Conlon, Christopher

From: Mccrory, Daniel <Daniel.Mccrory@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 July 2015 19:27
To: 'Marcus Davis'
Cc: Pozylo, Adam; Smith, Paul; 'Will Prior'; Simpkin, Rachael
Subject: RE: Former Uplands Mill, Biddulph - Completion Report - Issue 3

Hi Will/ Marcus,

Thank you for the information, sorry for the delay.:

Apologies for not including summary comments on plots 99-137 in the previous summary of my position - The comment was only "awaiting further analysis" / and or the info in previous emails.

I think we are getting there now but a few issues need to be clarified and a little bit more sampling and/ or precautionary measures.. To this end I've updated my comments below:

Briefly, some of the main points are

- You note that despite a lack of comments plots 99-104 had been included (Sect 5). I can't seem to find these results, please clarify.
- The validation Sample HP6A is not accepted in this instance, as it is not does not appear to be a representative sample of soil condition as it was essentially stones (70%). This does have knock on issues as outlined below.
- Thank you for the NHBC stuff , possibly this is my fault but these appear to relate to insulation rather than the contamination conditions e.g. ground gas, similarly appendix 3 notes "cleared condition" but as some of these properties have yet to be completed I'm not sure how this works? Could you brief me on this? It may be quicker to get a statement or a chat with Geoff Hurst from NHBC, do you have a contact for him??
- An aside, but where you have not yet conducted the trial pits due to access, please don't include them in the figures as it makes it a bit confusing (or amend to be move obvious)

Summary of Plot Information

Plots 1-18 (discharge requested)

History – Generally soft landscaping, but also car park (plots 2/3) and Dry Chemical Store (plot 4)

Final Levels – Generally reduction / profile using limited material from other parts of the site

Additional: 150mm clean top soil placed on plots 16 -18
: Ground Gas Protection required

Analysis – 3 Samples from 3 trial pits in the area were analysed (WS114 + *visual WS404*) (plot 4), TP206 (PAH & Hydrocarbon in response to +ve pid), and TP 208 (plot 18) ; High gas and organic odour noted but

source not sampled further . Further visual inspections/PID were undertaken plots (WS 403 & 406, respectively). The profile was generally consistent with natural strata and no made ground was noted.

The majority of initial samples were from some depth (1.9 – 2.5m) and although limited relevance (as with most initial samples) in determining risk

Photographs of "show home membrane" received July 2012 by Bovis Holmes – so that plot is fine in this regard.

Previous: Awaiting further Validation

Update

- 10 further samples taken (HP 14 – 23).

Generally considered to be acceptable and demonstrate that it is unlikely that a significant risk exists at the plots.

Ground Gas
NHBC Certificates (in bundle) appear to relate to insulation rather than ground gas protection or other issues? Please Clarify
NHBC appendix indicates conditions but not clear if these have been discharged? Please Clarify, may be worth getting a statement from NHBC

Update Summary
Subject to some further clarification I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 19-40 (discharge requested)

History – Undeveloped/ green field to south west of mill building land. Limited sources of contamination

Final Levels – Generally reduced to Natural Strata

Additional: 150mm clean top soil

Analysis – Samples from 3 trial pits in the area were analysed (TP208; 210 & 213; plots, 16, 20 & 40 respectively). No issues/ exceedences, though some made ground is noted in TP208 (adjacent plot [17] to be checked). Further visual inspections/PID were undertaken plots 23 & 32 (TP209 & 211 respectively) and indicted that the profile was consistent with natural strata and no made ground was noted.

Due to the actual sampled depth however, is likely to mean that the actual sampled soils were removed and placed in the in North /North East of the site. The author has assumed (based on site history and observations) therefore, that the obtained results were indicative of the full soil profile and hence final achieved levels.

Examination of the logs and site history would indicate that this is a fair assumption and it is agreed that is unlikely that any significant sources of contamination would be present in this area of the site. Whilst it would always be desirable for this to be confirmed by virtue of actual plot samples, the applicant has, as a welcome precaution, also stated that 150mm clean cover layer has also been placed on all garden areas to mitigate any unexpected issues.

The applicant has demonstrated that the topsoil material (used in the 150mm) is clean and suitable for use and this is accepted. Although no depth validation has been has been submitted. (– was this checked by NHBC by any chance)?

