

Consultation Response from: KC Environmental Health (Pollution & Noise Control)
2023/93094 - land at, Bradley Villa Farm, Bradley Road, Bradley, Huddersfield, HD2 2JX
Discharge of conditions 24 (Remediation Strategy), 30 (external materials), 34 (foul water pumping station) and 35 (drainage infrastructure in green belt) of previous permission 2021/92086 for erection of 277 residential dwellings and associated infrastructure and access
Date Responded:
13th December 2023
Responding Officer:
NH
Responding Ref:
WK/202337984

Conditions 30, 34 and 35 are outside the remit of Environmental Health.

Condition 24 – Remediation Strategy

A Gas Risk Assessment, dated 31st January 2021 (ref: 041/3319/MJT/AGT) and Earthworks Specification report, dated April 2022 (ref: 3319/3) authored by Lithos have been received in support of discharging Condition 24. The report includes geotechnical information, which is outside the remit of Environmental Health, this consultation response therefore only relates to the land contamination aspects of the report.

Gas Risk Assessment, dated 31st January 2021 (ref: 041/3319/MJT/AGT)

The report states that land north of the site is underlain by former underground coal workings, which likely extend beneath the site, hence the requirement for monitoring. Monitoring wells were installed in 13 boreholes, with response zones located in mudstone and coal strata. The report states that over a three-month period from October 2020 to January 2021, six monitoring visits were conducted. However, data from 12 visits appear to have been reported in the appended information. Atmospheric pressures during the monitoring programme ranged from 985mb to 1048mb.

Methane was not detected in any boreholes on any occasion. The maximum carbon dioxide concentration recorded was 6.5% v/v. The minimum oxygen concentration reported was 2.3%v/v, and the highest flow rate detected was 20.4 l/h. The report expands on the depleted oxygen concentrations and carbon dioxide concentrations encountered and considers the likely source to of hazardous gas at this site to be gases from coal workings and blackdamp.

Considering the findings, the report recommends the installation of ground gas protection measures for an Amber 1 site. While presenting various options, the report suggests a score of 3.5 as necessary. The conclusion of the report outlines proposals for verification.

Having read the report we make the following comments that require clarification and/or additional information.

1. The report outlines the methodology adopted for the ground gas monitoring, detailing 6 visits over a 3-month period. However, a discrepancy appears to exist as the data sheets provided are for 12 visits. Notably, the appended information reveals several omissions:
 - On visit 2 (12/10/2020) only 6 boreholes (PH101, PH104, PH105, PH106, PH109 and PH113) were monitored.
 - On visit 4 (29/10/2020) only 1 borehole (PH105) was monitored.
 - On visit 6 (12/11/2020) only 1 borehole (PH101) was monitored.

- On visit 8 (01/12/2020) only 1 borehole (PH105) was monitored.
- On visit 10 (17/12/2020) only 2 boreholes (PH105 and PH109) were monitored.
- On visit 12 (12/01/2021) only 2 boreholes (PH106 and PH109) were monitored.

The rationale behind these omissions from the report remains unclear, and we request clarification on this point.

2. The report does not provide any commentary on the refuse tip 100m West of the site. In addition. The monitoring sheets show variations in both flow data and encountered carbon dioxide levels and adds that there is the potential for future increases in carbon dioxide concentrations attributed to blackdamp from mine workings.

Given the omitted data, the sensitivity of end-use, proximity to infilled land, and the identified gas issue on site, we find it imperative to provide additional commentary on this matter. Furthermore, we do not agree with the assessment of low generation source potential as presented in the report for these reasons.

For these reasons, we do not accept the Gas Risk Assessment authored by Lithos, dated 31st January 2021 (ref: 041/3319/MJT/AGT) at this stage and recommend that Condition 24 remains until further notice.

Earthworks Specification report, dated April 2022 (ref: 3319/3)

The report outlines an anticipated regrade of the site to facilitate the construction of the attenuation pond and attenuation tank, along with geotechnical criteria for fill materials. However, the report does not appear confirm how any imported materials will be confirmed as suitable for the intended use from a human health aspect. Additionally, the Geoenvironmental Appraisal (report no 3319/1) presented limited sampling and chemical analysis for shallow soils (0-0.30m). If the applicant intends to repurpose these subsoils as part of the earthworks, testing will be imperative for the subsoils to confirm they are suitable for re-use.

While we acknowledge the information provided in the report, we request supplementary details regarding the proposed earthworks, particularly concerning the verification process for imported materials and the plans for any site-won subsoils. For these reasons, we recommend that Condition 24 remains until further notice.

Recommendation

Condition 24 – Remediation Strategy

We recommend that Condition 24 remain until further notice. As highlighted in our comments, the applicant must provide supplementary information on the above points before we can reconsider our position. This is essential to ensure unacceptable risks to human health and the environment are identified and removed, and to ensure that the development is safely completed in accordance with the requirements of Policy LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.