

MEMORANDUM



From: Stacey Inglis
Contaminated Land Officer

To: Simon Greenland
Planning Officer

Our Ref: P/2018/0890

Your Ref: P/2019/0900

Date: 18 December 2019

**No. of
Pages:** 3

**RE: P/2019/0900, LAND AT THE CORNER OF OAK ROAD AND ABBEY ROAD,
WREXHAM INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, WREXHAM, LL13 9RF**

**APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF DETAILS RESERVED BY CONDITION IMPOSED
UNDER PLANNING PERMISSION P/2018/0890 – CONDITION 3 – SUBMISSION OF A
PHASED SITE INVESTIGATION OF THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF CONTAMINATION**

The following reports have been submitted in support of the above application:

- SOCOTEC UK Limited, Volume 01: Phase 1 Report: Desk Study and Site Reconnaissance at Oak Road, Wrexham. Dated September 2019.
- SOCOTEC UK Limited, Volume 2: Phase 2 Report: Contaminated Land Assessment Factual and Interpretative Report. Dated September 2019.

Having reviewed the above reports I have the following comments to make:

- SOCOTEC UK Limited, Volume 01: Phase 1 Report: Desk Study and Site Reconnaissance at Oak Road, Wrexham. Dated September 2019.
 1. Section 10.2 – please note that I have not provided comments on the geotechnical aspect of the report as it is not within the remit of the Contaminated Land Team.
 2. Section 3.2 – It is stated that the rusted drum is located on the north side of the concrete service chamber (photo 4) however I cannot identify the drum in the photo, please can it be marked on the photo?
 3. Section 11 – What is meant by '*dynamically sampled boreholes*'?
 4. With the exception of the above the information provided within the report is satisfactory and I am in agreement that further intrusive site investigation is required to

refine the conceptual site model and determine if contamination is present at unacceptable levels.

- SOCOTEC UK Limited, Volume 2: Phase 2 Report: Contaminated Land Assessment Factual and Interpretative Report. Dated September 2019.
5. Section 2.2.2 – It is stated that there is a historic on site pond and on site railway sidings, please can the location of these historic features be marked on an appropriately scaled plan showing their location in relation to the sample locations.
 6. Section 3.1 – Please can you provide further explanation / justification regarding the sampling methodology particularly in relation to why the historic on site pond and railway sidings were not targeted?
 7. Section 3.2 – Please can you provide a detailed methodology of how the samples were taken? It is stated within the desk study that there would be 2 cable percussion boreholes and a minimum of 5 dynamically sampled boreholes? As queried in Item 3 what is meant by 'dynamically sampled boreholes'?
 8. Section 3.2 – Please can you provide the borehole logs and associated photos for all sample locations? There should also be included within the report a description of the type of ground encountered, e.g. depth of made ground, description of material encountered, was natural ground proven, depth of borehole / sample location, was groundwater encountered in any of the sample locations etc. This information must be provided and should have been documented within the borehole logs.
 9. Section 5 – It is stated that the gully will be culverted and backfilled, what will it be backfilled with? Was the gully dry during the intrusive site investigation?
 10. Section 6.3 – It is stated in the final paragraph on page 6 that '*a further tranche of C4SLs are in preparation and expected in 2017*', this should be updated to reflect that the report was written in September 2019.
 11. Section 6.4 – It is acknowledged that the sources of the GACs were discussed in section 6.3, however in Table 2 it is not stated which GAC has been used for each determinand, this must be provided.
 12. Section 6.5 – It is stated that the desk study showed minimal risk to controlled waters, however it was stated within the conclusions and recommendation in the desk study that the intrusive investigation would provide groundwater information for the site. Please can you provide a detailed explanation justifying why no further works were undertaken in relation to controlled waters?
 13. There is no discussion within the report of the potential risks posed from ground gases other than it being noted in table 1 in section 6.2. It was stated within the conclusions and recommendations in the desk study that the intrusive investigation would provide gas information for the site. Please can you provide a detailed explanation about why risks from ground gases have not been discussed or investigated within the report or during the intrusive works? Given that there are no borehole logs provided or any

details on the depth of made ground, particularly in the area of the pond, it is not possible to discount ground gas at this stage.

14. Section 6.6 and 6.7 – It is not possible to provide comment on the updated conceptual site model or remediation recommendations until items, detailed above, have been resolved.

Please note that I cannot recommend the discharge of condition 3 until a satisfactory response has been received and approved in writing to the above Items. I look forward to receiving a response in due course in the meantime should you have any queries regarding the above then please contact me on Ext. 8773

.....
Stacey Inglis
Contaminated Land Officer