

Gedney, Oliver

From: Grant, David
Sent: 02 November 2021 14:09
To: _planningadvice
Subject: FW: H16-0935-20 Horseshoe Road
Attachments: We sent you safe versions of your files; 0756-4 Plot 1 Horseshoe Road Spalding - V R November 2021-signed (1).pdf

Please add this email and attachment to the DIP under 6SUP – Validation Report – Plot 1.

Many thanks,

David Grant | Senior Planning Officer | **South Holland District Council**

Direct Dial: 01775 764472

www.sholland.gov.uk

Please note that any informal officer opinion expressed by this email is without prejudice and is not binding on the Council during the consideration of any formal application.



served by One Team

From: G R MERCHANT LTD <grmerchant.arch.cons@gmail.com>
Sent: 02 November 2021 12:16
To: Grant, David <dgrant@sholland.gov.uk>
Cc: Armour, Susan <Susan.Armour@breckland-sholland.gov.uk>
Subject: H16-0935-20

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

This message originated from outside your organization

Dear David & Sue,

Please find attached the Validation Report for Plot 1 Horseshoe Road.

Hopefully this now satisfies the condition compliance ap[plication and we await for approval.

Regards

Sarah

G R Merchant Ltd

01406 490800

www.grmerchantltd.com



**PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT
PLOT 1 HORSESHOE ROAD
SPALDING
LINCS**

**PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT
PLOT 1 HORSESHOE ROAD
SPALDING
LINCS**

VERIFICATION REPORT

Report Ref.: 0756/4

Prepared by

D Sargeant

D Sargeant

Date

November 2021

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.	LIMITATIONS	5
3.	LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY SETTING	6
4.	SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION	7
5.	REMEDIATION RECOMMENDATIONS Reproduced from the Phase 2 & 3 Reports and Letter GEL/SHDC dated 22 June 2021)	8
6.	INSPECTION	10
7.	VERIFICATION	11
8.	CONCLUSIONS	12

FIGURES

- Figure 1 Site Location Plan

APPENDIX 1

- Imported Topsoil Delivery Note – Ref 112605

APPENDIX 2

- Plate 1 - Image to Show Reduced Level Excavation Including Membrane
- Plate 2 - Image To Show Restored Level - A
- Plate 3 - Image To Show Restored Level - B

APPENDIX 3

- British Sugar Chemical Laboratory Test Report – Imported Soils

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
PLOT 1 HORSESHOE ROAD
SPALDING
LINCS

1. INTRODUCTION

BLM Builders Ltd (the Client) proposes to redevelop a plot of land [known as 'Plot 1', and hereafter referred to as 'The Site'] at the above address to a residential end use.

A site location plan (reproduced from the RMS [Phase 3] report) has been included as Figure 1 towards the back of this Verification Report (VR) to assist the reader.

A Phase 2 Investigation report was prepared and issued by this Author, the content of which was subsequently approved by the Local Planning Authority, who also required that the referred Phase 2 investigation be carried out.

It is recommended that this VR is read in conjunction with the previously issued report(s) referred above including the LPA-Approved Remediation Method Statement, dated March 2021.

1.2 Additional Information

The Phase 2 report showed that soils within the site had been locally and variously impacted by a limited number of PAH congeners, which exceeded the respective 'S4UL' value at relatively shallow depth (i.e. <600mm), thus identifying a need for mitigating action and hence according to the planning regime, leading to the need for the preparation of the Remediation Method Statement (RMS) dated March 2021, which provided details of how the risk posed by the referred raised determinant concentrations is to be managed (i.e. remediated) such that the site can be considered 'suitable for use' by the LPA.

BLM Builders imported 'topsoil' into Plot 1 the quality of which was queried by the Regulator [SHDC] who requested that further testing should be carried out. This was done in June 2021 and the results were communicated to SHDC in a letter dated 22 June 2021. The additional analysis showed one sample, from the front garden of Plot 1, exceeded the guidance for lead and PAHs and therefore required replacement. The replacement source was chosen as British Sugar, which was acceptable to the Regulator. This VR confirms and documents the remedial works associated with this aspect of the site.

