VARLEY STREET
MANCHESTER

FINAL ADDITIONAL SITE INVESTIGATION AND UPDATED REMEDIATION STRATEGY


Job Number: LKC 22 1670
Date: September 2023
Client: ISG Ltd



INCREASING LAND VALUE

LK GROUP

INCREASING LAND VALUE



LK GROUP

LK Consult Document Verification			
Site Address	Sawley Road, Miles Platting, Manchester, M40 8EF		
Report Title	Final Additional Site Investigation and Updated Remediation Strategy		
Job Number	LKC 22 1670	**Document Ref.**	LKC 22 1670-B1-GI-Varley Street
Date Issued	September 2023	**Report Version**	R0
Prepared By	Ella Mcleod	**Reviewed By**	Peter Dunn

Revision Record			
Revision No.	**Date**	**Nature of Revision**	**Approved By**

DISCLAIMER

This report has been prepared by LK Consult (LKC) who have exercised such professional skill, care and diligence as may reasonably be expected of a properly qualified and competent consultant, experienced in preparing reports of a similar scope.

However, to the extent that the report is based or relies upon information contained in records, reports or other materials provided to LKC, which have not been independently produced or verified, LKC gives no warranty, representation or assurance as to the accuracy or completeness of such information.

This report is issued on the condition that LKC will not be held liable for any loss arising from ground conditions between sampling points (i.e. boreholes/trial pits/hand augers/surface samples) which have not been shown by the sampling points or related testing carried out during the investigation, nor for any loss arising from conditions below the maximum depth of the investigation. Opinions on such conditions, where given, are for general guidance only.

This report is prepared solely for the benefit of ISG Ltd. It may not be relied upon by, or submitted to a third party for their reliance for the purposes of valuation, mortgage, insurance and regulatory approval, until all invoices have been settled in full.

Those using this information in subsequent assessments or evaluations do so at their own risk.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Site Details

Site Location:	Site is bound by Sawley Road to the north, Vickers Street to the east and James Street to the south. Centred at approximate National Grid Reference 386140E 399618N.
Site Area:	Approximately 15,300m^2.
Current Land Use:	Vacant land.
Proposed Development:	Planning ref. 136645/VO/2023. Erection of a part single, part two storey detached school building (Class F1) with associated sports facilities, access, car parking arrangements, landscaping and boundary treatment.
Purpose of Report:	Contamination Assessment.

Preliminary Risk Assessment

PRA Details:	Undertaken by EnviroSolution Ltd (ref. CL101_V1, dated 1st February 2023).
History:	Terraced housing, infant school, 2no. timber yards. Surrounding area: several works.
Geology / Hydrogeology:	Glacial Till (Secondary Undifferentiated Aquifer) over Pennie Middle Coal Measures (Secondary A Aquifer).
Mining:	1no. mine shaft is mapped to be located on site. of the site is classified as a 'Development High Risk Area' due to the presence of mine shafts, past shallow coal mine workings and probable shallow coal mine workings.
Relevant Environmental Setting:	Rochdale Canal 110m south. No groundwater abstraction licenses or discharge permits within 300m. No recorded landfills / historic landfill sites. Not within Source Protection Zone.
Recommendations:	The site was classified as moderate risk in terms of contamination and the risk to identified receptors (e.g. human health, controlled waters, buildings). Site investigation was recommended.

Additional Ground Investigation Work Undertaken

Date of Investigation:	10th and 23rd May 2023.
Intrusive Investigation Work Undertaken:	7no. window sample boreholes (WS101-WS106 & WS104A). 2no. trial pits, soakaway test undertaken in 1no. pit (TP101, SA101) – reported under separate cover.
Monitoring Wells:	Installed in all boreholes.
Monitoring:	6no. gas monitoring visits.
Insitu Geotechnical Testing:	SPTs, pocket penetrometer tests.

Contamination Risk Assessment

The table below shows a summary of the risk assessments undertaken for each pollutant linkage, the revised conceptual model and recommendation for either remediation and / or further investigation.

