

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

**2025/91415 - Shelley Lodge, 2, Box Ings Lane, Shelley, Huddersfield, HD8 0SU**

**Discharge of details reserved by condition 6 (Phase II Report) on previous permission 2021/92355 for alterations and extension to existing stables to create dwelling**

**Date Responded:**  
**15<sup>th</sup> July 2025**

**Responding Officer:**  
**NH**

**Responding Ref:**  
**WK/202518100**

**Condition 6 – Phase II Report**

A Phase 2 Environmental Report authored by RGS (30<sup>th</sup> April 2025, C3044/25/E/7662) has been received in support of the application to discharge Condition 6. 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 intrusive investigation by RGS was undertaken in March 2025. RGS note in the report, 'It should be appreciated that this Phase 2 investigation has been undertaken after the full development of the site. Indeed, the property has been built and is occupied.'

The report further explains that site levels have been reduced, and soils have been 'excavated and replaced locally' and the report reads 'It is not clear how much soil was removed, but in the main most strata remain in situ and no additional soils have been brought onto site.'

The intrusive investigation in March 2025 by RGS included three exploratory locations across the site, the installation and monitoring of three ground gas standpipes and the chemical analysis and assessment of three soil samples against soil screening values.

Topsoil was recorded in all three exploratory holes, underlain by made ground and then sandstone. Chemical analysis confirmed the presence of organic contaminants; however, when compared against the selected screening criteria, RGS conclude that the tested areas are generally suitable for the intended end use.

A previous investigation identified PAH contamination at the site and the results of the recent investigation have been compared to the historic results. RGS comment:

*"The concentrations of PAHs are similar to those detected in TP02 (2022). For reference, the concentration of benzo(a)pyrene in WS01 to WS03 are 0.13 mg/kg, 0.18 mg/kg and 0.79 mg/kg. These results would suggest that the elevated concentrations of benzo(a)pyrene obtained at TP01 (2022) could be considered an anomaly. In any event, the soils at that location (TP01, 2022), and within at least a 3 m radius of the position, have been buried by permanent hardstanding, thus breaking the pathway between source and end-user."*

Gas monitoring was conducted on six visits between 14 March and 17 April 2025, under atmospheric pressures ranging from 1000 mb to 1028 mb. Monitoring took place under falling, steady and rising pressure conditions. Methane and carbon dioxide concentrations peaked at 0.9% v/v and 2.7% v/v respectively. Oxygen levels ranged from 17.1% v/v to 21.1% v/v, and flow peaked at 0.1 l/h. RGS conclude that the site may be classified as Characteristic Situation Level 1, i.e. no ground gas protection measures are considered necessary.

### Comments

We have reviewed the Phase 2 Environmental Report authored by RGS (30<sup>th</sup> April 2025, C3044/25/E/7662) submitted in support of the application to discharge Condition 6. At present, we do not accept the report and recommend that Condition 6 remain in place until further notice. The following points require clarification:

The report, particularly the conceptual site model and risk assessment, reads as though the development is still incomplete. However, it is clear from other sections that the property has already been constructed and occupied. Despite this, RGS have not recommended any further investigation. However, there is a lack of clarity regarding the nature and volume of material that was excavated or introduced to the site during development. There was also known contamination previously identified which additional testing has not focused on. In such circumstances, we would expect a high-resolution ground investigation to confirm the absence or presence of contamination. The chemical testing of only three soil samples does not provide sufficient confidence, given the level of uncertainty at this point.

The report states: *'At this site, the readings undertaken to date were at atmospheric pressures of between 991mb and 1010mb.'* However, the accompanying table and gas monitoring records indicate that no readings were taken below 1000mb. This discrepancy is not in line with good practice guidance and suggests that either some data are missing, or the stated pressure range may be incorrect.

Given these points, we recommend that Condition 6 remain in place until further clarification is provided. At which point, we recommend additional consultation with Environmental Health.

### Recommendations

#### **Condition 6 – Phase II Report**

We have reviewed the Phase 2 Environmental Report authored by RGS (30<sup>th</sup> April 2025, C3044/25/E/7662) submitted in support of the application to discharge Condition 6. At present, we do not accept the report and recommend that Condition 6 remain in place until further notice.