It has also been stated that gas protection measures have been installed but no validation of this has been submitted has been submitted-(again was this checked by NHBC or do you have anything else with this regard?

Update
NHBC Certificates (in bundle) appear to relate to insulation rather than ground gas protection or other issues? Please Clarify

Update Summary
Subject to some further clarification I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 41- 62 (discharge requested)

History – Majority of plots; were undeveloped/ green field to west/south west of mill building land. Limited sources of contamination

Plots 52-55, occupied a small part of mill building (not noted in Table) but now driveways?

Final Levels: plots 47 - 57 reduced (or no change-Natural strata?),
plots 41-46 & 58 – 62 – material from "re: profiling of central area"

Additional: Not known if topsoil placed? Please confirm

***Update**: 150mm clean top soil confirmed by consultant on plots 46- 61*

Analysis – Only one sample one sample 1 trial pits in the area (WS115 – plot 46), indicate no issues/ exceedences*. Two visual/ PID inspections (WS 407 – plot 51 & TP212 – plot 32) indicated that no made ground generally present and the profile was indicative of natural soils and similar to that observed in previous trial pits in the undeveloped SW area, as noted previously (TP209-213)

* This result in this plot was subsequently raised with material from "re: profiling of central area", so this result only considered to be a representation of the natural ground rather than definitive plot sample of final levels (in top 1m).

No direct sample was taken of the Mill area encompassing plots 52-55 but WS 113 (– plot 64) is near to the area and indicated no exceedences when samples of made ground were taken. Visual examination of the profile at WS 405 (plot 68) in addition to WS 113 appear to indicate that in general the profile consisted of surface made ground construction materials (concrete etc.) immediately above natural ground. No evidence of contamination (visual/ olfactory or PID) is stated by the author.

Plots 47 – 57: Where levels were reduced to natural strata, examination of the logs and site history, suggests that it is a reasonable assumption that the natural strata are unlikely to be contaminated.

Summary
I would not have any further issues with the above plots.

Plots 41-46 & 58 – 62; Where plots have been raised and received "re: profiling of central area" the actual source of material is more ambiguous.

The following assumptions must be made; these assumptions need to be clarified by the author.

It is assumed that as the consultant uses the past history of the location, as a measure of likely contamination in these plots (Table 1) and therefore that majority of sourced material to raise levels was from the surrounding natural strata that was also undergoing construction. Therefore, it is assumed that in this instance, the material used in garden areas has been sourced from either natural strata in the south west or adjacent plots that have/ were being constructed (and levels were reduced) or the natural strata beneath the mill slab/ hard standing where levels were also reduced.

Summary
Previous: Subject to some further clarification regarding assumptions

Update Summary
I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 63- 85 (discharge requested*)

Previous: Awaiting further validation

Update

- 11 further samples taken (HP 34 – 44).
- Additional Sample Taken (HP 39A – for PAH's)

Plots - HP 36 -39 Asbestos detected (including Amosite) in plots, 79, 81, 83 & 85 but at low levels.

Source of contamination is postulated to be associated with granular made ground / building platform that was clearly defined.

Cover layer proposed for plots 73 and 77-85 as a means of breaking any possible pollution linkage. This approached is accepted, however, further validation required of cover layer required.

Assumed that remaining plots 63-72, 74-76 will have 150mm clean top soil placed, inline with previous plots? Subject to conformation I would have no issues with these plots

Gas Update
NHBC Certificates (in bundle) appear to relate to insulation rather than ground gas protection or other issues? Please Clarify

Update Summary
Subject to some further clarification* I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

*Some plots require validation one would anticipate that at minimum 150mm cover layer be placed in other areas as a precaution

Plots 86-87 (discharge requested)

History - Located on undeveloped/ greenfield to the west of mill building land. Limited sources of contamination presumed

Final Levels – Generally reduced to Natural Strata

Additional Info: 150mm topsoil placed

Analysis: No direct analysis. Natural strata is presumed to be uncontaminated by reference to previous investigations in locations with similar site history.

