

Consultation Response from: KC Environmental Health (Pollution & Noise Control)
2025/92915 Land at Jill Lane, Mirfield, WF14 0DR
Discharge of details reserved by conditions 4 (external materials), 5 (boundary treatments), 6 (Phase I Desk Study Report), 7 (Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report), 8 (Remediation Strategy), 11 (coal mine workings), 13 (bat roosting), 18 (landscaping) on previous permission 2023/93067 for demolition of existing equestrian building and erection of replacement dwelling
Responding Date:
3rd November 2025
Responding Officer:
SR
Responding Ref:
WK202533886
Comments
Contaminated Land

Environmental Health have been consulted in relation to conditions 6,7 and 8 only, we do not comment on geotechnical matters; any comments are in relation to contaminated land only.

6 (Phase I Desk Study Report), 7 (Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report)

In support of the discharge of the above the following documents have been submitted: -

- Stage 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report by ARP, ref: PWS/01r1
- Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report by ARP, ref: PWS/01r2
- Letter by ARP, Gas Risk Assessment, ref: PWS/01/L8/WW, dated 14th March 2025

Condition 6

The stage 1 assessment provides a site history since 1854, it summarises the desk top data available and presents a preliminary conceptual site model indicating intrusive investigation is required due to made ground, possible asbestos and coal legacy/landfill, with sampling and gas monitoring recommended, in relation to nearby landfill/shallow coal.

We accept the information provided in relation to condition 6.

Condition 7

The intrusive fieldworks were undertaken on the 1st of September 2024 and included three trial pits (TP1 to TP3), excavated to depths of between 2.1m and 3.5m. a trial pit location plan and logs are included in Appendix B.

Chemical analysis of six soil samples was undertaken, for metals, inorganics, speciated PAH, TPH, phenols, and asbestos.

The ground conditions are given as up to 0.35m thickness of crushed fill present in TP2 and TP3 (below a thin topsoil in TP3), with only topsoil present at the surface of TP1. Natural clays are present beneath, to depths of between 1.4m and 1.7m, onto weathered mudstones. No groundwater ingress was noted.

Results of the chemical testing from the investigations are included in Appendix 3. The report informs; Made ground contains elevated PAH (including benzo(a)pyrene up to 10mg/kg) and sporadic chrysotile asbestos. The overlying topsoil to this material (found at TP3 only) also

contained microscopic chrysotile asbestos, and elevated lead (370mg.kg).

An updated conceptual site model is presented in 7.12, a moderate risk is identified in relation to asbestos, contamination and gas. A remediation option is presented, however the gas monitoring at this point was incomplete.

Gas monitoring results are presented in the letter by ARO, ref: PWS/01/L8/WW. Three gas monitoring wells were installed in boreholes BH1, BH2 and BH3, six visits were made over a 11-week period. The visits were made between the 17th of December 2024 and 04th of March 2025. On the days of the visits, atmospheric pressures ranged between 978mb and 1,033mb. No methane was detected, maximum CO₂ was recorded as 1.9% v/v. The maximum flow rate recorded as 0.5 l/hr, a gas screening value has been calculated using the monitoring data collected, the report attributes a CS1 value. Despite this the letter goes on to describe mining features and concludes that as a precaution gas protection measures of foundations should be designed with a vented sub-floor void and a gas membrane resistant to CO₂ and CH₄ should be installed within the property on site.

We acknowledge the report and make the following recommendations.

Condition 8 Remediation Strategy

In support of the discharge of condition 8 a Contamination Remediation Statement by ARP, ref: PWS/01rem, has been submitted as an appendix to the Phase 2 report. Given the date of this strategy in relation to the later issued gas risk assessment letter, we are considering both documents.

The various reports have established that remediation is required to site, including but not limited to the removal of contaminated material and clean cover system and gas protection measures identified in the gas risk assessment letter. We anticipate sufficient evidence of remediation, including gas protection measures, to be presented future verification report.

Recommendations

Condition 6 (Phase I Desk Study Report), Condition 7 (Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report)

On the basis of the professional judgement of the report author and the evidence and interpretations presented in the Stage 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report by ARP, ref: PWS/01r1, the Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report by ARP, ref: PWS/01r2 and the Letter by ARP, Gas Risk Assessment, ref: PWS/01/L8/WW, dated 14th March 2025, Environmental Health have no objection to the discharge of conditions 6&7.

We remind the applicant that any unexpected contamination encountered during groundworks, must be reported to the LPA, as per the requirements of Condition 9.

Condition 8 Remediation Strategy

Based on the professional judgement of ARP Consultancy presented in the Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report by ARP, ref: PWS/01r2 and the Letter by ARP, Gas Risk Assessment, ref: PWS/01/L8/WW, dated 14th March 2025, we can confirm that we have no objection to the discharge of Condition 8. Where a site is affected by contamination, the responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.

