

Applica	ition Ref:	24/00946/COND (23/04646/FU)						
SITO X. Pronogal.		idge Farm, Wike Ridge Lane, Alwoodley, Leeds, LS17 9JF - Change of Use er riding school stables to create 1No dwellinghouse with parking area.						
Discharge of Condition		ditions	13	Our Ref: PCL06776_24_0		PCL06776_24_00946	946_PSD1	
To:	Umar Dad	hiwala		From:	G	regory Gibson	Date:	29/02/2024

RECOMMENDATION			
Conditions Recommended for Discharge	Condition 13 (C_SIRS)		
Conditions Remaining	Condition 14 (C_AMEN) Condition 15 (C_VERI)		
COMMENTS			

Based on the available information, it is recommended that Condition 13 can be discharged.

The following reports have been approved by the Contaminated Land team:

- Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report, December 2023, ARP, Report ref: CDP/30r2le
- Method Statement for Assessment of Imported Soils, December 2023, ARP, Report ref: CDP/30imple

Should any soils be imported to the site, then the verification report relating to the testing and verification of the imported soils will need to be submitted in support of a condition discharge application to discharged Condition 15.

Geotechnical issues have not been considered or reviewed as this is not within the remit of the Contaminated Land team.

NOTES			
See above.			
Information Reviewed	Title: Stage 2 Geo-Environmental Report		
	Preparation date: December 2023		
	Prepared by: ARP		
	Report ref: CDP/30r2le		
	Title: Method Statement for Assessment of Imported Soils		
	Preparation date: December 2023		
	Prepared by: ARP		
	Report ref: CDP/30imple		

GENERAL ADVICE				
Planner advised to	Landscape & Conservation			
consult:	Reason: Potential implications of remediation on existing trees. Environmental Health			
	Reason: Potential contaminants in dust from remedial works			
Applicant advised to	Health & Safety Executive			
consult:	Reason: To ensure that any potential asbestos within buildings due for demolition is			
(for planner to advise	dealt with appropriately			
applicant)	Yorkshire Water			
	Reason: To ensure that appropriate services are provided at the site			
Environment Agency Waste Management Licensing Section				
	Reason: To ensure requirements of Waste Management Regulations are met			



If this application is to be refused, please $\underline{\text{DO NOT}}$ include contamination as a reason without consulting us.



The following pages are summary information for Leeds City Council only. This information should not be relied upon by third parties.

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE SITE?				
Previous contaminative	On Site: farmland			
use	Off Site: pump			
Environmental Setting	Geology: Drift – none. Solid – SST. Hydrogeology: Sec A. Hydrology: 95m south of the site. Mining: not within a coal mining affected area. Landfill: none within 250m. Radon: <1%			
Proposed Development	Change of Use of former riding school stables to create 1No dwellinghouse			

SUMMARY O	SUMMARY OF WORKS UNDERTAKEN / REPORT FINDINGS/ RECOMMENDATIONS.				
Phase 2	Fieldwork				
	8no. WSs (WS1 – WS9) to max depth of 2.7mbgl. 2no. HPs (HP1 – HP2) which were foundation pits.				
	2110. TIFS (TIFT = TIF2) WITIGH WERE TOUTHDATION PILS.				
	Ground Conditions				
	Ground Conditions				
	6.1 All of the investigation locations revealed a surface covering of concrete, which was between				
	0.1m and 0.3m thick. The concrete was underlain by made ground, generally to depths of between 0.25m and 0.5m, comprising mainly slightly clayey sandy gravel of sandstone. In WS5,				
	WS6 and WS7, the gravel included brick as well as sandstone, and in WS9, the gravel also				
	included trace bitmac. In WS6 and WS7, the made ground was cohesive rather than granular,				
	but the granular content was similar (sandstone and brick).				
	but the granular content was similar (sandstone and brick).				
	6.2 The made ground was underlain by firm, locally soft, stony clays and slightly clayey sands,				
	gravels and cobbles, all of residual material derived from in situ weathering of rock. All the				
	window sample boreholes (except WS4 which intentionally terminated at a shallower depth of				
	1.5m as part of the investigation design) terminated by refusals in rock at depths of between				
	0.6m and 2.7m.				
	6.3 Samples of Intact bedrock were obtained from WS1, WS2, WS5 and WS7, and were confirmed				
	to comprise sandstone, recovered as sandy gravel with medium cobble content. In WS3, WS6,				
	WS8 and WS9, no samples of the rock were obtained, but the refusals at between 0.8m and				
	2.0m, are considered likely to be sandstone.				
	6.4 No groundwater ingress was encountered during the investigation. Cores were noted to be wet				
	beneath the concrete cores but this was as a result of the coring process that uses water as a				
	lubricant. All positions were backfilled with arisings upon completion.				
	Analytical Accessment				
	Analytical Assessment				
	Soil samples: 11no. samples taken.				
	Lab suite: HM/SM, phenols, PAHs, TPHs, asbestos. "Six samples from areas which will be either beneath existing buildings (to be converted to residential use) or existing/proposed hardstanding (WS1, WS2, WS8, WS9, HP1, HP2) were tested for speciated PAH, banded TPH, and Organic Matter. A full suite of metals				
	and inorganics was not deemed necessary for these internal samples, as all but				
	the vapour inhalation pathways will be blocked."				



