MEMORANDUM

From:	Stacey Inglis Contaminated Land Officer	**To:**	Lauren Rowlinson Planning Assistant
Our Ref:	P/2024/1319	**Your Ref:**	P/2024/1319
Date:	18 September 2024	**No. of Pages:**	2

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

RE: P/2024/1126 – DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 38 (CONTAMINATION) OF PLANNING PERMISSION P/2023/0280

LAND OFF, BRYN LANE, WREXHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, WREXHAM, LL13 9UT

The following letter report has been submitted to discharge condition 38 of planning permission P/2023/0280:

- SP Associates – Letter Report Kingmoor, Wrexham Industrial Estate. Report: S1761-2 dated 05 July 2024.

The above letter report has been read in conjunction with the following report submitted in support of planning permission P/2023/0280:

- SP Associated – Phase I Assessment Plot 3A Kingmoor Park, Wrexham. Dated September 2021.

Having reviewed the above reports I have the following comments to make and trust that they will be forwarded to the appropriate person(s):

In general the level of detail provided within the letter report is limited and does not provide a sufficient justification of the site investigation undertaken, specifically:

1. The Site and Site History – It is stated that small industrial buildings and tanks were located in the south-eastern section of the site which have subsequently been demolished. Do you know what the purpose of the larger factory to the south was, if so could this indicate what the small industrial buildings and possible tanks may have been used for?

2. Site Work – There is only a very brief explanation for the sample strategy that was undertaken during the site investigation works, please can a more detailed explanation be provided taking due consideration of the following:

- It is noted that the large area to the west of the development was not sampled, please can you provide a reason for this?
- It is noted that two trial pits (TP1 & TP2) were in the area of the former industrial buildings and tanks. Were these areas targeted? Did you consider targeting the footprint of the previous buildings and possible tanks?
- Given that the area of hardstanding has the greater potential for contamination to be present, what was the justification for only undertaking two trial pits in this area?

3. Laboratory Testing –It would have been useful to know what the hardstanding area on the south-eastern section of the site was formerly used for to inform the chemical suite, however it is acknowledged that a wide chemical suite was chosen for the laboratory testing which should address this unknown.

4. Risk Screening – In accordance with best practice and current guidance the initial conceptual site model, presented within the Phase I Assessment Report (dated September 2021), should have been updated and included within the letter report.

5. Proposed Remedial Measures – It is acknowledged that the chemical analysis results indicate that no remedial measures are required, however a response to the queries above is required before this can be agreed.

   In addition, should any unidentified contamination be found during the course of the development the Council should be informed and the area investigated to determine if contamination is present at levels that may pose a risk to potential receptors.

I am unable to recommend the discharge of condition 38 until a satisfactory response has been received and approved in writing to my queries detailed above. In the meantime should you have any queries regarding the above then please contact me on Ext. 8773.



……
Stacey Inglis
Contaminated Land Officer