

**106 GREENFIELD ROAD, HOLMFIRTH
SITE INVESTIGATION SUMMARY**

1. The site is proposed for a residential development, including access road, parking, landscaping and private gardens. ARP was provided with a copy of a Desk Top Study Report (NG8557/GRE), dated April 2014, by JNP Group Consulting Engineers, on behalf of Mr Robert Brook, to which the Client had, or would be, obtaining reliance.
2. In November 2018, ARP Geotechnical Ltd was appointed by H H Services Ltd to undertake a Stage 2 Intrusive Investigation, comprising trial pits to assess the ground conditions. The investigation was carried out on 12th November 2018 and the subsequent report (Stage 2 Geo-environmental Report, HSV/01r1) was issued on 7th December 2019.
3. At the time of the Stage 2 Report, the site was occupied by a detached house at the centre, with private garden, a workshop on the south, and fields to the north and southeast. The site is steeply sloping, with retaining walls present. Archive maps show that the workshop has been present on site since the 1850s. Little Croft has been present since the 1960s. A well is shown in the northwest corner from the 1900s.
4. Geological maps show the site to be underlain by undifferentiated mudstone, siltstone and sandstone of the Marsden Formation on the south, and sandstone of the Guiseley Grit Formation on the north. There are no faults shown to affect the site. The site is not affected by any coal mining.
5. Basic radon protection measures are recommended. There is an old landfill recorded 160m to the southeast, but lines of evidence indicate there is a minimal risk from landfill gas and monitoring is not considered necessary (this is subject to regulatory agreement).
6. The ground investigation revealed made ground only locally, to 1.1m depth in TP7 and 2.1m depth in TP13. Beneath the surface materials, cohesive and granular residual soils (derived from the weathering of bedrock) were identified to between 2.1 m and 3.4m depth, over intact bedrock of sandstone and siltstone. No significant groundwater ingress was encountered during the site investigation.
7. Contamination testing revealed no elevated concentrations of soil contaminants. No remediation measures are considered to be required with respect to ground contamination. With previously developed sites, there is a slight potential that unexpected contamination could be encountered, and in this unlikely event, this would need to be sampled and tested (this is often stipulated automatically as part of a planning condition). The quality of any imported soils will also need to be verified, in accordance with the Method Statement for the Assessment of Imported Soils (included in Appendix F of report HSV/01r1).
8. Strip/trench fill foundations are considered acceptable for the site, with GEN1 concrete applicable, if unreinforced. Soakaways are not considered viable. The existing highway retaining wall along the southern boundary is likely to be require highway authority consultations if any modifications are proposed.
9. For any excavations in close proximity to the site boundaries, the requirements of The Party Wall Act 1996 will need to be observed.
10. The suspected well in the northwest corner may be a pipe or spring-fed cattle trough, and should be addressed as part of the drainage design.