	Pollutant Linkage	Risk	Assessment
1	Contaminants posing a risk to future site users and offsite receptors via dermal contact, ingestion and inhalation (of soil, dust, fibres and home-grown produce).	**Moderate** (metals, PAHs, TPH, asbestos)	- Elevated contaminants identified. - **Recommendations:** Remediation required in soft landscaping areas. Watching brief during earthworks.
2	Volatile contaminants posing a risk to future site users and offsite receptors via the inhalation of vapours.	**Moderate**	- Volatile contamination identified. - **Recommendations:** Remediation to include installing a vapour resistant membrane in proposed buildings, Watching brief during earthworks.
3	Gas posing a risk to buildings and future site users, buildings and offsite land users via the migration of gas into building causing explosion and asphyxiation.	**Moderate**	- Elevated carbon dioxide identified in all monitoring wells and mine shaft located on site. - **Recommendations:** Gas protection measures in line with CS2. Should hazardous ground gases be encountered as part of routine monitoring undertaken as part of coal mining remediation, then further gas monitoring and/ or upgrading of gas protection rating may be required
4	Mobile contamination posing a risk to controlled waters via the migration through permeable strata.	**Low**	- No significant risk to groundwater given the environmental settings and ground conditions encountered. - **Recommendations:** No remediation required. Watching brief during earthworks, particularly for petroleum hydrocarbons.
5	Organic contaminants posing a risk to water pipes.	**Moderate**	- Elevated organic contaminants identified. - **Recommendations:** UU risk assessment to be completed. The site will likely require barrier piping.

Recommendations and Remedial Strategy

The table below shows the remediation and validation requirements for the site. This information should be documented in a Site Completion Report for submission to the local authority.

Phase	Remediation Requirements	Validation Requirements
Pre-Construction (enabling)	<u>Excavation, processing and stockpiling</u> This will include the grubbing out and processing of hardstanding and unsuitable material. Any oversize material, if encountered will be processed and re-used as appropriate. Appropriate site won material will be stockpiled for potential reuse. Additionally, suspect material will be quarantined for characterisation prior to possible offsite disposal.	Log of work undertaken including photographs. Re-use of material will be under U1 and T5. Testing of site won/ imported soil as per Table 6-2.

Phase	Remediation Requirements	Validation Requirements
Pre-Construction (enabling)	Earthworks Site Inspections & Unexpected Contamination A watching brief should be maintained by a suitably qualified and experienced person during enabling works to identify any unusual ground conditions. If any visual or olfactory evidence of contamination be encountered at the site, further assessment of the material may be required. Particular attention should be paid to hydrocarbons, as visual and olfactory evidence of contamination identified during site investigations. Should hazardous ground gases be encountered as part of routine monitoring undertaken as part of coal mining remediation, then further gas monitoring and/ or upgrading of gas protection rating may be required	Log of work undertaken including photographs. Details of any sampling undertaken and validation of any potential additional remedial work. Further assessment of gas risk if hazardous ground gas encountered.
	Segregation and removal of unsuitable materials As part of the watching brief during earthworks, areas of unexpected contamination (including hazardous waste) and geotechnically unsuitable material will be delineated, excavated and removed following suitable testing and verification.	Log of work undertaken including photographs. Consignment notes confirming removal of unsuitable material.
Build-Phase	Vapour Membrane Elevated petroleum hydrocarbon (aromatic C10-12) and VOCs were identified on site. Given the ground conditions encountered, further contamination may be present across the site. It is recommended that buildings are to include a vapour resistant membrane.	Plan including foundation design. Photographic evidence showing installation of membrane.
	Gas Protection Measures In line with CS2 as per UK guidance[1,2]. This is likely to / should include: • Passive subfloor or active subfloor ventilation system. • Methane and carbon dioxide resistant membrane installed as per manufacturer's instructions. • Ventilation of confined spaces within the building. • Well-constructed reinforced suspended, raft or cast in situ ground slab. • Minimum penetration of ground slab by services. • All joints and penetrations to be sealed. Depending on the type of building and foundation design the protection measures can vary. The gas protection measures will be detailed and approved with the Local Authority once the foundation design has been confirmed.	Supply and review of foundation designs. Photographic evidence of sub-floor void, ventilation and suitably sealed gas membrane. Validation of gas protection measures should be in line with CIRIA 735[3]

[1] CIRIA (2007). "Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings." CIRIA C665
[2] BSI (2015). "Code of Practice for the Design of Protective Measures for Methane and Carbon Dioxide Ground Gases for new buildings." BS8485:2015.
[3] CIRIA (2014). "Good Practice on the Testing and Verification of Protection Systems for Building Against Hazardous Ground Gas". CIRIA C735.

