Charmian,

I have assessed the Environmental Statement (ES) and a would make the following comments on light/construction works/noise/odour impacts. Please see further below, comments made by Steve Manning in relation to Contaminated Land and Air Quality issues:

**Lighting**

I am satisfied with their design strategy and would simply recommend that a condition be applied to require compliance with their proposed design target (ILP Environmental Zone E2).

**Construction Works**

As the ES acknowledges, the construction phase has the potential to cause several environmental impacts. They therefore propose to produce and implement a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). We would expect this to be ‘site-specific’ rather than generic. The ES does suggest that this will be the case. We would expect as a the CEMP to contain as a minimum, the following:

- Acceptable hours of construction works
- Noise control measures
- Specified locations and hours of construction vehicle movements (and workers)
- A dust management plan, again to include a plan of sources and any abatement measures
- A waste management plan. Burning on site would be an unacceptable/illegal means of waste disposal.

Again, the dust/noise sections in the ES seem to acknowledge that this will be required and it is just a case of applying a condition to require the submission of this CEMP to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

**Noise**

I am happy with the recommendations in the ES with regard to dealing with road traffic and fixed plant noise impacting on residential receptors. The applicant will, however, need to submit a Noise Mitigation Scheme (prior to the commencement of development) via condition, that demonstrates that their design targets will be met. This scheme should include prescribed acoustic treatments to the building envelopes of all affected facades, based on detailed calculations once the design details are known as well as the layout of gardens etc with regard to the meeting the ‘outdoor living areas’ criterion.

The scheme should also prescribe the source noise level, position and distance/screening attenuation effects of any selected fixed plant installed at the local centre and school, so as to demonstrate that the “Rating Level of -10dB below measured background noise level (BS4142:2014)” target can be met.

I am very concerned about the potential for significant adverse noise impact as a consequence of building residential receptors immediately adjacent to the Chippenham Rifle and Pistol Club, despite the proposal for 3/5m barriers mentioned in the ES. The club has permission to meet on any day of the week between 9am and 9pm, but
apparently meet on Sunday mornings and Tuesday evenings during the summer months. These are nevertheless potentially noise sensitive times. I feel that visits are required to this site in Summer months at these times to assess whether it would be apt to build houses in such close proximity to such a noisy operation.

I cannot support this area of the proposed residential development based on the information in the ES and will require further information to be satisfied that no ‘buffer zone’ is required between source and receptor.

**Odour**

Wessex Water have raised the potential for proposed dwellings to be adversely affected by odour from the Blackwell Hams Sewage Treatment Works (STW) as an issue.

I have read the ‘odour’ paragraphs in the Environmental Statement (ES) and can see that predictive modelling has demonstrated (Figure 11.2) that proposed residential receptors should receive the same level of odour risk that occurs for existing residential properties in the area (1.5 OU \( \text{E} \)/m³). This would seem logical.

As you may be aware, some further modelling (AQ TN01) issued 2nd December 2014 by Peter Brett Associates (PBA), requested by Wessex Water, has concluded that existing (medium/high) and proposed residential receptors may be exposed to a ‘substantial’ (ie >10) odour impact of between 50 and 200 units (with Sludge Tank 4) and 5 to 50 (without Sludge Tank 4).

I mean no disrespect to Wessex Water or PBA when I say that I am very sceptical about these predictions and find it difficult to correlate these concentrations with what is actually happening on the ground. I can only conclude that, as Celine Bouvet inferred in the Technical Note, the modelling has over-predicted the impact.

I can confirm that we have no record (or recollection) of any odour complaints against this STW.

I do accept and acknowledge, however, that there is the ‘potential’ for the proposed dwellings to experience a slight odour impact from time to time, but my professional opinion is, that this would not be so sufficient as to raise an objection from our point of view, due to a lack of complaints and physical olfactory evidence.

The nearest proposed dwellings are approximately 350m to the west and the prevailing wind is, I believe, South-Westerly.

In my opinion, if these modelled levels prevailed locally, it would inevitably have generated a history of complaint from residents in the Thomas Mead area of Pewsham, accepting that nearer agricultural receptors would possibly be more tolerant.

I am aware that Wessex Water are meeting with the consultants to discuss the modelling results.

If you have any queries relating to the issues that Steve and I have commented on, please feel free to ask.

Regards

John Freegard
Senior Public Protection Officer
Wiltshire Council
North/West
01249 706404

From: Manning, Steven
Sent: 27 January 2015 12:08
To: Freegard, John
Subject: 14/12118/OUT - Rowden Park Garden Village
Importance: High
Hi John,

I have looked at the documents submitted in respect of the above proposed development and would like to comment on Contaminated Land and Air Quality.

