



# Consulting Engineers Ltd.

---

28 Headfield Road, Savile Town, Dewsbury WF12 9JE

Date: 10<sup>th</sup> July 2025

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND ERECTION OF MOT BAY/SERVICE AREA.

LOCATION OF PROPOSAL: WILTON MILLS, 586, BRADFORD ROAD, BATLEY, WF17 8LP

Planning application reference number: 2025/91168

Dear Edward Cheseldine

Please find attached site review with supporting information.

No further site investigation work is required.

I hope that the aforementioned information meets with your requirements and should you require any further information or assistance please do not hesitate to contact the under signed.

Yours sincerely 

Asif Neki BEng (Hons)  
Director

The Institute of Structural Engineers. Member Number: 074453708

AN CONSULTING ENGINEERS LTD.  
COMPANY REG. IN ENGLAND NO. 04727086



**Consultation Response from: KC Environmental Health (Pollution & Noise Control)**

**2023/91489 - Wilton Mills, 586, Bradford Road, Batley, WF17 8LP**

**Discharge of conditions 5 (noise report), 8 (Phase I Report), 9 (Phase II Report) and 10 (Remediation Strategy) on previous permission 2022/93360 for demolition of existing garage and erection of MOT bay/service bay/storage area (within a Conservation Area)**

**Date Responded:**  
16<sup>th</sup> February 2024

**Responding Officer:**  
NH

**Responding Ref:**  
WK/202315961

This response relates to contaminated land conditions only.

**Condition 8 – Phase I Report**

A Phase 1 Geoenvironmental Risk Assessment, authored by MDJA, (dated April 2023, ref: 4293) has been received in support of the application to discharge Condition 8. The report includes geo-technical information, which is outside the remit of Environmental Health, this consultation response therefore only relates to the land contamination aspects of the report.

The report evaluates historical maps dating back to 1890, identifying potential contaminative land uses on and off-site, such as mills, a garage, tram depot, and workshop. While the site walkover date is unclear, provided photographs depict the site adjacent to existing residential areas. The report asserts the absence of visibly contaminated material or distressed vegetation indicating significant contamination. Environmental setting information has also been provided and evaluated.

A preliminary conceptual site model was presented, and several potential pollutant linkages have been identified with a low to moderate risk to receptors. The report recommends further ground investigation involving soil sampling, laboratory analysis, and groundwater and ground gas monitoring.

After reviewing the report, we concur with the need for an intrusive investigation. However, the provided investigation proposals are limited. Future investigations should follow good practice guidance. Despite this, there is adequate information to fulfil the condition's requirements, and we recommend that Condition 8 is discharged.

**Condition 9 – Phase II Report**

No Phase II Report appears to have been received in support of the application to discharge Condition 9 on previous permission 2022/93360. Therefore, Condition 9 should remain until further notice.

**Recommendations**

**Condition 8 – Phase I Report**

We accept the Phase 1 Geoenvironmental Risk Assessment, authored by MDJA, (dated April 2023, ref: 4293) and recommend that Condition 8 is discharged.

**Condition 9 – Phase II Report**

No Phase II Report appears to have been received in support of the application to discharge Condition 9 on previous permission 2022/93360. Therefore, Condition 9 should remain until further notice.

NONE ON SITE

SEE Report NOT NEEDED

NOT NEEDED

SEE BOREHOLE LOGS

SITE

SITE FULLY CLEANED UP. NO RUBBISH ON SITE.

NOT NEEDED

Considering the geological/mining details boreholes were decided to be taken to the base of the Flockton Thin coal seam (shown as up to 1.4m thickness) or to 20m if not encountered.

The works were to be supervised by the Drilling Engineers Mr. S. Fish and Mr I. Wiles, and overseen by the Principal Engineer Mr. M. Lyons.

### 3.2 Interpretation of Findings

Borehole No. 1 proved 0.3m of made ground followed by soft light brown sandstone to 0.8m deep and a thin 0.1m section of **coal** to 0.9m deep. Grey light brown mudstones followed by grey sandstone was then proved to 20m deep with no signs of any other coal seam.