Phase	Remediation Requirements	Validation Requirements
Build-Phase	Environmental Cover System Shared Landscaping: 450mm thick environmental cover system comprising: geotextile membrane and at least 450mm comprising clean inert fill and sufficient topsoil for a growing medium.	Measured thickness of environmental cover system via hand dug pits and staff and/or as-built survey at each layer. Photographic evidence throughout each stage, showing geotextile membrane, subsoil and topsoil installation process and completion. Chemical validation of imported/ site-won soils.: See Table 6-2.
	United Utilities (UU) Risk Assessment UU Potable Water Risk Assessment to be undertaken once the location and depth of potable water pipes are known and following completion of the earthworks. Barrier pipe likely to be required.	To be completed following completion of the remediation earthworks.

The remediation recommended in the table above should be validated to ensure it has been carried out appropriately. This should be documented in a Completion/Validation Report and submitted to the local authority for completion.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... **ii**

1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Background 1

2 Summary of Previous Work **2**
2.1 Summary of Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report 2
2.2 Summary of Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Site Assessment Report 3
2.3 Summary of Shallow Mining and Mine Shaft Investigation Works Report 4

3 Further Ground Investigation **6**
3.1 Site Investigation Design and Methodology 6
3.2 Well Installations 6
3.3 Onsite Testing 7
3.4 Laboratory Testing 7
3.5 Gas Monitoring 7
3.6 Geotechnical Testing 7

4 Ground Conditions **9**
4.1 Geology – Generalised Sequence 9
4.2 Groundwater 10
4.3 In-Situ Geotechnical Testing 11

5 Further Assessment of Pollutant Linkages **12**
5.1 Introduction 12
5.2 Gas Risk Assessment 14
5.3 Controlled Water Assessment 17
5.4 Additional Risk Assessments 19
5.5 Contamination Conceptual Model 19

6 Remediation Strategy **21**
6.1 Introduction 21
6.2 Summary of Recommended Remediation & Validation Works 21
6.3 General Remediation & Enabling Works Requirements 24
6.4 Pre-Construction (Enabling Works) 26
6.5 Build Phase Remediation Works 26
6.6 Site Completion Report 29

FIGURES

Figure 1: Site Location and Boundary Plan
Figure 2: Site Investigation Location Plan

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Risk Matrix
Appendix B: Profile Logs
Appendix C: Gas Monitoring Results
Appendix D: JIWG Output Sheet
Appendix E: Generic Assessment Criteria Values

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

LK Consult Ltd (LKC) has been commissioned by ISG Ltd to carry out an additional site investigation and provide an updated Remediation Strategy for Varley Street, Manchester. The investigation was undertaken in support of a planning application for the construction of a school with associated sports facilities and infrastructure.

The additional site investigation was undertaken in order to undertake an updated hazardous / ground gas risk assessment for the site. Additional site investigation works at Nelson Street (parcel of land adjacent to the west of site) were undertaken by LKC at the same time at this investigation and is reported under separate cover.

The Remediation Strategy is required to determine the work necessary in order to ensure the site is "suitable for use" for the proposed development with regards to potential contaminated land pollutant linkages.

A summary of the site details is presented in Table 1-1. Figures 1 indicates the site location and boundary.

Site Location	Site is bound by Sawley Road to the north, Vickers Street to the east and James Street to the south. Centred at approximate National Grid Reference 386140E 399618N.
Approximate Area	Approximately 15,300m^2.
Topography	Approximately 59m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). Site is approximately level.
Current Site Use	Vacant land.
Purpose of Report	Planning.
Proposed Development	Planning ref. 136645/VO/2023. Erection of a part single, part two storey detached school building (Class F1) with associated sports facilities, access, car parking arrangements, landscaping and boundary treatment.