Examination of the logs and site history would indicate that this is a reasonable assumption and it is agreed that is unlikely that any significant sources of contamination would be present in this area of the site. Whilst it would always be desirable for this to be confirmed by virtue of actual plot samples, the applicant has, as a welcome precaution, also stated that 150mm clean cover layer has also been placed on all garden areas to mitigate any unexpected issues.

The applicant has demonstrated that the topsoil material (used in the 150mm) is clean and suitable for use and this is accepted.

Update Summary
I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots; 88-94 (discharge requested)

History - Located within the mill building that may have contained several sources of contamination e.g., a dry chemical store and machine pit areas.

Final Levels – Levels raised with material from "re: profiling of central area" plots 88 & 89 receiving over 1m of fill from this source.

Additional Info: 150mm topsoil placed

Area cleared/demolished, machine pits bases removed and site reprofiled prior to targeted phase 2" investigation

Analysis – 4 TP in vicinity of plots. Samples taken when final levels placed but analysis generally targeted below this placed material. No PID screen was undertaken.

1 sample taken at 1.2m depth TP705 (plots 93 & 94), TP 707 (0.3m) & 706 (1.5m) near to the plots. A visual /(not PID) screen was undertaken at TP 708 (plot 89)

TP 707: (road near plot 88)
Analysis indicated no contamination. Though not significant, some TPH was identified at 0.3m in the placed material at TP707 (now road). No further investigation of this location undertaken due to "access restrictions". Presumably, because no PID was used at this location to screen for volatiles, the presence of TPH was not identified until after the lab results were returned.

Whilst the actual level of TPH contamination is not of major concern, given the potential sources of hydrocarbon contamination in this vicinity (machine pit beds) it could indicate the material used to raise levels in this area may not have screened for contamination as effectively as one might have hoped.

TP 705: (plot 93/94)
Analysis indicated no contamination. Whilst TP 705 was conducted on plots 93 & 94, it targeted the natural start beneath the plots – not the material used in the gardens; therefore it does not reflect the material used in the top 1m of these plots.

TP 706 (front garden /landscape area plot 90)
Analysis indicated no contamination. TP 706 was located on the front landscape area of plots 90. As with TP705, this trial pit targeted the natural strata beneath the plots – not the material used in the gardens; therefore it does not reflect the material used in the top 1m of these plots, e.g. (re: profiling of central area).

The above noted both can be accepted as further evidence that the natural strata at 1+ m depth is unlikely to be contaminated and that the machine bases appear to have been removed*.

**There is an assumption that machine pits etc. were actually targeted correctly, as this may have be complicated by virtue of the site having already been re: profiled and material placed on these areas at the time of the investigation.*

TP 708 (plot 88/89)
An environmental sample was taken from the log at 0.3m but a decision was made to either not analyses this sample or not use the results. It is not immediately clear why, and is considered to be an erroneous decision as this would have provided invaluable information as to the contaminates present in the top 1m of these plots.

The author states in Table 1 "No - no visual or olfactory evidence of contamination. "Sufficient data available to characterise the contaminative ground conditions". It is not clear how this conclusion was reached based on the data collected in this area to that point.

Summary
Would appear to be significant unknowns regarding the material used in the garden areas following the site re:profile. ?

Previous: Site to be re-evaluated following submission of further garden validation.

Update
The author has stated – in Table 1 that HP6A was undertaken to update the results, as requested. This though was for plot 164 (near 98-97) rather than the above plots, so I this may be a mistake. Please clarify

Plots 95 – 98 (discharge requested)

History - Similar to the previous plots. Located within the mill building that may have contained several sources of contamination e.g., a dry chemical store and machine pit areas. An electrical substation was also present near this part.

Final Levels: As above. All plots were raised with material from "re: profiling of central area" following removal of the slab

Additional: Not known if topsoil placed

***Update**:* 150mm clean top soil confirmed by consultant

Analysis – 3 relevant samples available. 1 sample taken at 1.2m depth prior to demolition WS 105 (plots 95), 1 sample taken after reprofiling TP 704 at 1.4 (near 96 & 97) No PID screen 1 sample taken of top 1m from adjacent plot (164).

WS 105 (plot 95)
Taken prior to demolition. Positive PID at 0.3 & 1.2 M with slight hydrocarbon odour noted. Analysis though did not indicate significant contamination at 1.2m depth.