Borehole No. 2 proved 0.5m of made ground followed by light brown/yellow clay to 1.1m deep and a thin 0.1m section of **coal** to 1.2m deep. Grey light brown mudstones followed by grey sandstone was then proved to 20m deep with no signs of any other coal seam.

Borehole No. 3 proved 1.5m of made ground followed by light brown/yellow clay to 1.8m deep (no coal). Grey light brown mudstones followed by grey sandstone was then proved to 20m deep with no signs of any coal seam.

No signs of underground shallow workings or unstable ground were encountered at any of the three borehole locations and no fugitive gases were detected at any point during the drilling operations.

The logs match well which would infer no signs of any geological faulting between the borehole locations.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The geology appears consistent with that conjectured on BGS records in that part of what is believed to be the Flockton Thin coal seam base was encountered in the north, which would infer that the seam has indeed outcropped. The seam will dip away northwards and therefore away from this site, hence no coal seam being encountered within 20m deep. No workable seam is anticipated below the Flockton Thin seam within an influencing depth of the surface (with regard to historic mining void migration), therefore the site will be stable from the shallow mining aspect and no further associated considerations are necessary. As such usual foundations can be considered, suitably designed for the given structure and nature of near surface strata.
- 2) No signs of any mine entries were observed during the investigation, however slight risks are always present within the exposed coalfield for discovering such features. Watching briefs would be prudent during future ground works for any associated signs of either an old mine shaft or adit. The Mining Remediation Authority should be notified where any such feature is suspected.

↑ NORMAL FOUNDATIONS / STEEL FRAME  
ON SITE ELECTED ON PAD

← NONE ON SITE. FOUNDATIONS FINISHED.

NO GAS.



- 3) No fugitive gases were encountered, and given the clay deposits and findings the risk of such to impact on development is considered low.

This report and future development proposals should be submitted to the regulators for their approval prior to any works taking place.

I trust that this satisfies your requirements, however please do not hesitate to contact myself at any time for further clarification or advice.

Yours Sincerely,

M. Lyons  
Consultant Mining Engineer  
BSc Csci MIMMM

Enc.

*THIS SITE INVESTIGATION INTERPRETATIVE REPORT IS BASED ON AND LIMITED TO THE INFORMATION IN MY RECORD AT THE TIME THE ENQUIRY IS ANSWERED. It is based on my professional opinion in line with the guidelines set out in CIRIA C758D – "Abandoned Mine Working Manual." The opinion may be overruled by Government Authorities based on other information not in my record. Further site investigations may be undertaken which would supersede the factual findings of this investigation. Copyright in this report belongs to M.A. Lyons. All rights are reserved and unauthorised use is prohibited. Copyright is not transferred to external parties by possession of this report, however, those for whom the report is compiled have the right to use it. If any unauthorised third party comes into possession of this report, they rely upon it entirely at their own risk and the author does not owe them any Duty of Care or Skill.*

### 5.3 Drilling Log Sheets

Client: Amjid Rashid	Site:Wilton Mills Bradford Road Batley	Cape Site Services unit 2, rear of Castle Buildings Carlton Road, Barnsley, S71 3HX		
Date:1/7/25	Method: water flush	Permit No: 29978		
Driller: Simon Fish		Driller Assistant: Richard Hawkins, J.Doughty		
Drillers Signature:		Page No:1 of 1		