Table 1-1. Summary of site details.

2 Summary of Previous Work

The following reports have previously been provided for the site and should be read in conjunction with this report:

- 'Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report' for Varley Street Manchester, undertaken by EnviroSolution Ltd (ref. CL101_V1, dated 1st February 2023).
- 'Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Site Assessment Report' for Varley Street Manchester, undertaken by EnviroSolution Ltd (ref. CL102_V1, dated 2nd March 2022).
- Shallow Mining and Mine Shaft Investigation Works report undertaken by LKC (ref. CL-602-LKC 22 1670-CMSI R1, dated 20th June 2023).

2.1 Summary of Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report

The site history, site description and environmental settings are described in the Phase 1 Site Assessment Report (desk study), with pertinent information summarised below:

- The site is vacant with rough vegetation across the majority of the site and a tarmac games court in the west.
- Historical mapping indicates that terraced housing was present in the eastern part of the site from 1893 mapping onwards. The area to the north of the site was also developed for terraced housing from 1893 mapping.
- A timber yard is shown in the eastern part of the site from 1908 mapping, which was extended by 1948 mapping.
- A day nursery is present in the south west of site from 1948 mapping, a second timber yard is present in the east.
- By 1965 mapping, all buildings are demolished and the site is used as a playing field.
- Surrounding historical land uses include several works within 50m to the north, south and south west (chemical works, cloth works, iron foundry, rubber works and smelting works). By 1965 mapping, the chemical and rubber works 10m south of site were converted to warehouses and a depot.
- By 1978 mapping, the chemical works and iron foundries are labelled as works and an engineering works is located adjacent to the eastern boundary. The works adjacent to the eastern site boundary is no longer present.
- A works is still present to the south of site (understood to be a packaging company).
- BGS records indicate the site is underlain by superficial Till (Diamicton) and Pennine Upper Coal Measures Formation. 2no. BGS borehole records 10m and 25m west of the site indicate made ground to approximately 2m below ground level (bgl) overlying stiff clay with lenses of sand (4m thick band of sand recorded at 12mbgl). Bedrock was recorded at depths of between 25-27.5mbgl.
- The site is intersected by two seams of coal, one of which is recorded as being worked.
- 1no. mine shaft is mapped to be located on site.
- Part of the site is classified as a 'Development High Risk Area' due to the presence of mine shaft, past shallow coal mine workings and probable shallow coal mine workings.
- Superficial deposits are considered a Secondary Undifferentiated Aquifer and bedrock a Secondary A Aquifer.

- Rochdale Canal is located 110m south of the site. No groundwater abstraction licenses or discharge permits were identified within 300m from the site and the site is not located within a Source Protection Zone.
- No recorded landfills / historic landfill sites were identified within 250m from the site.

The desk study report concludes that "*the site can be classified as moderate risk in terms of contamination and the risk to the identified receptors (e.g. human health, controlled waters, buildings)".* The report recommended site investigation to assess potential pollutant linkages.

2.2 Summary of Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Site Assessment Report

An intrusive investigation was undertaken on 17th to 18th January 2022 and 24th to 25th February 2022. 10no. window sample boreholes were drilled to depths of 3.50-5.00m below ground level (bgl). 19no. trial pits were excavated to depths of 1.50-2.50mbgl and 2no rotary boreholes were drilled to a depth of 35.00mbgl.

The site investigation included in-situ geotechnical testing as well as geotechnical laboratory analysis. Chemical laboratory analysis was undertaken on soil samples collected from investigation locations.

6no. boreholes were installed with monitoring wells to undertake groundwater level monitoring and gas monitoring.

Made ground was recorded to depths of between 0.50-3.30mbgl and was generally thickest in the south western half of the site. The made ground generally comprised sandy clayey gavel / gravelly sandy clay with anthropogenic material including brick, glass, concrete, ceramic fragments, slag, ash and timber.

Visual / olfactory evidence of hydrocarbons was noted as follows:

- A strong hydrocarbon odour and an oily sheen was recorded in WS7 between 0.30-1.10mbgl;
- A slight hydrocarbon odour noted within the superficial clay in TP1 (1.00-1.50mbgl);
- A hydrocarbon odour was noted at 1.00mbgl in TP7, and a slight hydrocarbon odour noted at 1.10mbgl in TP13;
- Made ground with an oily sheen and strong hydrocarbon odour was recorded in TP14 between 0.30-1.20mbgl;
- A hydrocarbon odour was noted in TP16 at 1.20mbgl.

