

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

**2026/90378 - Land Off, Cockley Hill Lane, Kirkheaton, Huddersfield, HD5 0HH**

**Discharge of details reserved by conditions 5 (Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report), 6 (Remediation Strategy), 8 (Validation Report), 11 (construction traffic), 18 (bat / bird roost) on previous permission 2014/91831 for outline application for erection of 60 dwellings, formation of access public space and associated infrastructure**

**Date Responded:**  
**19 February 2026**

**Responding Officer:**  
**Hannah Kent**

**Responding Ref:**  
**WK/202604648**

Thank you for consulting Environmental Health on the above discharge of conditions application on previous permission 2014/91831.

## **COMMENTS**

### **Contaminated Land**

The following documents were submitted in support of the above application.

- A Combined Stage 1/Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report, Ref: GHO/11r1, dated October 2025, prepared by ARP Geotechnical Ltd.
- A Contamination Remediation Statement, Ref: GHO/11rem1, dated October 2025, prepared by ARP Geotechnical Ltd.

The Combined Stage 1/Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report has identified that:

*...the majority of the site has remained undeveloped. A small portion of the southwest of the site was quarried for sandstone rock and later occupied by a small building and associated car parking. A triangular area on the east of the site was developed with a cluster of small buildings, demolished sometime prior to 1994. A well (and later trough) was present at, or close to where the site abuts Shop Lane. Although not indicated on the Ordnance Survey archive maps, the geological records and Coal Authority abandonment plans indicate that opencast coal mining has been carried out on the eastern half of the site. The desk-based study identified the following:*

- *Possible contaminated material placed in the backfilled opencast workings across the central portion of the site (although unlikely - the material is probably inert natural arisings) - metals, inorganics, TPH, PAH, phenol, asbestos.*
- *Possible contaminated material placed in the backfilled sandstone workings encroaching on the southwest of the site (although unlikely - the material is probably inert sandstone arisings of less economic value i.e. sand, gravel and cobbles of sandstone) - metals, inorganics, TPH, PAH, phenol, asbestos.*
- *Possible made ground associated with the limited areas of former development on the southwest and east of the site - metals, inorganics, TPH, PAH, phenol, asbestos.*
- *Possible (unlikely) made ground on the rest of the site - metals, inorganics, TPH, PAH, phenol, asbestos.*
- *Possible landfill and mine gases from historical backfilled opencast workings and shallow mining - carbon dioxide, methane.*

The preliminary conceptual site model identified *several potential source – pathway – receptor linkages applicable to the proposed development, ranging from moderate to very low risk.*

An intrusive investigation was considered necessary as recommended:

- *Trial pit and windowless sampling borehole implemented on a grid basis, preferably 25m spacing.*
- *Samples of the made ground issued for testing for a broad suite of determinands, including metals, inorganics, asbestos, phenols, speciated PAH, and TPH.*
- *Landfill gas monitoring, due to the presence of historical backfilled opencast coal and sandstone workings and shallow coal seams/mining.*
- *Upon receipt of contamination test results, any elevated TPH would be speciated to allow further risk assessment, and leachability testing undertaken on all elevated determinands, to give indication of mobility.*

Intrusive investigations were undertaken in stages, beginning in 2016 to include the northwestern half of the current site area, followed in February 2019 which included approximately three quarters of the southeastern half of the current site area and later in May 2019. A final intrusive investigation was undertaken in September 2025 to provide additional information on a new area of land added to the site since 2019.

*Made ground was encountered below the topsoil (2016 TP1, TP5, CP1 and CP2, 2019 TP2, TP3, TP4, WS3, WS5, R101, R102, R103 and R104, and 2025 WS11), to proven depths of up to 11.5m.*

- *Topsoil was considered suitable for re-use on the site.*
- *Some areas of made ground had several determinands above the screening value for residential gardens, and some also above the screening values for public open space (POS) near residential sites - Far Eastern Triangle.*
- *No asbestos was detected*

*Gas monitoring was carried out from October 2016 to April 2017 for CP1, CP2, R1A, R2A and R3A, and from March 2019 for WS1, WS3, WS5 and WS7, confirming the site as CS2.*

The report concluded that:

*...the vast majority of the site, soils are uncontaminated and suitable for reuse on a residential development. On the eastern enclosed corner only, which... is proposed for public open space, some form of remedial action is necessary to prevent excess risk to the public and future maintenance workers. There is also a risk from ground gases.*

And therefore:

*...provided that remedial measures are adopted, then the risks to the identified receptors are deemed acceptable for the proposed development of residential properties with private gardens, and areas of POS.*

The Contamination Remediation Statement confirmed that:

- Borehole monitoring has shown that CS2 gas protection measures are required for the proposed properties, comprising a membrane and ventilated sub floor void. CS2 gas protection will also protect against radon.

- Contamination testing confirmed that topsoil and made ground to be uncontaminated and suitable for the proposed residential development with the exception of:
- Demolition rubble in the eastern triangle which contained elevated copper, lead, PAH compounds including benzo(a)pyrene with no significant leachability.
- The Eastern Triangle where remediation is necessary, the site is proposed for public open space and that:
  - Where only turf is proposed, provision of a clean topsoil of a minimum 0.3m thickness is considered adequate,
  - Any planted areas, a clean soil of a minimum 0.6m will be required (may include subsoil) ,
  - Alternatively made ground could be removed from site and suitably disposed (WAC testing).
  - Soils used as clean cover will require verification testing.

Following remediation of the site (condition 7), a validation report (condition 8) is required to be submitted to the local planning authority.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The submitted reports satisfy the requirements of conditions 5 (Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report), and 6 (Remediation Strategy), which can now be discharged.

As stated above, the site will now required remediation (condition 7), and a validation report (condition 8) is required to be submitted to the local planning authority.