TP 704 (near 97 & 96)
Analysis indicated no contamination. Whilst TP 704 was located near the gardens of plots 96 & 97, it targeted the natural start beneath the plots – not the material used in the gardens; therefore it does not reflect the material used in the top 1m of these plots.

As with some other TP (700 series) the analysis be accepted as further evidence that the natural strata at 1+ m depth is unlikely to be contaminated and that the machine bases appear to have been removed*.

**There is an assumption that machine pits etc were actually targeted correctly, as this may have be complicated by virtue of the site having already been reprofilled and material placed on these areas at the time of the investigation.*

HP6
Sample taken from Analysis indicates exceedence of previously agreed for GAC BaP (1.1) but is below new C4SL level. High PAH at adjacent plot so resample of this garden is required*.

*Material analysed described as “Reprofiling of central portion of site and surplus from south-east of the site”, so not clear if this is similar in source to “Reprofiling of central portion” used in 95-98

Summary
Would appear to be significant unknowns regarding the material used in the garden areas following the site re:profile. ?

Site to be re-evaluated following submission of further garden validation.

Update
A sample HP6A was submitted to verify PAH concentration and update the results, as near plots 98-97 and similarly sourced material

Unfortunately, the sample does not appear to be material one would consider to be soil (70% stones) so it cannot be accepted as a reflection of likely PAH / soil content and cannot be accepted. Update required

Plots 99 -106 (discharge requested)

History - Similar to the previous plots. Located within the mill building that may have contained several sources of contamination e.g., and machine pit areas. An electrical substation was also present near this part.

Final Levels: As above. All plots were raised with material from “re: profiling of central area” following removal of the slab

Additional: Not known if topsoil placed? Please confirm

***Update**:* 150mm clean top soil confirmed by consultant

Analysis –Two samples taken for chemical analysis; the first was sample was for TPH, PAH and in the area near plot 99 indicate no issues/ exceedences*. A second sample was taken at 1.5 m near plot 103 (TP 706) however targeted the natural start beneath the plots – not the material used in the gardens; therefore it does not really reflect the material used in the top 1m of these plots.

Two further visual/ PID inspections (WS 107 – plot 100 / 106 & WS 111 – plot 104) indicated that no made ground generally present except for construction materials

* This result in this plot was subsequently raised with material from “re:profiling of central area”, so this result only considered to be a representation of the natural ground rather than definitive plot sample of final levels (in top 1m).

Plots 107 -109

History - Similar to the previous plots. Located within the mill building that may have contained several sources of contamination e.g., and machine pit areas. An electrical substation was also present near this part.

Final Levels: As above. All plots were raised with material from “re: profiling of central area” following removal of the slab

Update:

Additional: No soil not placed but construction not complete?

Analysis – No direct analysis has been taken from this area. However, samples taken from adjacent plots HP7 (adjacent to 107) and HP8 (adjacent to 109) were previously undertaken.

The sample in plot 107 significantly exceedences GAC for PAH's. The full extent of this contamination was not delineated at the time. Whilst there is some comfort that plot 162 (HP8) and 164 (HP6) appear to indicate that this significant contamination is restricted to this plot (East to west) no analysis has been undertaken southward and the conformation analysis for plot (HP6 A). The possibility that the PAH contamination identified in HP7 extends southward cannot be discounted.

Update Summary

A sample should be taken from plot 107. Alternatively, contamination should be assumed and cover layer should be adopted for plots 107 and 108 as a precaution. Please clarify you preferred approach.

Plots 110 – 114

History - Similar to the previous plots. Located within the mill building that may have contained several sources of contamination e.g., and machine pit areas. An electrical substation was also present near this part.

Final Levels: reduced to natural strata and "re: profiling of central area" following removal of the slab

Additional: Not known if topsoil placed? Please confirm

Analysis WS 108 at 1.8 m no exceedences (+ PID at depth but no analysis undertaken)

Update

- 3 further samples taken (HP 31 – 33, at plots 114 – 110, respectively)

Generally considered to be acceptable and demonstrate that it is unlikely that a significant risk exists at the plots

Plots 115– 131

Update
Awaiting Further Validation

Plots 132 -155 (discharge requested)

Apartments

History- Located on the former mill building with associated contamination and greenfield land further west.

