

MEMORANDUM



From: Angela Guy
Contaminated Land Officer

To: Louise Phillips
Planning Officer

Our Ref: P/2022/0567

Your Ref: P/2022/0567

Date: 05 July 2022

**No. of
Pages:** 2

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

P/2022/0567 REAR OF INGELBY CHIRK GREEN CHIRK WREXHAM

DISCHARGE OF CONDITIONS 6 AND 7 (CONTAMINATION) OF PLANNING PERMISSION P/2021/0356

The following reports have been reviewed (the Stage 1 report occasionally referred to below has already been reviewed):

- Smith Grant LLP Former Coal Yard, Lloyd's Lane, Chirk 'Stage 2 Contamination Assessment', March 2018
- Smith Grant LLP Former Coal Yard, Lloyd's Lane, Chirk 'Remediation Strategy', April 2018
- Smith Grant LLP Former Coal Yard, Lloyd's Lane, Chirk 'Hydrocarbon Removal Verification Report', May 2018

In principle, all of the documents are sufficient in relation to the works that they cover, however before I can recommend discharge of condition 6 I would recommend responses are provided on the comments below.

1. It is noted in paragraph 3.2.1 of the Stage 2 report that one of the purposes of the investigation is to confirm the presence, if any, of residual contamination from fuel leakage (this is also mentioned in 6.2.3 of the Stage 1 Assessment). In an email from Ben Thomas dated 13 December 2017 Ben confirms that a sampling position will be located near to the AST in the building. It is assumed that the photo of the large fuel storage tank in central south of the site in the PRA is the AST being referred to. However it is not clear which of the 8 trial pits are positioned to address the matter. Presumably it is TP3 and/or TP4 based on the chemical analysis results finding hydrocarbons, however further detail on which trial pits target specific features should be provided.

2. In 2.1 of the Stage 1 Contamination Assessment two stockpile areas are referred to, however there is no further mention of these features in the subsequent reports listed above. Please can further detail be provided regarding the status and proposals for these stockpiles?
3. Paragraph 7.2.2 of the Stage 2 report recommends further investigation in the vicinity of TP4 and TP7 *"...to identify the presence/absence of hydrocarbon contamination through visual and olfactory observations within the area. Additional investigation works will allow determination as to whether an appropriate remedial procedure needs to be implemented, typically requiring removal of impacted soils or free product. This may include additional validation sampling to confirm removal of impacted ground, if present."* It is noted that the Verification Report details the works in the vicinity of TP4, but please provide clarification on this matter in relation to TP7, will the remaining remedial works sufficiently address this?

For the discharge of condition 7, the works outlined in section 6.3 of the Verification Report should be completed and evidence in the form of an additional Verification Report provided to the Council. Specific note should be taken of the following matters:

- i. With regard to risks/protection of water supply pipes, the remediation works for the identified hydrocarbon contamination needs to form part of the water pipeline risk assessment.
- ii. I have no concerns regarding the findings of the gas risk assessment and note that radon protection is required for the proposed development, this is a matter that will be addressed through Building Regulations.
- iii. Following the asbestos survey, confirmation on the removal of any ACM should be referred to in the Verification Report (this is not works being done for land contamination, but to demonstrate compliance with other asbestos legislation so that land contamination by asbestos hasn't been caused).

Should you have any queries regarding the above then please contact me on Ext. 8771.



.....
Angela Guy
Contaminated Land Officer