#### Measurements In Meters

BH No:	FROM	TO	THICKNESS	DESCRIPTION
1				
	0	0.3	0.3	Made Ground
	0.3	0.8	0.5	Sandstone light brown soft
	0.8	0.9	0.1	coal
	0.9	15.1	14.2	mudstone grey/light brown with soft bands
	15.1	20	4.9	sandstone Grey
				Borehole sealed upon completion, gas monitored for duration, negative readings
2				
	0	0.5	0.5	Made ground
	0.5	1.1	0.6	clay light brown/yellow
	1.1	1.2	0.1	coal
	1.2	15.5	14.3	mudstone grey/light brown with soft bands
	15.5	20	4.5	sandstone grey
				Borehole sealed upon completion, negative gas readings
3				
	0	1.5	1.5	made ground
	1.5	1.8	0.3	clay light brown/yellow
	1.8	14.8	13	mudstone grey/light brown with soft bands
	14.8	20	5.2	sandstone grey
				Borehole sealed upon completion negative gas readings

NO  
WATER  
in  
Bore Hole's

**Phase 1 Geoenvironmental Risk Assessment**

**WILTON MILLS  
586 BRADFORD ROAD  
BATLEY  
WF17 8LP**

for

**Mr. A. Rashid/Carlinghow Motor Care**

Report Number 4293

April 2023



**Michael D Joyce Associates LLP**  
Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Consultants

Charnock Court 6 South Parade Wakefield West Yorkshire WF1 1LR UK

6.6 Others

None of the following are recorded within 250m of the centre of the study site.

**Waste and Landfill**

Active or recent landfill  
Historical landfill (BGS) records  
Historical landfill (LA/mapping records)  
Historical landfill (EA/NRW records)  
Licensed waste sites  
Waste Exemptions

**Current Industrial Land Use**

Current or recent petrol stations  
Electricity cables  
Gas pipelines  
Sites determined as Contaminated Land  
Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH)  
Regulated explosive sites  
Hazardous substance storage/usage  
Current Historical licensed industrial activities (IPC)  
Licensed industrial activities (Part A(1))  
Radioactive Substance Authorisations  
Licensed Discharges to controlled waters  
Pollutant release to surface waters (Red List)  
Pollutant release to public sewer  
List 1 Dangerous Substances  
List 2 Dangerous Substances  
Pollution inventory waste transfers  
Pollution inventory radioactive waste

No GENERAL  
SOURCE of  
GROUND  
CONTAMINATION.

**7 CONTAMINATED LAND AND INVASIVE PLANTS**

No  
CONTAMINATION  
ON SITE.

7.1 There is no visibly contaminated material on the surface of the site, nor is there any distressed vegetation suggestive of significant or serious contamination.

7.2 The inspection of the site did not indicate any obvious invasive plants. However, the identification of such is outside the expertise of this consultancy and appropriate advice should be sought.

**8 RADON**

8.1 According to the GroundSure Geo-Insight Report the site lies in an area where between 3% and 5% of properties are above the action level recommended by UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA). Basic radon protective measures are therefore required according to the data provided in the GroundSure Report and UKHSA.



No GROUND GAS AFTER

S. I. Report.

RADON PROTECTION NOT NEEDED.

Risk Assessment based on Conceptual Site Model

Summary of Hazards, Pathways and Receptors

Source	Potential Pollutant	Pathways	Receptor	Risk
Vehicle Workshop.  Potential contaminated Made Ground.  Possible past spillages and metals.	Oils, fuels, grease, hydraulic fluid, metals, asbestos.	1 - 5	A. Present Occupants.	Low Risk.
			B. Groundworkers.	Low to Moderate Risk. Personnel to adopt suitable precautions, together with washing facilities.
			C. Future Occupants.	Low Risk for commercial use.
		6	D. Controlled Waters.	Low Risk. On-site monitoring to be undertaken throughout the ground works phases of development shows no adverse effects, the risk will be low.
			E. Ecosystems.	Low Risk.
		7	F. Building Materials and Services.	Low Risk. Install pipes in clean bedding materials. Adequate precautions to be taken in respect of buried concrete.
Organic Material.	Landfill Gases, Radon, VOCs, SVOCs.	8	A - F	Low to Moderate Risk.
Waste materials.	Fly-tipping.			Any waste materials to be removed from site.

All  
 Low  
 Risk

NO FURTHER SITE INVESTIGATION  
 WORK REQUIRED.