

Tom McEvoy

From: Daniel Evans <daniel.evans@sutcliffe.co.uk>
Sent: 08 April 2026 14:45
To: Tom McEvoy; William Baldwin; 'Ian Welsh'
Cc: David Bowen; Alex Tosh
Subject: RE: 25/00087/COND1 [Filed 14 Apr 2026 16:36]

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Filed by Mail Manager

Hi Tom,

I have drafted a **responses** below to the queries, but there are a few bits we need to add to the report to box this off. @'Ian' do you have any site reduction photos of Plots 5-9 and any waste transfer notes?

'Post Demolition sampling and inspection of the historic pond in the south
The revised report confirms that no additional sampling was undertaken following demolition of the former public house. Sutcliffe state that the risk to future users is deemed acceptable as a 300mm clean cover system has been placed in Plots 1-4, which are located within the previous footprint of the building. The assumption is that the site characterisation is the same under the footprint of the building as it is elsewhere on site. However, the purpose of the additional sampling (as detailed within Section 2.3 of the Remediation Strategy) was to ascertain if there were any potential contamination issues that arose from the demolition of the building or subbase material. This was needed to demonstrate that a 300mm cover system would be sufficient to protect end users. *It is advised that we are unable to accept that the remedial measures undertaken in this area are acceptable, without supporting evidence.*

It appears that no inspection of the historical pond was undertaken, instead a review of the historic mapping was carried out. The risk of gas generation was considered low as the pond was infilled in the 1980's and therefore would not be actively generating ground gas due to the time lapsed since it was filled. Please confirm whether there are any details available about the nature of the infill material to support this conclusion, as well as proving evidence that this material does not pose a contamination risk?

Historic Pond

Northern and Southern ponds both last appear on 1981-1984 historical mapping, and are no longer visible on 1993 mapping, hence a high likelihood that both were infilled at the same time. Samples obtained at position WS103 and TP103 located in the northern pond, both returned with no exceedances of long-term human health thresholds for residential with plant uptake end use, hence there is a reasonable assumption that the same material will be provided in the southern pond.

Post Demolition

All samples obtained during the investigation, including the position in the vicinity of the former building (WS101) returned with no exceedances of long-term human health thresholds for residential with plant uptake end use. There is a reasonable assumption that the material below this position to have similar ground conditions to below the footprint.

As part of the demolition and formation works to achieve site levels the development, all materials associated with the demolition of the former building, were removed from site and as such any risk associated with contamination of the demolition of the building were removed at this time.

Also, given that the proposal in the former building footprint is majority hardstanding, it is deemed that 300mm is suitable for the remaining soft landscaping areas.

Ground Gas Protection Measures

It has been confirmed that a Novia Methane Pro 390 gas barrier was installed in all plots. Appendix C contained details of the gas membrane specification/ installation photographs and Sutcliffe's visual

inspection of the Gas Protection Measures. Whilst details of the installer have not been provided the information is deemed sufficient.

Cover System

The source of the topsoil has been confirmed as being imported from R Draper, testing comprising 3 samples from a stockpile (September 2025) and 3 from Plots 1-4 (November 2025). *There are no plot validation photographs from Plots 5-9 please submit.*

Provided in the revised report.

Topsoil was imported on site until the 3rd December 2025, *please confirm that this is the same source/ originating stockpile from Drapers and therefore the testing undertaken is sufficiently representative of all material imported?*

The source is the same material from Drapers and in accordance with our Phase III Remediation Strategy testing frequencies, the testing undertaken is sufficient for this material.

Please provide the waste transfer notes for the site won topsoil, as detailed within Section 2.3 Remaining Potential Contaminant Linkages.'

Provided in the revised report.

Kind Regards,

Dan Evans

BSc (Hons) AMIEnvSc FGS M.I. Soil Sci.

Geo-Environmental Scientist

SUTCLIFFE

18-20 Harrington Street, Liverpool, L2 9QA

t: 0151 227 3155

e: daniel.evans@sutcliffe.co.uk

w: www.sutcliffe.co.uk



Inspiring and influencing the built environment since 1985

Head Office:

18-20 Harrington Street, Liverpool, L2 9QA

Tel: 0151 227 3155

Structural & Civil Engineering
Geotechnical & Environmental Investigations
Building Surveying
Pre Planning Services

Manchester Office: 0161 817 5180

North Wales Office: 01978 664 071

London Office: 020 8016 4320



From: Tom McEvoy <tmcevoy@agarchitects.co.uk>

Sent: 23 March 2026 15:48

To: William Baldwin <william.baldwin@sutcliffe.co.uk>; Daniel Evans <daniel.evans@sutcliffe.co.uk>

Cc: David Bowen <david.bowen@sutcliffe.co.uk>; Alex Tosh <alex.tosh@sutcliffe.co.uk>; 'Ian Welsh'