

Online Comment

Application H03-1158-21
Location Railway Cottage Counter Drain Drove Tongue End PE11 3JH
Proposal Details relating to contamination & pollution (Condition 7 of H03-0915-20)

Name Sue Armour
Address Environmental Protection Officer SHDC

Date Submitted 15-12-21
For/Against Comments

I have reviewed the Trentside Geotechnical Testing 'Geotechnical Summary Report Railway Cottage, Counter Drain Drove, Tongue End, Spalding' Ref TGT3174-ENV dated 30th July 2021 submitted in respect of condition 7 of H03-0915-20.

Please could the following points be clarified?

- When was a site walkover undertaken and by whom? What were their observations? Have those observations been used to inform the conceptual model?
- How was the factual desk study information, presented in appendix A, used to develop the conceptual model?
- How was the factual desk study information used to inform the testing suite? Were any specific contaminants of concern identified?
- Section 4.2 presents an 'updated conceptual model', what was this updated from?

When considering potential pollutant linkages 1, 2, 9 & 10 it is noted that 'Ground is close to virgin. No structure has been built on site. Site appears to have had occasional inhabitation and is in close proximity to farm land so samples should be tested.' Please could you clarify how this relates to the past use as railway land, the previous dwelling and signal box on site, and the 2.1m of made ground soils recorded?

Would the author like to revise those linkages (5, 6, 15, 16) making reference to Head, London Clay and the secondary aquifer?

Potential pollutant linkage 17 indicates a moderate potential risk from asbestos and it is noted 'Given the age of the adjacent existing building structures asbestos containing material may be present within the building fabric and surrounding sub soils' Please could this be related back to the site walkover? What are the adjacent buildings and could their use impact on the sites' suitability for use?

Potential pollutant linkages 21, 22, 23 & 24 relate to ground gas and have a consequence of 'moderate to low' yet no investigation was undertaken. Please clarify this, along with the reasoning behind no. 22 - migration of methane off site to adjacent buildings (medium/likely = moderate) being excluded from further consideration.

- How was the factual desk study information used to determine the sampling strategy?
 - Does the applicant feel the sampling strategy adequately characterises the site? Both in terms of the number of sampling locations and their distribution. Were any of the sampling points targeted based on the factual desk study information or to high exposure areas?
- I'm pleased to note that the four samples selected for chemical testing do seem reasonable for inclusion in a residential setting. However without clarification on those points raised above, it is not possible to ascertain if the right samples, from the right places, have been considered. I am therefore not able to recommend discharge of condition 7 of H03-0915-20 at the current time.