2. LIMITATIONS

This Verification Report (VR) is for the sole reliance and use of the Client. Any Third Party coming into possession of this report relies on it at their risk, unless written permission is expressly sought from, and provided by, Goldfinch Environmental Limited. The author owes them no duty of care and skill. Goldfinch Environmental Ltd accepts no responsibility or liability for the consequences of this document being used for purposes other than that for which it was commissioned and the assessments provided herein should not be relied on as a legal opinion.

The findings and opinions expressed are relevant to the time of the site visit and information review and should not be relied upon to represent conditions at substantially later dates. The assessments and opinions given in this report are based upon information available at the time of the report. Where additional information comes available which may affect or identify a need to review our conclusions or assessments we request the opportunity (and reserve the right), to review the information and where warranted, modify our assessment / opinion in part or wholly, accordingly.

This VR does not include any geotechnical considerations pertaining to the site as these were outside the agreed brief.

The recommendations given in this report are based on guidance and best practice in place at the time of issue of the report, the information available at the time of the investigation, the nature of the indicated proposed development and associated end user behaviour patterns. Should any of the foregoing change at any time, then this report should be reviewed in the context of proposed changes.

This report has been based upon the construction details, layout drawings and pattern of occupancy/usage provided by the Client and/or their Agent. Where these details are subject to change either by the commissioning Party (Client), (or a subsequent owner where a site is 'sold-on'), then this report will need to be reviewed and amended accordingly in the light of any such proposed design changes. It is the responsibility of the commissioning Party(-ies) to ensure our Office is provided with this information. It is (reasonably) anticipated that this review would be required by the Planning Authority.

This VR report is for the sole reliance and use of the Client, any Third Party coming into possession of this report relies on it at their own risk, unless written permission is expressly sought from Goldfinch Environmental Limited. The author owes them no duty of care and skill.

The recommendations given in this report are based on the information available at the time of preparation of this VR (mainly the outcome of the Phase 1 and 2 and RMS reports recently approved by the LPA), the nature of the indicated proposed development and associated end user behaviour patterns. Should these proposals change at any time these reports and this RMS should be reviewed accordingly in the context of the proposed change(s).

3. LEGISLATIVE & REGULATORY SETTING.

The Environmental Protection Act of 1990 created the framework for the identification and remediation of contaminated land. The Act defines “contaminated land” as any land, which appears by the Local Authority to be “in such a condition, by reason of substances, in, on, or under the land that significant harm is being caused or there is significant possibility of such harm being caused, or, pollution of Controlled Waters is being, or is likely to be, caused”.

Land potentially affected by ‘contamination’ is a material consideration for planning purposes together with its relationship with ‘regulatory intervention’ (Part IIa), and ‘voluntary’ investigation (which includes redevelopment of sites which may be affected by contamination). The Model Procedures (CLR-11, Environment Agency 2004), provide a generic framework indicating key technical activities applicable in each of these contexts.

The management of land contamination broadly comprises three components, which are identified as ‘Risk assessment’, ‘Options appraisal’ and ‘Implementation’. These, in turn, determine if any *unacceptable* risks exist, ascertain the most appropriate remediation strategy for the site and, finally, demonstrate that the strategy will be effective.

In accordance with this and other current guidance, where a ‘land quality’ risk assessment is required each ‘Relevant Pollutant Linkage’ (RPL, formerly referred to as “source-pathway-receptor” framework), is separately identified and a level of risk attached. This is documented in the form of a ‘Conceptual Model’.

The outcome of the assessment of established, plausible relevant pollutant linkages is used to determine qualitatively the need for further investigation, or remediation with ensuing mitigation of the determined unacceptable risk. (In accordance with the Model Procedures and Regulatory preference, detailed remedial measures should be provided in a separate phase).