**Contaminated Land**

Our records do not show any historical land uses of a potentially contaminative nature for the majority of the proposed site. There is however a parcel of unknown filled ground likely to be associated with former extraction activity to the south of the proposed site (see mapping extract below):

The Environmental Statement states the following regarding this feature:

13.11.3. There are no known major sources of contamination or hazardous waste within the proposed development areas and the historical and the current landfill activity, in general, makes the presence of significant concentrations of potential contamination unlikely. The potential exception relates to the area of former landfill which is part of the Site, although this area may represent a potential source of soil contamination it is to be retained as green open space and will remain undeveloped.
The Peter Brett Associates Ground Investigation submitted with the application further supports the above and identifies two infilled regions (see below)

The Local Planning Authority would need to be satisfied that both parcels of unknown filled ground were suitable for their intended use and as such requisite investigation as to their composition would be necessary. The gassing risk they pose to the nearest proposed housing development would also need to be investigated and any mitigation justified in the context of a gas risk assessment. It is noted that only one gas installation is in close proximity to one of these potential sources.

Peter Brett Associates make the following comment in their Ground Investigation Report of December 2014:
In view of these matters the following condition is required for this proposed development:

No development shall commence on site (other than that required to be carried out as part of a scheme of remediation approved by the Local Planning Authority under this condition), until steps (i) to (iii) below have been fully complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until step (iv) has been complied with in full in relation to that contamination.

**Step (i) Site Characterisation:**

An investigation and risk assessment must be completed to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

- A survey of the extent, nature and scale of contamination on site;
- The collection and interpretation of relevant information to form a conceptual model of the site, and a preliminary risk assessment of all the likely pollutant linkages;
- If the preliminary risk assessment identifies any potentially significant pollutant linkages a ground investigation shall be carried out, to provide further information on the location, type and concentration of contaminants in the soil and groundwater and other characteristics that can influence the behaviour of the contaminants;
- An assessment of the potential risks to
  - human health,
  - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
  - adjoining land,
  - groundwater and surface waters,
  - ecological systems,
  - archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s “Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11” and other authoritative guidance.

**Step (ii) Submission of Remediation Scheme:**

If any unacceptable risks are identified as a result of the investigation and assessment referred to in step (i) above, a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use must be prepared. This should detail the works required to remove any unacceptable
risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment, should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, a timetable of works and site management procedures.

**Step (iii) Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme:**

The approved remediation scheme under step (ii) must be carried out in accordance with its requirements. The Local Planning Authority must be given at least two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

**Step (iv) Reporting of Unexpected Contamination:**

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it should be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment should be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of step (i) above and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme should be prepared in accordance with the requirements of step (ii) and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Step (v) Verification of remedial works:**

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report (referred to in PPS23 as a validation report) must be produced. The report should demonstrate the effectiveness of the remedial works.

A statement should also be provided by the developer which is signed by a person who is competent to confirm that the works detailed in the approved scheme have been carried out (The Local Planning Authority can provide a draft Remediation Certificate when the details of the remediation scheme have been approved at stage (ii) above).

The verification report and signed statement should be submitted to and approved in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

**Step (vi) Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance:**

If a monitoring and maintenance scheme is required as part of the approved remediation scheme, reports must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval at the relevant stages in the development process as approved by the Local Planning Authority in the scheme approved pursuant to step (ii) above, until all the remediation objectives in that scheme have been achieved.

All works must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s “Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11” and other authoritative guidance.

**REASON:** To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

In respect of the Peter Brett Associates Ground Investigation Report of December 2014 clarification is also sought on laboratory analysis obtained as only a summary table has been seen (referred to as Table 2.1 (which appears to be a
summary of solid geology) but included as Table 1 of Appendix B; the LPA needs to see copies of the original laboratory test certificates to be confident about the provenance of tabulated data. It is understood these may be found in the factual report of the Ground Investigation GEL 2014 ? a copy of which is sought. Also the treatment of ground gases in the Ground Investigation report only refers to gas concentrations with no mention of any ground gas risk assessment having been carried out which includes details of the maximum gas concentrations and flow rates observed expressed as a gas screening value and compared against current guidance. These matters need to be addressed as well as the potential need for additional investigation work which characterises the two potential features of contamination concern present at the site above.

It is recognised that the provision of the phase 1 investigation reporting and phase 2 investigation reporting should contribute to the eventual discharge of the suggested condition.

Air Quality

Our records show that proposed site is not within an air quality management area or within an air quality planning zone, in view of this we would not be automatically seeking an air quality assessment and associated transportation studies. Due to the scale of this proposal and the likely need for an EIA both an air quality assessment and transportation study should be undertaken; which appears to be the case from the documents looked at.

The councils adopted Air Quality Strategy seeks positive contributions to the improvement of air quality in Wiltshire; in view of this we would expect to see the developer demonstrate what positive contributions they could make towards improving air quality in Wiltshire e.g. sustainable travel alternatives and infrastructure, driver training, tree planting, contributing to local air quality action groups. The following link has further information and resources which underpin the comments above www.wiltshireairquality.org.uk

If I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

Steve Manning

Steven Manning, MSc, BSc(Hons), Chartered EHP
Environmental Health Officer
Public Protection,
Wiltshire Council
County Hall,
Bythesea Road,
Trowbridge,
Wiltshire BA14 8JD

01225 716680
steven.manning@wiltshire.gov.uk

www.wiltshire.gov.uk