




Re: P/2020/0061/HYBR 
William May to: Jennifer Bolton

28/02/2020 15:46

Jen, with respect to the Lighting Strategy, I would make the following comments:

- **Section 4.0 Design Guidance: Bats** - the report claims that "Bat surveys have identified low foraging and commuting activity for common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and noctule bats along the northern boundary of Booths Wood" - is the developer required to provide evidence of this claimed survey? The northern boundary of Booths Wood is in close proximity to the proposed footway / cycleway link to the M62 Motorway footbridge. Drawing No. CPW-190081-E-EXT-XX-01 indicates a potential spill light level in the range 1.0-3.0 lux along the Booths Wood northern boundary. Section 4.0 also states that there are "no set parameters in terms of lux levels set out by the legislation's and very little research has been carried out to determine a specific value". It is also stated that "one of the general principles which has been adopted by a number of planners is that a lighting level of 1.0 lux or above is not acceptable on the Bat roost or known feeding routes". Based on the information provided, it would appear that at least part of the Booths Wood northern boundary will be subject to light spill which exceeds this acceptable level. I have recently been contacted by a Lighting Design Engineer from consultants WSP, regarding various Highway lighting matters associated with this development. One of these matters was a proposal to illuminate the full length of the 1.20 Km footway / cycleway link, which is routed along the northern boundary of Booths Wood - are you aware of this proposal? The spill lighting levels indicated on the above drawing do not appear to include any potential contribution from the proposed footway lighting elements. It is suggested that inclusion of these lighting elements is likely to effect an increase in the spill lighting levels along the northern boundary of Booths Wood (what is still unclear at this stage is by how much). I would therefore propose that if this footway lighting is to be installed, it's contribution should be included in the above drawing. My personal preference would be for this 1.20 Km footway link to remain unlit (there are potential issues related to monitoring of the lighting for correct operation and any subsequent maintenance activities related to potential restrictions for vehicle access).
- **Section 5.0 Illumination Levels** - the lighting design targets for the various area's appear reasonable and appropriate. The actual design levels indicated generally do not appear excessive, with the possible exception of the South East Level Access (101 lux) and the Office Entrance (104 lux). However, both of these area's appear quite small, and at this stage I do not anticipate any significant issues from these relatively high lighting levels. The report states ""it is preferable to have 0 lux reaching the woodland , however it is lit by 1.0 lux, this is due to the fact that the service yard needs to be sufficiently lit to conform to health & safety standards". As indicated above, the northern boundary of Booths Wood is actually subject to a spill light level in the range 1.0-3.0 lux (and not the 1.0 lux claimed). Also as previously indicated, this spill light level does not include any potential contribution from the proposed footway / cycleway lighting elements.
- **Section 6.0 ILP Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light** - it is agreed that the site is located within an E2 Environmental Zone: Low District Brightness. This E2 Environmental Zone has an associated Pre-Curfew light spill in to windows limit of 5.0 lux and a Post-Curfew limit of 1.0 lux. I do not anticipate any issues relating to light spill in to windows, due to the distance of the nearest properties (Old Hall Farm) from the proposed development. There may be objections from residents relating to the potential view of the development against a dark background, but this is likely to viewed against the existing development phases (thereby providing a lit background against which it will be viewed). With respect to light in to properties, the report appears to concentrate on properties such as The Bungalow, Home Farm, Moat House Farm and Moat House, all of which are located some distance north of the M62 Motorway (but strangely makes no reference to Old Hall Farm, which appears to be closer). As these four properties are even further away from the proposed development, again I do not anticipate any issues with light spill in to windows. There are of course 3 no. existing significant developments along the norther boundary of the M62.

I trust the above comments are sufficient for your current needs, but please do not hesitate to call if you have any further queries.

Regards.

Bill May
Lighting Manager

St Helens Council
Tel. 01744 676650

Jennifer Bolton

Hi Bill, Within the ES statement there should also...

27/02/2020 12:27:45

From: Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC
To: William May/envpro/STHMBC@STHMBC
Date: 27/02/2020 12:27
Subject: Re: P/2020/0061/HYBR

Hi Bill,

Within the ES statement there should also be some information on lighting.

I asked them about the north east area and they said they would get some information over relating to that area.

Jen

Jennifer Bolton
Senior Planning Officer
Development Control
St Helens Council
01744 676184

Jennifer Bolton

- UNIT 1 DWG. 16 - 190081-E-EXT-XX-01 P2 E...

26/02/2020 12:42:49

From: Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC
To: William May/envpro/STHMBC@STHMBC
Date: 26/02/2020 12:42
Subject: Re: P/2020/0061/HYBR

[attachment " UNIT 1 DWG. 16 - 190081-E-EXT-XX-01 P2 External Lighting Strategy-Lux Levels-Light spill.pdf" deleted by Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC]

Jennifer Bolton
Senior Planning Officer
Development Control
St Helens Council
01744 676184

Jennifer Bolton

Hi Bill, On the last page of the lighting strategy p...

26/02/2020 10:41:01

From: Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC
To: William May/envpro/STHMBC@STHMBC
Date: 26/02/2020 10:41
Subject: Re: P/2020/0061/HYBR

Hi Bill,

On the last page of the lighting strategy pdf is a that plan that you mentioned.

Is that ok?

Thanks

Jen

Jennifer Bolton
Senior Planning Officer
Development Control
St Helens Council
01744 676184

Jennifer Bolton

Hi Bill, This is a hybrid application. All details are...

19/02/2020 11:52:01

From: Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC
To: William May/envpro/STHMBC@STHMBC
Date: 19/02/2020 11:52
Subject: P/2020/0061/HYBR

[attachment "4150-00001-PL6 SITE LOCATION PLAN OPP DWG. 2.pdf" deleted by Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC] [attachment "4150-05105-PL3 PARAMETERS PLAN 1 - OUTLINE AND DETAILED APPLICATION BOUNDARIES OPP DWG. 3.1.pdf" deleted by Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC] [attachment "POE_199_010_Omega Zone 8_Detailed Application Site Context.pdf" deleted by Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC] [attachment "UNIT 1 DOC.2 Lighting Strategy.pdf" deleted by Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC] [attachment "4150-05100-SK9 INDICATIVE MASTERPLAN OPP DWG. 1.pdf" deleted by Jennifer Bolton/CEXEC/STHMBC]

Hi Bill,

This is a hybrid application. All details are being assessed for a proposed warehouse (unit 1) to the north. The southern part is outline all matters reserved for potentially three warehouses.

They have submitted a lighting strategy connected to the full element. What I've noticed with it is that it only shows lighting around the building and not in the north west ecological mitigation area.

There are other plans on line which show more detail with the application along with an environment statement but I believe this plans are most relevant to you.

Thanks

Jen

Jennifer Bolton
Senior Planning Officer
Development Control
St Helens Council
01744 676184