Final Levels – Generally reduced to Natural Strata, with material removed off site

Additional Info: Gas Protection (CS2) measures required, awaiting Validation

Soft landscaping areas to the North of the apartments require a cover layer system, due to Chromium (TP201) – not yet discussed/undertaken.

Providing validation of gas protection measures can be provided it is agreed that is unlikely that any significant pollution pathways would remain in this part of the site.

Summary
Subject to some further clarification I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Gas Update
NHBC Certificates (in bundle) appear to relate to insulation rather than ground gas protection or other issues? Please Clarify

Update Summary

Subject to some further clarification I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 156 -164 (discharge requested*)

History- Located north of the site with mill buildings and car park

Final Levels – Reprofiling of central portion of site and surplus from south-east of the site.

Additional Info: 150mm clean top soil

Analysis

- Samples taken (HP6 – HP12) from material placed in area
- Plot 156 Asbestos Contamination detected - cover layer required
-
- Plot 157, as Asbestos contamination was detected at plot 156, (HP9) further validation should therefore be undertaken on the adjacent plot 157. It is noted that this source of contamination could have arisen from the stockpile of located in this area prior to placement in the South of the site. This stockpile did extend to 157.
- Plot 163 (HP7) High levels of PAH and TPH were detected which would typically be expected to trigger the need for further work in this area to quantify the source and extent of this contamination (surprised this wasn't recommended). Any further remediation proposals (600mm cap) should incorporate a break layer (geo text layer of hard dig)
- Plot 164 (HP6) exceedences of the agreed SSTL for BaP were observed but ASL has decided to now use the less precautionary C4SL's (high organic matter) as SSTL. Given that the adjacent plot recorded levels of BaP of 21mg/kg this is not considered precautionary enough and further work sampling should be undertaken to ensure that levels are below the C4SL's

Update

- 2 Additional Samples undertaken
    - Sample HP13 undertaken at plot 157 for Asbestos, this did not detect any Asbestos, this is accepted.
    - Sample HP6A undertaken for PAH but as discussed this sample is not accepted

Gas Update
NHBC Certificates (in bundle) appear to relate to insulation rather than ground gas protection or other issues? Please Clarify

Update Summary

A valid sample should be taken from plot 164 to confirm PAH levels or alternatively, contamination should be assumed and cover layer should be adopted as a precaution.

Plots 165 -166 (discharge requested*)

History- Located north west of the site with above ground fuel storage with mill buildings and car park

Final Levels – Raised by over 2.5M, with re profiling of central portion of site and surplus from south-east of the site.

Analysis - WS104 (at 0.6m) for PAH and TPH (not full suite) Positive PID at 0.3m but no sample taken

No top soil added

Update Summary

Although one hopes that most of the large amount of material was from the South West and this is unlikely to be contaminated, no actual information on this material has been presented nor has any imported growing material been included.

A further sample should be taken from plot 165 or 166. Alternatively, contamination should be assumed and cover layer should be adopted for plots 165 and 166 as a precaution.

Plots 167 – 169 (discharge requested)

History - Located on the former mill building with associated contamination

Final Levels – Levels raised by 1-2m with material from "surplus from south-east of the site".

Additional Info: 150mm topsoil placed

Analysis: 2 samples prior to demolition WS106 (plot 167 –TPH/PAH only) and after re: profile TP 703 (plot 169). Analysis conducted when final levels placed but analysis generally targeted within this placed material (although at around 1m)

WS106 – Indicated no exceedences of TPH and PAH, though analysis undertaken in response to +ve PID result. Note this would now be >3m below final levels.

TP 703 (plot 68/69) – Indicates no exceedences of GAC for material placed on these plots.

Based on the site history of the source (south east) and some analysis of material likely to be present in the top 1m of the garden plots, it is considered unlikely that a significant pollution linkage exists at the above plots. It should also be noted that the welcome inclusion of 150mm clean cover layer would also help break any pollution linkages that were not detected.

Update Summary
I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 170-172 (discharge requested)

History - Located on soft landscaping / greenfield, limited sources of contamination. the former mill building with associated contamination

Final Levels – slightly raised with material from south-east of the site.