The made ground is underlain by soft to stiff brown / orange / grey mottled slightly gravelly clay.

A band of sand was encountered in the two rotary boreholes at depths of 10.00-11.00mbgl (thickness of 4.50-5.50m). Bedrock was encountered in the rotary boreholes at depth of between 23.50-26.50mbgl, consisting of grey mudstone with sandstone bands. No voids or loss of flush were recorded and no evidence of unrecorded shallow workings. Further investigation was recommended across the site.

Groundwater seepages were noted in 5no. trial pits at depths of between 1.20-2.00mbgl. Groundwater was not encountered during thrilling of the window sample boreholes.

Groundwater level monitoring was undertaken on 3no. occasions. Groundwater levels in 4no. monitoring well were recorded between 0.85-4.95mbgl. No groundwater was recorded in the remaining 2no. wells installed. It was concluded that the groundwater strikes and subsequent monitored levels represent perched water.

Soil laboratory analysis results were compared against Generic Assessment Criteria (GAC) for a residential without homegrown produce land-use scenario and against commercial land-use scenario for comparative purposes. When compared against residential without homegrown produce land-use scenario as a conservative approach, elevated contaminants were recorded for heavy metals (arsenic, lead), petroleum hydrocarbons (aromatic C10-12, C12-16, C16-21 and C21-35), PAHs, SVOCs and naphthalene. Asbestos (chrysotile) was identified in one sample of made ground analysed (TP9 at 0.30mbgl). Quantification testing stated the sample contained 0.015% asbestos. Remediation was recommended in areas of soft landscaping.

Three groundwater samples were collected and compared to UK Drinking Water Standards. Exceedances of arsenic were detected in two of the samples. During the monitoring and sampling of WS7, a strong hydrocarbon odour and a sheen to the water was identified however the groundwater results recorded all TPH fractions are less than limits of detection. The risk to receptors was considered to be negligible due to impermeable Diamicton (till) which underlies the site.

Gas monitoring was undertaken on 3no. occasions between 24th January 2022 to 7th February 2022. The worst-case gas screening value (GSV) calculated classified the site as Characteristic Situation 1 (CS1). However the report recommended the site be considered Characteristic Situation 2 based on carbon dioxide concentrations recorded as greater than 5%v/v and that gas protection measures are required in all new buildings on site.

2.3 Summary of Shallow Mining and Mine Shaft Investigation Works Report

The investigation works were undertaken to confirm the ground conditions below the site and allow an assessment of the potential for the site to be affected by shallow coal seams / workings and mine entries.

The coal mining report covers both the Varley Street site and the adjacent ‘Nelson Street’ site. The summary herein, pertains to the Varley Street site only.

The investigation works were carried out by LKC in May 2023 and comprised drilling 5no. open hole rotary boreholes to 40mbgl and trial trenching to locate 1no. mine shaft (refer to Figure 2).

Rotary drilling was undertaken to determine the depth of coal seams beneath the site and obtain evidence of unrecorded and recorded mine workings.

Trial trenching was undertaken to locate the mine shaft shown to be located in the southern area of the site (ref. 386399-016).

Superficial strata comprising sandy clay was recorded in all locations. Depth to rockhead was recorded as between 23.00-27.80mbgl and the depth to intact coal was recorded as between 34.00-34.50mbgl. The thickness of the coal ranged between 0.50-1.00mbgl.

A total of 4no. trenches were excavated to investigate Shaft Ref. 386399-016. Made ground was generally recorded to a maximum depth of 2.20mbgl and comprised mostly sand and clay, with ash, clinker, ceramic, brick, rootlets and coal fragments. The made ground was underlain by variably gravelly and sandy clay.

A circular area of deeper made ground was recorded between 2.30-2.60mbgl in Trench 4 which is likely the untreated mine shaft.

Treatment and stabilisation work was recommended based on the findings of the coal mining investigation.

