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

2025/92161 Land adjacent to 17 Whitehall Road West, Birkenshaw, BD11 2LS

Discharge of details reserved by conditions 4-8 (intrusive investigations), 11 (Remediation Strategy and Verification Report), 12 (CEMP), 13 (noise), 14 (Arboricultural Method Statement), 15 (CMP), 16 (highway), 17 (visibility), 18 (Safety Audit), 19 (estate streets), 20 (waste collection), 21 (surface water attenuation), 24 (bin storage), 25 (bicycle storage), 26 (drainage), 28 (drainage), 29 (CEMP: Biodiversity),-30 (landscape), 34 (solar panel array), 35 (materials), 38 (boundary treatments) on previous permission 2024/92281 for erection of 23 dwellings

Responding Date:	**Responding Officer:**	**Responding Ref:**
26th November 2025	**SR**	**WK202536791**

Comments

This response is in relation to contaminated land conditions 7 and 8 only, Environmental Health do not comment on geotechnical aspects of any reports. In our earlier response dated the 22nd of September 2025, we commented on a Combined Stage 1/Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report by ARP, ref: ORH/20r1, dated the 11th of August 2023 and the letter by APR Geotechnical ltd, ref: ORH/20/AJjcl1, dated the 5th of September 2023. The piecemeal information only considered the northern part of the site which was insufficient to characterise the site as a whole.

Since this another historic site investigation report by RSK Geosciences, ref: 350520-R01 (00), dated November 2022, has been submitted. The report covers the southern section of the site in isolation. It has concluded that further sampling is necessary to fully investigate the exceedances for arsenic across the site, we do not accept the report authors description of the "*slight exceedances*" of Generic Assessment Criteria values (GAC), given that only 4 topsoil samples were submitted for analysis, with 3 of them exceeding values. The report author concludes further sampling is required. Thus, the conceptual site model is not complete for the site. In any new report we require justification for the number of samples taken across the whole site, including north and south elements.

We also note that although shallow coal has been identified at site from borehole and trial pit records, the combustion risk has not been fully addressed in relation to services, site levels and foundation depths have not been fully discussed in relation to gas risk and no detailed information has been given to explain if trial pits and rotary boreholes that penetrated the shallow coal layers on site have been safely backfilled. We expect a new report to address this.

We reiterate our position that the site as a whole has not been fully characterised and risks identified in reports have not been fully investigated. Without a thorough site investigation and conceptual site model for the whole site, potential remediation strategies cannot be accurately developed. We expect a new report to summarise all the information from earlier reports on both parts of the site and present any new investigation information, providing a site wide conceptual site model. For these reasons we recommend conditions 7&8 remain.

Condition 11 cannot be discharged until all preceding contaminated land conditions have

been discharged and the construction work at site is complete.