HH-GAC: S4ULs, C4SLs. Resi wHGP land-use. 2.5% SOM. HH-GQRA: 1no. exceedance recorded for BbF & Di(ah)A. 95& UCL on BbF, risks from Di(ah) A ruled out qualitatively. No other exceedances recorded. No asbestos fibres identified.

Recommendations

No further work required.

Method Statement for Assessment of Imported Soils

2.10 The contamination testing, carried out on eleven samples of made ground, did not identify any concentrations of contaminants requiring any remedial measures. It is still necessary to have in place a method statement for the assessment of any soils to be imported, in order to satisfy the Regulatory Authorities that the soils are suitable for use on the site, in terms of human health. This needs to be independently confirmed, in accordance with the guidance supplied in the document produced by the Yorkshire and Lincolnshire Pollution Advisory Council (YALPAG): "Guidance on the Verification Requirements for Cover Systems". The measures described below will be required to ensure compliance with the document.

3.0 Imported Soils

3.1 If any imported soils are required, the source will need to be confirmed, and the material tested for the attached suite of contaminants, to comply with the maximum screening values listed. The frequency of testing is given on the table below.

Material Type	Number of Samples
Topsoil or subsoil from greenfield site or manufactured source	Minimum 3No. or 1 per 250m³ (whichever is greater)
Topsoil or subsoil from brownfield site or screened source	Minimum 6No. or 1 per 100m³ (whichever is greater)

- 3.2 An MMP or U1 exemption (dependent on volume) may be required if soils are to be imported from other development sites under the DoWCoP.
- 3.3 The material should be placed in quarantined stockpiles and once a stockpile has been approved by the Engineer, no further material should be added to the stockpile, and any further import should be stockpiled separately. Further testing shall be carried out where any mixing is suspected to have occurred.
- 3.4 As and when required, the soils will be used around the plots as the development progresses, and it will be necessary to verify that the appropriate soils have been placed in the garden area, and not soils from any other source. This will be achieved by excavating trial pits on the basis of one per 25m². The trial pits will be photographed, to include a reference scale, and the photographs included within any report to enable the location on site to be identified.
- 3.5 If space is insufficient on the site to store quarantined stockpiles, the soils can be placed directly into the garden area, but samples of each material would need to be taken and tested directly from the trial pits within the garden, described in 3.3 above.
- 3.6 The results of all the laboratory analysis, sample descriptions, plans, and import documents, will form part of the Soils Validation Report.

4.0 Unexpected Contamination

4.1 Any unexpected contamination uncovered during the works shall be inspected, sampled and analysed in laboratory for the suite of determinands appended to this Method Statement, and compared to the maximum concentration levels listed on the enclosure. Works on the affected materials shall cease until the appraisal is complete and, if necessary, a Remediation Statement is to be prepared and approved by the Planning Authority before work is recommenced.



Abbreviations			
LCM – Lower coal measures	GI – Ground Investigation	TPH – Total petroleum hydrocarbons	
PLCM – Pennine lower coal measures	DS / DTS – Desk study	GW – Groundwater	
BH – Bore hole	VR – Verification report	CW – Controlled waters	
RH / RBH – Rotary hole	RS – Remediation statement	SW – Surface waters	
RO – Rotary Open Hole	GG – Ground gas	NVO – no visual or olfactory evidence of	
RC – Rotary Core	GGRA – Ground gas risk assessment	contamination	
TP – Trial pit	HM – Heavy metals	Bgl – below ground level	
SI – Site Investigation	PAH – Polyaromatic hydrocarbons	MG – Made Ground	