DC Admin

From:
Sent: 01 December 2025 17:16
To: Pollution
Cc: David Shepherd; Mathias Franklin; Lee Stoney; Martin Wood; Farzana Tabasum; Cllr Kath Pinnock; Cllr Andrew Pinnock; Cllr John Lawson;
Subject: Re: URGENT: Technical Contradictions & Failure to Provide Statutory Risk Assessments regarding Westgate Site

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have read the new application documents alongside the earlier Lithos GRA. Fortunately I know the planning portal exceptionally well and can locate documents quickly. I am also blessed with reading comprehension. The picture you have set out in your email is not just incomplete, it is materially wrong.

I do not skim these documents, I forensically examine them word for word, line for line. I then research extensively to broaden my understanding and, if in doubt, ask experts. Having worked in the specification industry for a number of years I do have my go to people. The professional view I am getting back is one of disbelief and concern. They are frankly amazed by what has been signed off and are watching closely.

The narrative you have presented does not withstand comparison with the technical evidence on your own file. You now have contradictory reports on your portal.

Let us start with Lithos, shall we?

1. Lithos' gas assessment is not just inadequate it is engineered to downplay risk

Your email states that Environmental Health is "satisfied that the information adequately addresses risks to both on site and off site receptors." That statement is untenable and my challenge to you is simple: show me. Show me where we are mentioned or assessed. Name the report.

The Lithos gas assessment contains serious deviations from standard practice:

a) Split VOC and SVOC out in the GRA specifically to downgrade the risk rating: Lithos treat Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and Semi Volatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) as if they operate independently, when in reality they contribute cumulative vapour risk in made ground of this age and depth. Separating them has the very convenient effect of keeping the overall Characteristic Situation artificially low. That approach contradicts CIRIA C665 (the authoritative UK guidance on ground gas) which requires cumulative worst case assessment, not disaggregation designed to soften the outcome.

b) Excluded my community at every stage: Across all Lithos submissions there is no vapour / gas assessment for existing homes, no plume modelling towards Quarry Road, no pathways considered

beneath existing foundations, and no monitoring wells anywhere near existing receptors. Lithos have assessed future residents only. Existing residents, the closest and most exposed receptors, are treated as if they do not exist.

c) CO_2 exceedances in Area C have been quietly neutralised: Area C recorded CO_2 exceedances which in any standard assessment would trigger additional investigation or a higher Characteristic Situation. Instead Lithos modelled CO_2 using assumptions designed to minimise generation, restricted gas generation to shallow made ground only, and ignored deeper ground conditions and the potential for gas to accumulate and move laterally. This is not risk led modelling. It is value led modelling.

d) Language allowing even further value engineering: Lithos' own remediation wording, for example "do not move Area A soils" unless they choose to, in which case "record where they have been placed", is a transparent example of engineered flexibility. This benefits Strata, not public safety, very much in line with the whole design I may add.

2. Your portrayal of ground conditions is contradicted by the site's own data

Your email relies on the idea that deep made ground "does not extend" to Quarry Road, that piling conditions which create off site gas risk "are not present", that gas would "vent upwards", and that there is "no basis" for off site gas assessment.

Each of these is contradicted by the actual ground model:

• Area C comprises significant depths of made ground and quarry infill, not shallow localised pockets.

• That infilled ground extends towards Quarry Road and is at the same foundation level as existing houses.

• The underlying strata are designated a Secondary A aquifer, rendering your "upwards venting" theory untenable, as groundwater flow can drive lateral migration.

• Borehole logs and N values show voided, heterogeneous, unpredictable ground, exactly the type where lateral migration can occur.

On top of this, the later Sirius trial pits and boreholes show in detail what this ground is made of. Those logs record multiple groundwater strikes and consistent bands of medium plasticity clays across the trial pits, overlying and interbedded with made ground comprising ash, clinker, brick, concrete and other demolition and industrial wastes. In simple terms there is a combination of gas generating materials beneath lower permeability clays and groundwater. That is exactly the kind of stratigraphy that can cap upward movement and force gases to migrate sideways under and through the ground, including beneath existing properties. The extent and detail of the Sirius investigation make it impossible to claim ignorance of these conditions. The data shows a complex, gas generating ground profile extending towards Quarry Road, not a shallow, benign surface layer where gas will conveniently disperse upwards. Heterogeneous made ground does not eliminate pathways, it creates complex and unpredictable ones.

3. Statutory piling, gas migration, vibration and settlement assessments remain absent

You have still not produced:

• A piling gas migration risk assessment.

• A vibration risk assessment for existing homes.

• A settlement / lateral displacement assessment.

• A construction phase gas monitoring strategy.

• Any assessment of rigid inclusion effects adjacent to existing foundations.

Piling deeper than existing house foundations into voided quarry infill without these assessments is indefensible.

4. Environmental Health cannot redefine its remit to avoid inconvenient duties

You cannot reduce core environmental and public safety obligations to matters “outside your remit.” Environmental Health had and retains a non delegable duty to ensure that contamination, gas migration, dust / fibre exposure, and structural risk were properly assessed before approval and before high risk works. Those duties were not met.

5. Closing position

Nothing in your email alters the requirements set out in my letter of 26 November, and nothing you have provided meets the standard of evidence based assurance required on a site of this complexity and contamination.

I need a response based on actual technical evidence, not dismissive platitudes with no basis in fact.

Until you provide that, my formal 14 day notice remains fully in effect.

Yours sincerely,