Additional Info: 150mm topsoil placed

Analysis: 2 samples near to plots both taken after final levels placed, TP705 (93 & 94) prior to and TP 703 (plot 169).

As noted previously, TP 705 it targeted the natural start beneath the plots but given that only a limited amount of fill was used on these plots, this may reflect the natural strata in this area. Although, TP703 was not taken directly beneath these plots it does serve as some analysis of the likely placed material in this area (same source – south east).

Based on the site history of the source (south east) and some analysis of material likely to be present in the top 1m of the garden plots, it is considered unlikely that a significant pollution linkage exists at the above plots. It should also be noted that the welcome inclusion of 150mm clean cover layer would also help break any pollution linkages that were not detected.

Update Summary
I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 173-181 (discharge requested)

History – Generally located on soft landscaping / greenfield, limited sources of contamination. the former mill building with associated contamination

Final Levels – plots 170-177, levels generally reduced, plots 178 – 181 raised (>2m) with material from south-east of the site.

Additional Info: 150mm topsoil placed

Analysis: 2 samples taken after final levels placed, TP701 (plot 175) and TP 702 (plot 178). Both samples did not detect any contaminants of concern above GAC's and broadly agreed with the results with TP703, which was also taken from placed material from this source.

Based on the site history of the source (south east) and some analysis of material likely to be present in the top 1m of the garden plots, it is considered unlikely that a significant pollution linkage exists at the above plots. It should also be noted that the welcome inclusion of 150mm clean cover layer would also help break any pollution linkages that were not detected.

Update Summary
I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 182 & 183 (discharge requested)

History – Mill building

Final Levels - Generally raised with "Re:profiling of central portion of site and surplus from south-east of the site. "

Analysis - Direct analysis of both garden areas undertaken HP4 (plot 182) and HP5 (plot 183). No contaminants detected above GAC's

Additional Info: 150mm clean topsoil

Summary
Based on the analysis of material likely to be present in the top 1m of the garden plots, it is considered unlikely that a significant pollution linkage exists at the above plots. It should also be noted that the welcome inclusion of 150mm clean cover layer would also help break any pollution linkages that were not detected.

Update Summary
I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 184 -187(discharge requested)

History – Building /Car park area containing effluent treatment and an electrical substation.

Final Levels - Generally raised with "Re:profiling of central portion of site and surplus From south-east of the site. "

Analysis –1 sample at TP215, indicated no contaminates above GAC (pre reprofile) Direct analysis of adjacent garden material HP4 (plot 182) and HP5 (plot 183) and HP12 (plot 161) No contaminants detected above GAC's ,

Additional Info: 150mm clean topsoil placed

Summary
No direct samples are taken in this area It would appear to be some unknowns regarding the material used in the garden areas following the site re: profile, however, examination of adjacent plots apparently from the same source, indicates that samples are not contaminated.

Awaiting Further Validation

Plots 186 and 187 require Gas protection CS2 – no validation provided.

Gas Update
NHBC Certificates (in bundle) appear to relate to insulation rather than ground gas protection or other issues? Please Clarify

Update Summary

Subject to some further clarification I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

Plots 188 – 197* ; Plot 194 & 195 (discharge requested)

History – Soft Landscaping

Final Levels - Generally raised with "Re:profiling of central portion of site and surplus From south-east of the site. "

Analysis:

- HP1 (plot 188), HP2 (plot 189) and HP3 (190)

- HP1 indicates that asbestos was detected in 2 samples extending to a depth of 0.8m (including Amosite). Further work should be undertaken in this area to quantify the level of Asbestos contamination, and possible removal of impacted soils. Any further remediation proposals (600mm cap) should incorporate a break layer (geo text layer of hard dig)

Update

- Further asbestos screen undertaken from plot 188 (HP1A) undertaken at plot 157 for Asbestos, this did not detect any Asbestos
- Samples taken from Plot 192 (HP 46) plot 195 (HP47) and plot 197 (HP 45) detected low level Asbestos

    - Low level Asbestos identified in Plot 192 and 197,
    - Cover layer proposed for all plots except 194 & 195

Gas Update

NHBC Certificates (in bundle) appear to relate to insulation rather than ground gas protection or other issues? Please Clarify

Update Summary

Subject to some further clarification* I would not have any further issues for the above plots.

