted.	None.
iii	<p><b>Spatial Development Framework – Employment Development</b></p> <p>Fully endorse the principles set out in box KL4 of the draft SPD.</p> <p>Endorse and emphasise the importance of the ancillary service uses that support the function and operation of the employment area – being able to offer prospective occupiers on site services and facilities will give the Employment Park a distinct advantage in the market place, as well as serving the growing residential community in this area.</p>	Comments noted. The issues raised here about ancillary uses will largely be dealt with through masterplan and application stages. As set out in SPD supporting text (para. 4.11), proposals for ancillary development which go beyond a very small scale (secondary to the site's employment function) will need to be justified with reference to a sequential appraisal and with regard to Core Strategy policies relating to development and regeneration of town and district centres.	None.
iv	<p><b>Development and Design Principles</b></p> <p>The design principles specific to the employment and ancillary service uses in box</p>	Comments noted – these issues will be worked up in more detail through the masterplan, and it is encouraging	None.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
v	<p>KL9 are endorsed by ION.</p> <p>In terms of box KL11, ION recognise the importance and value of the existing landscape and ecology, particularly as the semi rural landscape character naturally provides a high quality setting and environment for development to be set within.</p> <p><b>Delivery</b></p> <p>ION recognises the importance of a coherent and co-ordinated approach to the provision of strategic infrastructure (box KL14). The ability to achieve this rests on the viability of the mix of uses proposed and the way that they are phased in being brought forward for development. ION has undertaken a detailed development appraisal which demonstrates the ability to bring forward early development that will drive value to cross subsidise the infrastructure that will access and service all development areas across the SUE, as well as providing funding to improve and enhance Lord Derby Playing Fields and/or Oak Plantation. Beyond this there is no further identified and available funding to address other requirements set out in box KL14, including the provision of affordable housing. It is considered that this is consistent with the 'priority' based approach to infrastructure</p>	<p>to see the developer recognising their importance.</p> <p>Comments noted; infrastructure delivery and other requirements will be worked up through masterplan and planning application.</p>	None.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
vi	<p>requirements within the draft SPD.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b>  In summary, ION is supportive of the Council's approach to bringing forward a comprehensive and sustainable mixed use destination at Knowsley Lane that is anchored by the delivery of a Hybrid Employment Park.</p>	Comments noted.	None.
Bellway (submitted by Cushman & Wakefield)	<p><b>Role and Purpose of the SPD</b>  Bellway supports the principle of a single detailed Council-approved master plan for the whole of the Sustainable Urban Extension site.</p> <p><b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>  The Council's vision and objective to bring forward sustainable, high-quality family housing that will help to broaden the Borough's housing offer by appealing to the top end of the market is correct and one that will be successful in this location.</p> <p><b>Spatial Development Framework – Residential Development</b>  Based on their current experience of bringing forward homes on a number of sites across the Borough Bellway are of the opinion that the 100 homes set out in table 4.1 is insufficient, particularly if the Council is to be successful in its objective of rebalancing the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. SPD does not preclude a higher number of homes coming forward on the site, but makes clear (in Box KL5) that this cannot be at the expense of design and development quality. Precise details of housing numbers will be established through masterplanning</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
	<p>Borough's housing offer.</p> <p>A number of new homes between 150 and 160 is considered to provide a critical mass that will be effective in delivering the type and quality of residential environment that the Council aspire to. This is particularly important in the context of the sites location, local need, wider demand and market appetite, particularly for new two-storey four bed detached and three bed semi detached homes set in a high quality landscape and environment. This critical mass of new homes inclusive of the associated amenity space, car parking standards, and quality of place is considered vital to creating a viable new residential market within this part of Huyton, and indeed Knowsley as a whole. It is envisaged that this will facilitate the delivery of a single comprehensive sustainable community that will make the step change in the residential market that the Council require, both in meeting the needs of the existing residents and attracting economically active people into the Borough.</p>	<p>and planning applications and Council will consider proposals for higher numbers within the context of creating a viable and high-quality scheme.</p>	
iv	<p><b>Design Principles</b></p> <p>Bellway have considered the design principles set out in box KL9 and KL10 of the draft SPD and consider them consistent with their own design approach to delivering high quality housing developments across the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
v	<p>Borough and responsive to the specific characteristics of the site:</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Bellway Homes is supportive of the Council's approach to bringing forward a comprehensive and sustainable mixed use destination at Knowsley Lane, inclusive of a critical mass of houses that will assist in rebalancing the Borough's housing offer by appealing to families who are seeking to invest in homes at the top end of the market.</p>	Comments noted.	None.
Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	<p>i "Policy context" section should refer to the Merseyside &amp; Halton Joint Waste Local Plan which forms part of the Local Plan.</p> <p>ii It may be useful to include reference to waste management under part 3 of Box KL2; whilst a separate survey would not be expected the development of the site will entail a significant amount of waste generation.</p> <p>iii Part 2 of Box KL6 refers to consideration of facilitating construction related earth movements in the context of NPPF. The Council should be mindful that if retaining Oak Plantation and the playing fields then using these areas for re-use of surplus soil would not be appropriate.</p>	<p>Agree that this needs to be referred to.</p> <p>Agree that this would provide useful clarification.</p> <p>This issue will need to be resolved through masterplan and applications, and this advice is noted.</p>	<p>Reference to Merseyside &amp; Halton Joint Waste Local Plan added to this chapter (new sub-section as paragraph 3.17)</p> <p>Reference to waste management added to 'utilities and infrastructure' line in Box KL2 part 3.</p> <p>None.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
iv	Part 4 of Box KL7 should read 'surface and foul water removal and waste management.'	Agree that this would provide useful clarification. See also response to United Utilities comment below.	Reference to waste management added to Box KL7.
v	KL12 covers renewable energy, sustainable design and sustainable waste management. This is welcomed.	Comment noted.	None.
vi	KL2 – archaeology/heritage technical report should comprise a desk-based assessment supplemented by a walkover of the whole site. Information from Merseyside Historic Environment Record indicates a moderate potential for archaeological remains of a local or regional significance which could be dealt with by means of post-permission works secured by condition.	Comment noted – while the policy box does not need to specify the content/ approach to each technical report, it would be helpful to include the point that the scope of reports should be agreed with the Council.	Additional wording added to KL2 (3).
vii	KL2 - site history and ground conditions Phase I Desk Study should be produced which identifies all relevant potential sources, pathways and receptors and provides a preliminary risk assessment to ascertain whether there are any potential unacceptable risks posed by land contamination to future users of the site.	Comment noted – while the policy box does not need to specify the content/ approach to each technical report, it would be helpful to include the point that the scope of reports should be agreed with the Council.	Additional wording added to KL2 (3).
viii	Figure 2.1 – there re Priority Habitats on site which are not shown or referred to in the SPD. The link to policy CS8 and its supporting text is weak. This may have implications in terms of outdoor sports	Figure 2.1 (opportunities and constraints map) to be updated and will include reference to priority habitats.	Figure 2.1 updated. Cross-reference to requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS8 added to para. 4.20.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
	provision in the western end of the site. SPD should better reflect Policy CS8 and supporting text requirements as well as CS21.		
ix	City regional context should also refer to the LCR Ecological Network as part of the evidence base to inform Local Plans.	SPD does not need to refer to Local Plan evidence base and supporting networks in detail.	None.
x	KL2.3 – ecology report should meet BS 42020:2013.	Comment noted – while the policy box does not need to specify the content/ approach to each technical report, it would be helpful to include the point that the scope of reports should be agreed with the Council.	Additional wording added to KL2 (3).
xi	KL6.1 – should refer to Core Strategy policy CS8.	Agree.	Reference added to KL6 (1).
xii	KL11 should seek to retain Priority Habitat; welcome remainder of approach as this delivers a large part of CS8.	Agree.	Reference to Priority Habitat added to KL11 (2), as well as to Figure 2.1.
xiii	KL13 – pre-application charging for MEAS could usefully be flagged.	Agree that potential need to consult other bodies including MEAS could be mentioned, although this would sit better in supporting text than in policy box (and without reference to charges).	Reference to other bodies e.g. MEAS added to para. 6.9.
xiv	KL14 – developer responsibility for maintenance and management of Green Infrastructure created is required.	Agree.	Added reference to maintenance to KL14 (2d).

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
xv	Table 11.2 – Core Strategy Policy CS8 should be included as well as CS21.	Table 11.2 is directly taken from Core Strategy.	None.
Resident KM i	Development will lead to increased noise and traffic, and could have impact on safety and privacy of residents in surrounding area.	SPD sets out requirements to plan for and, where necessary, mitigate impacts on surrounding area. Further detail of this will emerge through masterplan and planning applications.	None.
ii	Although a project like this requires getting rid of a lot of the greenspace, hope that much of it can be maintained.	SPD identifies only part of site for development, and seeks provision for new and/or improved public open spaces. Also seeks to set high standards for development, including landscaping and planting, to ensure that a pleasant environment is provided.	None.
