

MEMORANDUM



From: Stacey Inglis
Contaminated Land Officer

To: Planning Officer

Our Ref: P/2022/1078

Your Ref: P/2022/1078

Date: 10 February 2023

**No. of
Pages:** 3

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

RE: P/2022/1078 – DISCHARGE OF CONDITION 23 (CONTAMINATION) OF PLANNING PERMISSION P/2018/1083

LOWER RACKERY FARM DARK LANE BURTON WREXHAM

The following letter report has been submitted for the discharge of condition (23) of planning permission P/2018/1083:

- GroundSolve Ltd, Letter report RE: Lower Rackery Farm, Llay – Contamination Assessment. Dated 10th May 2021

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

It is stated that GroundSolve Ltd have been appointed to confirm that previous filling on site has not resulted in possible land contamination, however this letter report has been submitted to discharge condition 23 (contamination) which was recommended due to the development site being within 250m of a former landfill site known as 'Astbury Landfill'.

This letter report is insufficient and does not meet the requirements of condition 23 of planning permission P/2018/1083.

I can provide the following specific comments on the information within the letter report:

1. In accordance with current authoritative guidance a phase 1 preliminary risk assessment (desk study) must be undertaken prior to any intrusive site investigation works being done. The purpose of a preliminary risk assessment is to develop an outline conceptual site model and identify all possible pollutant linkages, this will then aid in the design of future investigation works. This is an absolute requirement for all contamination assessments, please can you advise if this has been carried out and

provide a copy to the Council for written approval, if such an assessment has not been carried out, what is the justification for not doing so?

2. The contamination assessment has not identified the former landfill site within 250m of the proposed development, which may pose a risk to the development from landfill gas migration. 'Astbury Landfill' has had off site migration of landfill gas previously therefore it is essential that this potential source is fully considered within the contamination assessment. It should have been identified in the phase 1 preliminary risk assessment and outline conceptual model, if this had been undertaken (see item 1 above). Please can you advise why this potential source has not been considered?

In lieu of a gas risk assessment the Council will accept the installation of gas protection measures within the converted buildings. A methodology of these works (including specification details, design plans, installation, inspection and validation details etc..) must be submitted in writing to the Council for approval prior to any works commencing on site.

3. 1.0 Introduction – It is stated that fill has been placed on site that originated from a nearby development, details of where this material has come from is required as it will inform the conceptual site model for the site. Please can you also provide a plan showing where fill material was placed?
4. 2.0 Site Location and Description – It is noted that the area of the contamination assessment, detailed in Figure 2, is for a larger area than planning permission P/2018/1083, please can you advise why this is?
5. 3.0 Site Investigation – The site investigation presented is insufficient and has not been undertaken in accordance with current authoritative guidance (such as Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) and BS:10175:2011+A2:2017). The following information has not been provided:
 - o Summary of previous reports to include preliminary risk assessment and outline conceptual site model (discussed in Item 1 above, yet to be submitted).
 - o Site investigation methodology.
 - o Justification for the sampling strategy and chemical suites chosen. For example, what is the justification for the trial pit locations, none of the trial pits are within the footprint of the proposed development? Why have samples for chemical analysis only been taken from 3 of the 13 trial pits? How / why were those trial pits selected for chemical analysis?
6. 4.0 Ground Conditions – It is noted that made ground was encountered on site to a depth of 2.90m and it is considered to be derived from local excavations in glacial deposits, however you would not expect to find plastic within glacial deposits.

A key part of a contamination assessment is characterising the ground conditions on site to further refine the conceptual site model and increase your understanding of the nature and extent of contamination that may be present. As there is no conceptual site model presented it is not possible to determine if the ground conditions have been adequately characterised.

7. 5.0 Chemical Testing – It is acknowledged that the three samples taken from three trial pits on site do not show any elevated level of contaminants, however as detailed above in Items 1 to 6 the site investigation undertaken is insufficient. It is therefore not possible to draw any conclusions regarding the contamination that may or may not be present on this site.

Finally, there has been no discussion of the results of the chemical analysis in relation to a conceptual site model (that should be included within a desk study, yet to be submitted). There are also no recommendations for further work within the letter report and no discussion of information gaps or uncertainties.

I look forward to receiving a response to my comments in due course. For your information I have attached the following guide 'Development of Land Affected by Contamination: A Guide for Developers'.

Please note that as the contamination assessment at the above site has yet to be completed to the satisfaction of the Contaminated Land Team I cannot recommend that discharge of condition 23. Should you have any queries regarding the above then please contact me on Ext. 8773.



.....
Stacey Inglis
Contaminated Land Officer