

## MEMORANDUM

To : **JOSHUA EVANS – PLANNING- DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

From : **NICK JAMES - PRINCIPAL TECHNICAL OFFICER (AIR, LAND & WATER PROTECTION)**

Tel : **01432 261684** My Ref : **NJV/163965/232563**

Date : **6th September 2023** Your Ref :

---

**232563- THE ORLES, ASTON INGHAM, ROSS-ON-WYE.**

**APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF DETAILS RESERVED BY CONDITIONS 21 ATTACHED TO PLANNING PERMISSION 163965.**

**“Remediation Validation Report for The Orles, Aston Ingham, Ross-on-Wye. HR9 7LS.”  
Prepared by Wilson Associates. Dated 4<sup>th</sup> September. Report ref:4014/3**

The above report has been prepared to demonstrate the requirements of the earlier remediation strategy required by condition 20 (agreed 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017) have been achieved. Upon review it is evident and recognised that the technical specialist is unable to confirm that this is fully the case for reasons beyond their control. Membranes were installed and construction and groundworks carried out without their presence or knowledge either on site or through consultation. As such, the validation report will not fully accord with the remediation plan as agreed.

Whilst there will remain some uncertainty at this site due to the above, the report aims to ensure, as best as is reasonably possible, that the site is safe and suitable for its intended use

### **Soils**

With regard to the soils previously identified as requiring removal and/or capping, trial pits have been excavated and samples taken which are considered to demonstrate clean fill has been imported to site where required. This material achieves and, in part, exceeds those levels required by the remediation plan. Excavations of waste material were proposed in some areas of this site and although not possible to formally validate, they are understood to have been carried out.

### **Membrane**

A precautionary vapour membrane was proposed given the sites former use and some uncertainty with regard to a UST (underground storage tank void). Unfortunately an inappropriate membrane was chosen and installed by the developer. Because of this, the report has needed to look at other available evidence and revisit the original risk assessment.

Upon review, the risk from the UST void has been described as a perceived risk rather than actual. Alongside the trial pitting in the area of the void, which found clean fill, a visual inspection confirmed evidence of an, albeit not as recommended, membrane installed as required. Bringing together the information at hand, the specialist is satisfied that any risks due to potential residual hydrocarbon vapours are low to very low.

### **Extensions and renovations**

A recommendation is included in the report for the attention of future householders with regard to any extensions or alterations. It advises that these sort of works should not compromise the vapour mitigation installed as part of the development. This is repeated here as it is an important element for consideration at this site which future owners should be aware of (and is common to all developments where gas and vapour mitigation is present) and specialist advice should be sought prior to commencement.

### **Recommendation**

It is accepted that the development has not wholly addressed the requirements of the remediation plan appropriately. However, as discussed, the specialist considers that risks from soils on site have been satisfactorily mitigated and those from vapours are low to very low.

On the basis of the conclusions of the submitted report and with the above in mind, condition 21 may be discharged.

**NICK JAMES**