



Cedar Barn
 White Lodge
 Walgrave
 Northamptonshire
 NN6 9PY

t: 01604 781877
 e: mail@soiltechnics.net
 w: www.soiltechnics.net

FAO Matthew Christensen
 Taylor Wimpey North Thames
 1st Floor, Imperial Place
 Maxwell Road
 Borehamwood
 Hertfordshire
 WD6 1JN

Date: 6th March 2020
 Your Ref:
 Our Ref: L-STM3370A-004

Dear Matthew,

Re: 6/2019/2130/COND – Development at Chequersfield

We have received the LQM review of our ground investigation and remediation strategy reports for the development at Chequersfield. These documents have been revised to address matters raised by LQM.

The table below summarises our responses to LQM’s comments and directs to the relevant paragraphs/sections within the revised reports. Our responses are limited to comments and requirements for further information relating to chemical contamination and the remediation strategy. We have reviewed EPG’s ‘Gas Mitigation Design Report’ and, in our opinion, comments and requirements for further information as identified by LQM in relation to ground gas and vapour risks have been adequately addressed in the EPG report.

| Summary of responses to LQM review report – ground investigation report | | | |
|--|---|--|------------------------------------|
| LQM paragraph reference | LQM comment | Soiltechnics response | Revised GI report paragraph |
| (17) | Noted reference to outdated guidance | Current guidance referenced | 2.6.3 |
| (19) | Unclear whether site reconnaissance carried out | Date of site reconnaissance now included in site description | 3.2.2 |
| (23) | “The exact dates of the site work and details of exactly what was undertaken and by whom are not clear”. | Dates of phases of investigation and scope of investigations undertaken are provided | 4.1.1 |
| (25) | “The report provides no justification for the sampling and analytical strategies adopted by Soiltechnics as required by BS 10175”. | Constraints on site investigation (in particular the high voltage cable) are clarified. Further detail on the analytical strategy is provided in Section 8. Statements in 8.8.3 revised to account for confirmed site layout | 4.2, 8.7.1 and 8.8.3 |
| (27) | “...LQM are unsure if the testing is sufficient to provide a robust characterisation of potential contamination in the subsurface....”. | Table 5.2.1 is intended as a summary of scheduled testing. Further detail on the analytical strategy is provided in Section 8 | 8.7.1 |
| (28) | Comment on sample deviations | Deviations acknowledged in Tables 8.7.1a and 8.7.1b | 8.7.1 |
| (35) | Comment on use of statistics for targeted sampling and analysis | Table 8.7.1a provides further clarity on which analysis is | 8.7.1 |

| | | | |
|------|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | deemed targeted and non-targeted | |
| (36) | Comment on generic assessment criteria for lead | The upper bound C4SL for lead of 210mg/kg is stated (270mg/kg is the upper bound of the range of concentrations recorded) | 8.7.6.3.2 |
| (38) | Comment on appropriateness of use of SGV for assessment of dibenzofuran | Reference to the SGV has been removed | 8.7.6.5.1 |
| (39) | Potential vapour risks not considered | Vapour risks have been addressed in the EPG report | Refer to EPG report |
| (40) | Missing lab test certificates | All certificates now included in Appendix G. Additional leachate data from May 2019 investigation also now included | Appendix G, Appendix H and 8.7.9.4.1 |
| (54) | Comment on final conceptual model | Reference to final conceptual model removed. Statement in 8.10.1 presents conclusion in NPPF terms | 8.10.1 |

Summary of responses to LQM review report – remediation strategy report

| LQM paragraph reference | LQM comment | Soiltechnics response | Revised RS report paragraph |
|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| (56) | Clarity required regarding extent of capping | Further detail provided on requirement for capping, extent and justification | 3.2.1 |
| (57) | No evidence to justify specified minimum capping thickness | Recommended capping thickness checked using BRE 465 methodology | 3.2.3 |
| (59) | Clarification required for scope of lab testing of imported materials | Clarification provided | 3.4.2 |
| (60) | Query regarding verification criteria for additional determinands | Clarification provided on requirements for TPH and asbestos in imported soils | 3.3.7.2 & 3.3.7.3 |
| (62) | Requirement for photographic records of capping thickness verification | Photographic evidence specified | 3.4.1 |
| (63) | Comment regarding inclusion of unexpected contamination events within the verification report | Statement provided | 3.5.2 |
| (64) | Noted mismatch between compliance documentation specified in 3.3.8 and contents of the verification report | The compliance documentation specified in 3.3.8 relates to imported soils only. Requirements for documentation for inclusion in verification report are given in 3.4.2 | 3.4.2 |

In our opinion, the ground investigation and remediation strategy reports have been revised in accordance with comments and requirements for further information relating to chemical contamination and the remediation strategy as identified by LQM.

Yours sincerely,

Seb Crolla B.Sc., (Hons.), MEnvSc., FGS
seb.crolla@soiltechnics.net
 Associate Director, Soiltechnics Limited

soiltechnics