The risk assessment takes account of the local environment, end user behaviour patterns, and the nature of the development in relation to proven ‘unacceptable’ risk. This is the approach advocated by current guidance and therefore has been adopted in the assessment of this site.

4. SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site comprised a subrectangular plot of land on the southern side of the public highway (Horseshoe Road), Spalding, Lincs..

Approximate Grid Reference ⁵22651, ³21504 refers.

At the time of the site visit [which was required as part of the preparation of this Verification Report] Plot 1 was near completion and the garden area shown [shaded] on Figure 1 had been capped with a layer of imported cover soils from the LPA-Approved source but essentially there were no notable changes to the site.

5. REMEDIATION RECOMMENDATIONS (Reproduced from the Phase 2 & 3 Reports and Letter to SHDC dated 22 June 2021)

5.1 Land Contamination - Soils.

5.2 Overview.

The referred instances of contamination [WS1 and WS2] reported in the Phase 2 document and V4 in the letter dated 22 June 2021 have been shown on the proposed site layout in Figure 1 [titled 'Plan To Show Areas Proposed For 'British Sugar' Remediation] towards the back of this VR.

One soil sample (WS1) was shown to be coincident with private garden areas or soft landscaping at the rear of the site. The Reader should note a second soil sample (WS2) while exceeding guidance criteria was within a proposed hard cover area thus not requiring soil replacement as the management strategy was capping the location with permanent hard cover. No further referral to this location is made within this VR as it has only been included for the purposes of completeness.

The Phase 2 Report provided outline options for consideration to mitigate the current 'unacceptable' risk to End User human health within proposed gardens and soft landscaped areas which comprised:~

1. Replacement of the affected soils (in garden and soft landscaped areas only.).
2. Capping of the affected areas with a permanent physical barrier thus breaking the pollutant linkage between the contamination source (soils) and receptor (End User).
3. A combination of 1 and 2 above based upon the proposed layout for the development.

5.3 Risk Management Options.

5.3.1 Site Constraints Affecting Choice of Remedial Option / Strategy.

Figure 2 towards the back of this RMS shows the area(s) proposed for remediation (shaded blue and green), which are coincident with private garden area(s) in the completed scheme.

5.3.2 Remediation Method - Soil Replacement.

Given the distribution of the proven contaminant(s) and contaminant type(s), the relatively small area of 'concern', and following discussions with the Client, it was proposed that a clean cover ('Cover System'), of compliant (imported) soils was to be provided in the proposed private garden areas to provide a depth of approximately 600mm relative to finished topographic levels.

A [white/black] terram membrane could be placed as a 'marker' layer at the interface

between the residual surfaces and the imported compliant soils to prevent mixing and 'inadvertent' exposure to the underlying contaminated soils by 'enthusiastic' gardening activities.

This would be achieved by removing 600mm of the existing soils and replacement with 600mm of clean imported soils in the affected areas.

At the time of issue of this RMS the proposed source for these imported soils was British Sugar. In accordance with best practice, the Supplier provided a certificate of chemical analysis to allow assessment of the suitability of the candidate import soils for the proposed end use in the Cover System. A copy of this has been included in Appendix 3 towards the back of this RMS.

This data has been compared to current guidance values and is considered to pose a negligible risk to human health and therefore is considered 'suitable for use' in the referred cover system.

5.4 Management of Arisings.

The arising soils may be *temporarily* stored on a membrane nearby until removed off site and where this is the case, it is recommended that they are covered to mitigate run-off and mobilisation of contamination by percolating rainfall. Where this takes place it is the responsibility of the Developer to ensure materials designated as 'contaminated' are not mixed with 'uncontaminated' materials or redistributed in other parts of the site without prior LPA-approval.

Consideration may be given to reusing the contaminated soils where changes in site levels can be accommodated. These arising soils may be reused under areas, which are to be capped with a permanent physical barrier, e.g. driveways, parking areas and roads, buildings.

