



MEMORANDUM

From: Toni Slater Public Protection
Service Manager

To: David Williams Planning
Control Manager

Our Ref:

Your Ref: P/2016/0490

Date: 14-06-2016

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1996

Re: P/2016/0490, Pen y Bryn House

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF DETAILS RESERVED BY CONDITIONS IMPOSED UNDER PLANNING PERMISSION CODE NO. P/2013/0443: CONDITION 8 - SUBMISSION OF SCHEME TO DEAL WITH POTENTIAL CONTAMINATION CONDITION 10 - SUBMISSION OF SCHEME FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE AND INTEGRATED DRAINAGE CONDITION 11 - INFILTRATION OF SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE INTO THE GROUND CONDITION 19 - SUBMISSION OF A DETAILED NOISE REPORT

Contaminated Land

GroundSolve have prepared a Geo-Environmental Report (Rev A) for Pen y Bryn, Tenters Lane for the proposed apartment development for DMR(North Wales) Ltd, dated June 2015. The report states that it updates a Geo-Environmental Report (comprising a desk study and site investigation) prepared in August 2014. I have a copy of this report and note that it is for the area covered by P/2012/0625 and does not specifically cover the area of the apartment development and that this remaining area is covered by the June 2015 report. I would recommend that until further information, as detailed below, is submitted, then Condition 8 is not discharged.

I have the following comments to make on the June 2015 report (I have already commented on the August 2014 report).

There is clearly one past potentially contaminative use that has occurred on the site (the vehicle repair garage) and in addition the remaining land has made ground present which has some levels of elevated contaminants, including asbestos having been identified.

There is limited assessment of the above matters, but the assessment that has been undertaken has identified some contaminants that the qualitative risk assessment has shown to be unacceptable for the proposed end use of residential with gardens. But it is however stated that the development is not proposing to have gardens or even soft landscaped areas. The gas risk assessment and conclusions is sufficient. It is noted that the proposal to remove the made ground (primarily for geotechnical reasons to provide the required foundation medium for construction of

the car park area) will likely remove any source of contamination.

In light of the made ground being removed and despite the limited risk assessment, I consider the submitted report to be sufficient in principle provided that the following matters are clarified/dealt with:

i) figure 4 indicates an area of 'amenity' –presumably this will be soft landscaping, however the assessment carried out is assuming none is present, please provide a site layout plan that shows the outdoor areas and what these comprise (i.e. confirmation that there is no soft landscaping/garden areas) and clarify and amend the report findings accordingly if there is such an area to be included in the final development design;

ii) the site boundary on figure 3a-3k shows a larger area but the land does not appear to be included in the rest of the risk assessment report, although some is included within the 2014 report. Please clarify if this additional land is part of the development.

iii) the remediation strategy in 8.10 states that the made ground at the site will be removed for engineering purposes (car park construction) but that development levels are yet to be set. The risk assessment conclusions are built around the removal of the made ground therefore this matter needs to be clarified and the remediation proposals/risk assessment revised if the levels are such that the made ground is to remain on site.

iv) all asbestos is dealt with and details of how this will be done is included in the Remediation Strategy, the removal of asbestos pieces needs to be covered as well as the asbestos found within the soil.

v) it appears from the photographs that the demolition works has already taken place, however it is stated in section 9.6 that demolition debris following crushing could be used for structural backfill. Has this been done or have the materials been disposed of off-site?

vi) p7 of the report refers to an old well having been found. This requires further contamination assessment in terms of what the backfilled materials are. The geotechnical matters regarding this feature is not within the remit of the Contaminated Land Team.

vii) whilst section 8.9 states the risk to water supply pipes is negligible it is not clear whether the possibility of hydrocarbon hot spot areas have been considered, furthermore the investigation of the garage area is limited to one of the inspection pits (where a hydrocarbon odour was noted and no testing was undertaken) and one other trial pit. Therefore it is quite possible that unidentified contamination may be present in this area, section 8.5 does recognise this possibility. Further consideration of protection of the water supply is required and needs to be covered in the Remediation Strategy, the approach can depend upon whether the made ground is entirely removed or not.

viii) following excavation of the made ground, if material is then to be placed in outdoor areas to achieve a certain level then the material needs to be proven to be suitable, whether it is brought to site or site won from demolition/crushing arisings. If the material is imported then verification of the materials suitability should be provided in the form of source of material and testing certificates (including assessment of the results). If the material is site won then the verification of its suitability would include documentation/photographic evidence of the materials to demonstrate they are inert and suitable.

ix) I would require the above matters to be addressed in a detailed Remediation Strategy and submitted for approval before being able to recommend the discharge of Condition 8 of planning permission P/2013/0443. The Remediation Strategy should also include details of what verification checks will be undertaken and what will be detailed in the resultant report. In due course when the Remediation Strategy is implemented and a Verification Report completed then this can be assessed in relation to Condition 9.

It should be noted that C4SLs are not a replacement for SGVs, as is mentioned on p19 with regard to lead, I have attached a statement from the Welsh Government with regard to C4SLs.

Environmental Protection

The noise mitigation measures recommended in the Peak Acoustics Noise Report look to be acceptable.

.....

Head of Planning and Environment