Resident RF i	Oppose development going ahead – potential negative traffic and noise impact of businesses on residents. Loss of privacy also a concern.	Principle of development established by Core Strategy. SPD sets out requirements to plan for and, where necessary, mitigate impacts on surrounding area. Further detail of this will emerge through masterplan and planning applications.	None.
ii	Filling station and coffee shops not needed in the area.	SPD accepts that small-scale shops and services may be required to help support employment role of site. Comment largely relates to developer masterplan proposals rather than SPD; where masterplan or planning	None.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
iii	Development should be smaller scale – what will colour schemes and designs be?	<p>applications deviate from requirements of SPD developers will have to explain and justify this.</p> <p>SPD doesn't set out this level of detail, which will be worked up through masterplan and planning applications (but which even then may not address all aspects of development such as colour schemes used in buildings).</p> <p>Prominent buildings considered to help create a gateway at M57 junction, but SPD also requires development to be sensitive to and respect scale of existing homes along Knowsley Lane.</p>	None.
Resident LW i	Object to development of petrol station, brewery, hotel and industrial/retail units proposed by Ion. Concerns include impact of noise from deliveries and visitors, as well as during development. Also impact of light, litter and air pollution.	<p>Comment largely relates to developer masterplan proposals rather than SPD; where masterplan or planning applications deviate from requirements of SPD developers will have to explain and justify this.</p> <p>Although development work inevitably causes some disruption, Knowsley Council uses conditions (e.g. restricting working hours) to try to reduce impacts.</p>	Additional text added as paragraph 6.10 to explain use of conditions on planning permission.
ii	Could access to site not be from M57 roundabout? Would keep deliveries and	Advice from highways engineers is that Knowsley Lane is the most	None.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
	visitors away from Knowsley Lane, and there is already congestion at peak times.	suitable place to provide access to development.	
United Utilities i	<p>KL2 – Securing delivery of development in a co-ordinated and holistic manner is often a major challenge in practice.</p> <p>United Utilities notes the policies' intention for an over-arching masterplan accompanied by technical reports, including drainage and infrastructure. However, as you may be aware drainage connection points into our existing infrastructure are usually only able to be determined at planning application stage. Therefore we would recommend a phasing plan be included within the requirements of this policy. Alternatively a legal agreement should be drafted by the Council and agreed as part of the early process, not once the site has been split.</p> <p>See also comments about paragraph 6.6 below.</p>	<p>SPD KL2 includes requirement for masterplan to address phasing issues, also reiterated in KL13 in respect of planning applications.</p> <p>Council would be happy to bring UU into masterplan and planning application preparations as appropriate.</p>	None.
ii	<p>KL7: Utilities and other services</p> <p>Bullet point 4, page 26</p> <p>We would request a minor amendment (underlined):</p> <p>“The master plan should be accompanied by a utilities plan which sets out the strategy for the maintenance, installation and delivery of services including electricity, gas, water</p>	Agree (see also response to MEAS comment above).	KL7 (4) amended along suggested lines.

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
iii	<p>supply, <u>foul and surface water removal</u>,[...]"</p> <p>KL11: Landscape and ecology</p> <p>United Utilities supports the inclusion of SuDs within this policy, and wishes to highlight to all interested parties our free pre-application service which can be used to discuss surface water drainage in more detail. Contact should be made with Developer Services (wastewaterdeveloperservices@uuplc.co.uk).</p>	<p>Comment noted; information could be usefully added. See also next comment.</p>	<p>Additional paragraphs 5.15 and 5.16 added covering options for dealing with surface water run-off.</p>
iv	<p>We would also like to include the following text within the document:</p> <p>“Options for the disposal of surface water should be in line with the surface water hierarchy which requires that surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Into the ground (infiltration at source);</li> <li>• To a surface water body;</li> <li>• To surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system;</li> <li>• To a combined sewer.</li> </ul> <p>In cases where a developer still proposes to dispose of surface water via a combined sewer, robust evidence will be required to be submitted as part of any planning application to demonstrate there are no alternative methods available.”</p>	<p>Agree that this would be useful.</p>	<p>Additional paragraphs 5.15 and 5.16 added covering options for dealing with surface water run-off.</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Council response	Changes to SPD
v	<p>Paragraph 6.6, second bullet point</p> <p>Note the Council's reference to permitting more than one phase of development to come forward at a time, however would ask the Council to consider options for ensuring the appropriate infrastructure is delivered, not just for the stand alone sites, but for the benefit of delivering sustainable foul and surface water strategies, as mentioned above in our comments to KL2. This must be agreed at a very early stage, prior to any planning permission being granted.</p> <p>Would be happy to discuss this in more detail with the Council should this be required.</p>	<p>As with comments on KL2 above, SPD includes requirement for masterplan to address comprehensive development of site, also reiterated in KL13 in respect of planning applications.</p> <p>KL14 also sets out requirement for infrastructure to be provided on a site-wide basis, and again Council would be happy to bring UU into masterplan and planning application preparations as appropriate.</p>	None.