It is recommended that any uncontrolled movement of soil or water beyond the site boundaries is recorded and investigated. Appropriate corrective and preventive action to prevent recurrence is also recommended.

5.6 Concluding Comments To Section 5.

On completion of the remediation, verification information will be required which will include the results of the validation observations together with any landfill receipts for materials removed from site.

6. INSPECTION.

A visit to the site was made at the stages of

1. Removal of the unsuitable soils and placement of the membrane.
2. Delivery and commencement of backfilling with compliant soils.
3. Completion of remediation to obtain depth check measurements.

This information is shown in Plate 1 – 3 inclusive in Appendix 2 towards the back of this VR.

6.1 Importation of Soils.

This Author can confirm that the affected area(s) has been capped with a cover of clean soils from the approved source (British Sugar), which followed removal of approximately 600mm of the existing soils the net result being no change in the pre- and post- remedial topographic levels at the site.

7. VERIFICATION

7.1 Overview

Validation information regarding soil import e.g. the delivery note has been supplied by the Client and forwarded to the Environmental Engineer (EE). This has been included in Appendix 1 towards the back of this VR.

The unsuitable soils have been removed off site [Plot 1] to another location within the wider Application area and temporarily stored on a membrane. This material will either be removed off site under Duty of Care or considered for sustainable reuse in the wider Application area to assist in restoration of levels. This Author has advised that this material should not be reused within the surficial 600mm of the soil profile [relative to proposed finished levels] in proposed garden and soft landscaped areas but may be reused [environmentally] under areas of permanent hard cover. [It is understood that soil importation will be required across the wider Application area to compensate for 'low-levels'].]

8. CONCLUSIONS

BLM Builders Ltd (the Client) proposes to redevelop a plot of land at the above address to a residential end use.

Phase 1, Phase 2 Investigation and Remediation Method Statement documents were prepared and issued by this Author, the contents of which were subsequently approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Taking a risk-based approach as required by the Planning Regime and current guidance, this Author can confirm that as a result of the soil replacement works that have been carried out at the site and verified in this document the pre-existing **Low-Medium** risk can be reduced to **Negligible to Low** thus the site can be considered suitable for residential development.

This VR and its content are subject to the approval of the Regulator, which should be sought as part of the application to discharge the relevant planning condition(s).

FIGURES

Approximate Site Location



Figure 1

Ref: 0756/4

Site Location Plan

Goldfinch
Environmental
Ltd

APPENDIX 1

Imported Topsoil Delivery Note – Ref 112605

112605



RORY J. HOLBROOK LTD

HAULAGE, TIPPER & PLANT HIRE

Roudham Road East Harling Attleborough Norfolk NR16 2QN

Transport Office: 01953 718306 or 01953 718506

Fax: 01953 718403

Accounts and Admin: 01953 718315



DATE: 13/9/21

NAME OF OPERATOR

S DAVEY - SMITH

TYPE OF PLANT AND NUMBER

8X4 GRAB

SN212W0

NAME AND
ADDRESS OF HIRER

BRETT

SPALDING.

LEALANDS

HORSESHOE ROAD

Day & Date	Description of Work or Hired Plant	Wrkg	Stndg	Trav
	1 LOAD OF TOPSOIL / LANDSCAPE	20		
TOTALS				

The hirer or his agent upon signing the plant sheet implies acceptance of conditions of hire as printed overleaf.

Mileage

Signature

WHITE - Customer Copy YELLOW - Office Copy BLUE - Delivery Copy PINK - File Copy

APPENDIX 2

Soil Replacement Plates 1-3



Plate 1	Image to Show Reduced Level Excavation Including Membrane	Goldfinch Environmental Limited
Ref: 0756/4		



Plate 2	Image To Show Restored Level - A	Goldfinch Environmental Limited
Ref: 0756/4		



Plate 3	Image To Show Restored Level - B	Goldfinch Environmental Limited
Ref: 0756/4		

APPENDIX 3

British Sugar Chemical Laboratory Test Report – Imported Soils

