

Consultation Response from KC Environmental Health – Pollution & Noise Control		
2019/91279		
106 Greenfield Road, Holmfirth, HD9 2LP		
Discharge of conditions 7, 14, 15, 16 & 17 on previous application 2015/94106 for outline application for erection of 8 dwellings and demolition of existing dwelling		
Date Responded: 5th June 2019	Responding Officer: Joanne Cooper	Responding Ref: WK/201910269
Investigations into land contamination on this site have been undertaken alongside other geo-environmental surveys. They have been carried out as a due diligence procedure and not under recommendation from the Environmental Health department at Kirklees Council. The initial Environmental Health consultation response into the planning application 2015/94106 for the erection of 8 dwellings and demolition of one existing dwelling did not include pre-commencement conditions for the investigation of land contamination as there was no risk identified. I have reviewed the following three reports which relate the discharge of Condition 14: CLC6 Reporting of Unexpected Contamination. • Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report by ARP Geotechnical Ltd. on behalf of H H Services Ltd. for 106 Greenfield Road, Holmfirth (Ref: HSV/01r1) dated 7th December 2018. • Method Statement for Assessment of Imported Soils by ARP Geotechnical Ltd. on behalf of H H Services Ltd. for 106 Greenfield Road, Holmfirth (Ref: HSV/01imp) dated 7th December 2018. • Desk Top Study Report (NG8557/GRE) by JNP Group Consulting Engineers dated April 2014, which is referred to in the Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report by ARP Geotechnical Ltd. This response for discharge of condition 14 as it relates to land contamination is based on the information supplied by ARP Geotechnical Ltd. The Desk Top Study Report (Phase I) has been referred to in the ARP Stage 2 Report and is listed here for reference only. I am satisfied that the investigations carried out on site have sufficiently covered any concerns the developers have for land contamination and that the sampling strategy from the 13 trial pits is more than adequate for a site of this size and nature. The information supplied in the aforementioned reports is a true representation of the investigations carried out on site and show that there are no contaminants of concern. The Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report does recommend the need for basic radon protection as the area the development is situated in is classified as “intermediate probability” for the presence of radon ground gas. This has been covered in Section 4.9 of that report which states: “No radon protective measures are stated to be necessary for new dwellings or extensions on the site. However, the site is in an intermediate probability radon area. In these circumstances of apparent conflict, it may be prudent to assume basic radon protection is		

required, to prevent conveyancing difficulties. This is normally achieved by incorporating a radon barrier within a solid floor system, and extending the barrier through the cavity wall.”

I am satisfied that the radon protection detailed in this report will provide sufficient protection for future residents of these properties and recommend that the protective barrier be installed in accordance with the details from the aforementioned report.

Imported Soils

The aforementioned document titled Method Statement for Assessment of Imported Soils refers to the methods for verifying imported soils as laid out in the guidance provided by Yorkshire and Lincolnshire Pollution Advisory Council (YALPAG): "Guidance on the Verification Requirements for Cover Systems".

If imported soils are to be brought onto site for gardens and other soft landscaped areas then they shall be tested and verified in accordance with the YALPAG guidance and as stated in Section 3 of the Method Statement for Imported Soils report produced by ARP Geotechnical Ltd.