

From: Matthew Phillips
Sent: 31 October 2017 15:47
To: planning_admin
Subject: FW: P/2017/0771 - Former Fire Station Bradley Rd

Contaminated land comments

From: Angela Guy
Sent: 31 October 2017 14:25
To: Matthew Phillips
Subject: RE: P/2017/0771 - Former Fire Station Bradley Rd

Matthew

Having reviewed the Brownfield Solutions Ltd 'Geo-Environmental Assessment Report' dated March 2017 I have the following comments.

1. 3.4.6. It is stated that the three buildings on the site in 1912 were 'County Buildings', however this reference is for the buildings to the north east on what was formerly the Barracks. This is evident on the later 1968/70 map.
2. In developing the initial preliminary CSM there does not appear to have been a site visit, were potential contamination concerns visible on the site?
3. 5.2.2 There is no explanation of the position of the window sample locations, although it appears that WS1, WS5 and TH1 are in the vicinity of the former railway sidings and could therefore be indicative of ground affected by that former use, particularly as ash was identified in WS1. Further discussion of this and possibly overlaying of mapping to indicate sample positions in relation to the potential contaminated ground is required.
4. There is no explanation of the testing suite chosen. It is noted that the only hydrocarbons tested are speciated PAHs and phenols. The DOE Industry Profiles identifies fuel oils, lubricating oils and creosote, as potential contaminants that could be present and therefore other hydrocarbon analyses would be expected. The Profile also details other contaminants which could be present too that have not been covered by the testing suite. This issue requires further consideration.
5. The results of the chemical testing are not provided in sufficient detail, for instance there is no discussion on the horizons and depths that samples were collected from, what they are representative of, what the results are in relation to their actual screening levels (it is noted Appendix L does provide a summary on the type of screening levels but this alone is not sufficient for the interpretation of the results), and whether they are considered to be representative of likely ground conditions across the site (this could include statistical analysis).
6. I am in general agreement that the gas risks (based on information provided to date) are likely to be low and note that the risk assessment is yet to be completed and reported on. I would recommend that when it is complete the fact that basic radon protection is required is taken into account in forming any conclusions in regard to protection measures required. In addition based on the contamination identified to date and the proposed drainage measures and hardstanding at the site, the controlled waters risk assessment is likely to be sufficient (this is dependent on the outstanding matters in 2-6 being resolved).

In conclusion I would recommend that the standard conditions recommended by Helen (ZP01B and ZP02A) are still applied to the permission (if granted), so as to ensure the comments (2 – 6 above) are addressed.

Please note I have not provided comments on the geotechnical and radon aspects on the report as this is beyond 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/cynngorwrecsam

From: Matthew Phillips

Sent: 30 October 2017 09:32

To: Paul Sleeman

Subject: P/2017/0771 - Former Fire Station Bradley Rd

Paul,

The above application is the one I spoke to you about last week. The applicants had questioned whether the contamination conditions were needed in light of the Ge-Environmental Assessment that had been submitted, which I don't think Helen had reviewed.

I have had a quick look at the document myself and it does recommended some further works on page 34.

I need to get the application put through to Dave today or tomorrow as I am off Wednesday-Friday this week and it will go beyond the 8 week date if I wait to speak to Helen next week. All I really need confirming is whether the condition is still needed or not. Is this something you'd be able to do. If not then I will ask the applicants for an extension of time.

Matthew