

REF: 2165/BGP/Mining/mjs

Matthew Phillips

WCBC

By email

[Matthew.Phillips@wrexham.gov.uk](mailto:Matthew.Phillips@wrexham.gov.uk)

18<sup>th</sup> December 2020

Dear Matthew,

**RE: 57 BRYN GLAS RHOSLLANERCHRUGOG: P/2020/0700**

We have been asked to reply to the letter from the Coal Authority dated 24<sup>th</sup> November 2020, regarding the mining risk to the above development.

Whilst we would agree that it is possible that the shaft may be nearby, we would discount the risks to the site for the reasons stated in the report, namely:

- No colliery spoil was encountered on site, meaning that the likelihood of a nearby shaft is very low.
- The shaft was considered to be a trial, which based on the ground conditions encountered in the borehole was not pursued.
- There was no evidence for the shaft on the 1850 Public Health Plans at a scale of 1:500.
- All other old shafts in the area are marked by a mound of spoil, no mounds being shown close to this site.
- GSL Experience of looking for shafts in this area, with poor source information, has shown that they either don't exist, or can be up to 50m from their plotted position.
- The ground conditions confirmed that there were at least 25m of superficial cover beneath the site, with 12m of water bearing sand and gravel.
- Consequently, the shaft would have required extensive pumping.
- This was at a time, pre 1850 when shallow coal seams near surface which did not require pumping were abundant, with coal easily won.

In addition, the previous development on site had been there for a considerable time, and had strip foundations, with inspection of the property prior to demolition failing to reveal any evidence of structural damage.

Therefore, we do not see the point in producing a zone of influence for a shaft that may not exist, or was a short-lived trial. In any case, the zone of influence assuming the shaft was open and given the ground conditions would be enormous. This is because the underlying sand and gravel, which is water bearing would flow into the shaft from a considerable distance, at least until the shaft was full. This would then have the effect of causing damage to all the surrounding properties.

Regarding the second point we would stand by our conclusions that the risk to shallow mine working has been discounted for the reasons stated in our report. In addition, the thickness of any superficial deposits would be enough to choke off any void before it could possibly get to surface.

Should you have any further queries please call Mike Scott on 01244 661361.

Yours Sincerely

M J Scott