*All plots require validation with the exception of plots 194 & 195, though one would anticipate that at minimum 150mm cover layer be placed in these areas as a precaution

Soft Landscaping areas

No Information / not complete?

Update Summary

Further validation of soft landscaping areas will be required before full site validation can be achieved Cover layer required in and around TP201, WS 410 BH301A area

Regards

Dan

Dr. Daniel McCrory

Pollution Officer
Regulatory Services
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street
Leek
ST13 6HQ

Direct Dial: 01538 395400 Ext: 4413
Mobile: 07736380776

From: Marcus Davis [mailto:Marcus.Davis@aslenvironmental.co.uk]
Sent: 01 July 2015 11:16
To: Mccrory, Daniel
Cc: Pozylo, Adam; Smith, Paul; Will Prior; Simpkin, Rachael
Subject: RE: Former Uplands Mill, Biddulph - Completion Report - Issue 3

Dan,

Thank you for the update. We look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

Marcus

Marcus Davis
Projects Director

Holly Farm Business Park
Honiley
Warwickshire
CV8 1NP

T: +44 (0)1926 485 508
F: +44 (0)1926 485 507
M: +44(0)7718 516 144
E: marcus.davis@aslenvironmental.co.uk
W: www.aslenvironmental.co.uk

From: Mccrory, Daniel [mailto:Daniel.Mccrory@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk]
Sent: 01 July 2015 11:13
To: Marcus Davis
Cc: Pozylo, Adam; Smith, Paul; Will Prior; Simpkin, Rachael
Subject: RE: Former Uplands Mill, Biddulph - Completion Report - Issue 3

Marcus,

I have now gone through the report and I have nearly finished the update on each plot. I will get the final version to by Friday. There are no major issues but one or two minor ones.

Regards

Dan

Dr. Daniel McCrory

Pollution Officer
Regulatory Services
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
Moorlands House
Stockwell Street

Leek
ST13 6HQ

Direct Dial: 01538 395400 Ext: 4413
Mobile: 07736380776

From: Marcus Davis [mailto:Marcus.Davis@aslenvironmental.co.uk]
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 10:39 AM
To: Mccrory, Daniel
Cc: Pozylo, Adam; Smith, Paul; Will Prior; Simpkin, Rachael
Subject: RE: Former Uplands Mill, Biddulph - Completion Report - Issue 3

Dan,

Further to the emails from my colleague Will Prior, issued in response to your comments dated 23rd February, please can you confirm when we can expect to receive you response or are you in a position to recommend the sign off of the parts of the site where no further works are considered necessary?

Please contact us with any queries.

Regards

Marcus

Marcus Davis
Projects Director

Holly Farm Business Park
Honiley
Warwickshire
CV8 1NP

T: +44 (0)1926 485 508
F: +44 (0)1926 485 507
M: +44(0)7718 516 144
E: marcus.davis@aslenvironmental.co.uk
W: www.aslenvironmental.co.uk

From: Will Prior
Sent: 06 May 2015 15:00
To: Daniel.Mccrory@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk
Cc: Marcus Davis; Pozylo, Adam; Smith, Paul
Subject: Former Uplands Mill, Biddulph - Completion Report - Issue 3

Dan,

Further to our correspondence and discussions, please find attached a digital copy of the Completion Report – Issue 3 (report reference 038-09-087.1502, dated 6th May 2015) for the above named site. We will also forward all available NHBC sign off certificates under a separate email due to the file size.

We trust this is satisfactory for you to recommend discharge of the relevant planning conditions for those plots where the requested works have now been completed. We look forward to receiving your comments as soon as possible.

Regards

Will Prior
Projects Manager

Holly Farm Business Park
Honiley
Warwickshire
CV8 1NP

T: +44 (0)1926 485 508
F: +44 (0)1926 485 507
M: 07715 993 739
E: will.prior@aslenvironmental.co.uk
W: www.aslenvironmental.co.uk

This email and any attachments are the copyright of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council and intended for the recipient. Their contents are confidential and should not be disclosed to any third parties. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council accepts no responsibility for information unrelated to the business of the Council. If you are not the named recipient and you have received this E-mail please notify Staffordshire Moorlands District Council immediately. This E-mail and any response to it may be monitored on behalf of the Council.
