

From: Sharon Holman
Sent: 22 May 2018 16:08
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: P/2018/0357 - The Plas Coch, Visitor Accommodation application

Civ – pp resp

From: Angela Guy
Sent: 22 May 2018 11:48
To: Sharon Holman
Subject: FW: P/2018/0357 - The Plas Coch, Visitor Accommodation application

Sharon

Further to my email below I have now completed the assessment of the Geo-Environmental Report prepared by Enzygo Geoenvironmental Ltd dated March 2018. Based on the following comments I would recommend that the conditions are applied to the planning permission to ensure that the outstanding matters are investigated i.e. points 3, 4 and 5 below.

1. Our records indicate a depot on the area that is currently parking for the Plas Coch Inn, c. 25m to the west of the proposed development land and note the planning application boundary includes this area of land. The report only focuses on the land of the new development. We would normally ask that this former use be considered as part of the assessment, however, provided there are no changes proposed for the land where the former depot was situated, then in this case we do not deem it to be necessary.
2. On p16 of the Groundsure report (appendix A) a canal is noted has being 3m to the SE of the site on the 1872 map. However I believe this to be a mistake, having checked mapping I can see no canal feature, only a road and political boundary marking. Despite this paragraph 3.3 of the report does state that the canal is considered to be a negligible risk anyway so it does not alter the report findings so no further action is required on this matter from our point of view.
3. As stated in 3.4 of the report, it appears infilling of the pond has taken place. It is stated that this will be investigated as part of the investigation, however there is no intrusive sampling position in the area of the former pond, the closest is WS5, at best this could be on the very periphery of the pond, but it may not overlie it at all. To investigate the risks from the infill materials in the pond a location should been put in the central area as this would increase the likelihood of overlying it and establishing the greatest depth of fill. Aside from gas risks potentially being present, this is an area of landscaping and chemical contaminants from the infill could potentially be a concern.
4. It is noted that radon protection is required, this matter will be covered by Building Regulations, however if gas risks from the pond are established then gas protection is a matter that we would also require input into.
5. WS1 – the sample is taken from 0.2-1.00m, this is a wide depth range, and crosses two horizons, made ground and natural clay, therefore it is not possible to know if the results are showing the contamination status of the made ground or natural ground below it at 0.5m-1.0m bgl.
6. It is noted that robust remediation measures are proposed for landscaped areas, the design outlined would normally be suitable for a private residential garden and given that the only contaminant of concern identified in the report (notwithstanding the investigation of the pond being absent at this stage) is a sample containing asbestos at 0.001% taken from 0.2-1.00bgl (in the area of the proposed building), then further

risk assessment of this contaminant may be warranted, given the nature of the proposed development and costs and works associated with providing the remediation measures proposed.

7. As outlined in paragraph 9.26 if remediation works are undertaken (following agreement of any outstanding matters) then these will need to be checked and detailed in a Verification Report and submitted for approval. In addition, as outlined in section 9.27-9.28, if any unforeseen contamination is identified during the development works this also will require addressing and will need to be detailed in the Verification Report.
8. Please note that no assessment of geo-technical matters provided in the report have been considered as it not within the remit of the Contaminated Land Team.

Regards Angela

Ms Angela Guy BSc (Hons) MSc

Contaminated Land Officer

Swyddog Tir wedi ei Halogi



01978 298771



Environment and Planning Department, 16 Lord Street, Wrexham LL11 1LG



Adran Amgylchedd a Chynllunio, 16 Stryt yr Arglwydd, Wrecsam LL11 1LG



wrexham.gov.uk | wrecsam.gov.uk



twitter.com/wrexhamcbc | twitter.com/cbswrecsam



facebook.com/wrexhamcouncil | facebook.com/cyngorwrecsam

From: Angela Guy

Sent: 21 May 2018 13:44

To: Sharon Holman

Subject: RE: P/2018/0357 - The Plas Coch, Visitor Accommodation application

Hi Sharon

No it was Helen, but it's fine, it doesn't matter who replied on the initial consultation, any of us are able to pick it up at this point.

I've reviewed the report but need to check a couple of things when I'm back in the office tomorrow as I can't access mapinfo from home, I'll get back to you tomorrow morning, is that OK?

Thanks Angela

From: Sharon Holman

Sent: 21 May 2018 08:51

To: Angela Guy

Subject: FW: P/2018/0357 - The Plas Coch, Visitor Accommodation application

Hi Angela,

Did you provide the consultation response for this one? Please see point b) below. Could you comment please?

Thank you

Sharon

From: Scott Mackay [<mailto:scott@mackayplanning.co.uk>]

Sent: 16 May 2018 11:49

To: Sharon Holman

Cc: planning; Scott Francis; Gareth Crowther; Tina Moorhouse; Neil Carter; Nicholas Palmer

Subject: P/2018/0357 - The Plas Coch, Visitor Accommodation application

This email's attachments were cleaned of potential threats by Wrexham Council's Security Gateway.
Click <<https://usercheck.wrexham.gov.uk/UserCheck/PortalMain?IID={498D59B6-353F-DA40-A97E-51795C6B84E6}&origUrl=>> if the original attachments are required (justification needed).

Dear Sharon,

I understand you are on leave until next Monday. Regarding this application, I have reviewed the consultation responses which have been received to date from CPAT regarding archaeology and from Public Protection and have the following updates/comments for you:

a) Archaeology: CPAT consultation response dated 09 May suggests a requirement for the engagement of an archaeological contractor to prepare an archaeological assessment of the site with a written scheme of investigation before work commences on site. The suggestion is made that the determination of the application should be delayed so that this information can be gathered. Upon considering this, we have engaged CGMS Heritage who have discussed the matter directly with CPAT and provided borehole/test pit information to CPAT. Having considered this information CPAT have now withdrawn their pre-determination evaluation requirement and replaced it with a watching brief condition (please see email from Mark Walters at CPAT confirming this). I would be grateful therefore if you could confirm that the determination of this application will not be held up by the initial consultation response by CPAT and what the suggested wording of the watching brief condition will be.

b) Public Protection: regarding the suggested conditions, we confirm that proposed standard condition ZP01B regarding a Phased Investigation of the nature and extent of contamination is unnecessary as the submitted Geo-environmental Report prepared for and submitted with the application includes all the information requested. I would be grateful therefore if you could confirm that this condition will not be attached to any consent granted.

I also note that we have not received any formal correspondence of acknowledgment or confirmation of receipt and validation of this application from the Council. Can you please confirm if this has been sent and what your target determination date is?

I look forward to hearing from you.

regards

Scott Mackay (scott@mackayplanning.co.uk)

Mackay Planning
PO Box 12
145 Kilmarnock Road
Glasgow
G41 3JA

Mob: 07985 765908
Office: 0141 433 9030