LKC has been commissioned by ISG Ltd to carry out an additional site investigation and provide an updated Remediation Strategy for the site. The objectives of the additional site investigation are to allow installation of replacement gas monitoring wells to undertake 6no. gas monitoring visits to the site over a period of three months.

3 Further Ground Investigation

3.1 Site Investigation Design and Methodology

An intrusive investigation was undertaken by LKC to install monitoring wells for gas and monitoring. Soakaway tests were undertaken to assess the potential for the incorporation of soakaways in the future drainage design. It should be noted that the soakaway test results have previously been reported under separate cover.

The investigation was carried out on 10th and 23rd May 2023 and comprised the following:

- 2no. machine excavated trial pits to depths of 2.20-2.40mbgl, and a BRE soakaway test undertaken in 1no. pit (ref. TP101, SA101).
- 6no. window sample boreholes drilled to 2.03-5.45mbgl (ref. WS101 to WS106 & WS104A).

All site investigation locations are shown in Figure 2.

WS104 refused at 2.03mbgl on a probable sandstone cobble. The borehole was repositioned approximately 1m to the southwest (ref. WS104A).

The window sample boreholes were drilled to confirm the ground conditions beneath the site and to install monitoring wells for a series of gas monitoring visits.

Table 3-1 details the targeted and general coverage (non-targeted) site investigation locations.

Site Investigation Locations	Rationale
WS102, WS103, WS104, WS104A & WS105	To install monitoring wells within the footprint of the proposed school building, and general site coverage.
WS101, WS106	General site coverage.
TP101, SA101	Within proposed hardstood area / car park area where soakaways could be incorporated.

Table 3-1: Summary of sampling locations.

All profile logs are provided in Appendix B and are in line with BS14688-1[4] and BS5930[5].

The number of monitoring wells installed corresponds to approximately one per 50m square centres. This is in line with guidance in CIRIA C665[6] for a 'moderate' gas hazard and a moderate / high sensitivity of end use.

3.2 Well Installations

All of the boreholes were installed with monitoring wells for gas and groundwater monitoring.

[4] British Standards (2002) Geotechnical investigation and testing – Identification and Classification of Soil. Part 1: Identification and description. BS EN ISO 14688-1:2002.
[5] British Standard (2015). "Code of Practice for Ground Investigations". BS5930:2015.
[6] CIRIA (2007). "Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings." CIRIA C665.

Monitoring wells were installed in accordance with BS10175 and CIRIA C665[7] and generally comprised approximately 1m plain pipe over a length of slotted pipe surrounded by pea gravel and sealed at the top with bentonite and concrete.

Well installation details are provided in Profile Logs in Appendix B.

3.3 Onsite Testing

Soil was collected for onsite testing. A plastic zip bag was half filled with soil allowing a suitably sized headspace. The bag was sealed and stored for at least 20 minutes before being tested for total volatile organic compounds (TVOCs) using a PhoCheck Tiger photoionisation detector (PID). Results of the PID readings are presented on the profile logs (Appendix B). The on-site monitoring was carried out in line CIRIA C665[8] to aid in screening samples for volatile analysis.

3.4 Laboratory Testing

3.4.1 Soil Sampling (Contamination)

Soil sampling was not carried out as part of this additional investigation. A summary of the soil sampling carried out by EnviroSolution is provided in Section 2.2 and is further discussed in Section 5.1.1.

3.4.2 Water Sampling / Leaching Testing

Groundwater sampling / leaching testing was not carried out as part of this additional investigation. A summary of the groundwater sampling carried out by EnviroSolution is provided in Section 2.2 and is further discussed in Section 5.4.

3.5 Gas Monitoring

Six gas monitoring visits have been undertaken over a 12-week period in all installed boreholes.

Monitoring was undertaken using a Geotechnical Instruments GA5000 in accordance with the monitoring protocol outlined in CIRIA C665 (flow rate measured first).

The gas monitoring results are reproduced in full in Appendix C. It should be noted that the gas monitoring results are reported together with the Nelson Street site adjacent to the west. Data from WS101, WS102, WS103, WS104A, WS105 and WS106 apply to this report.

3.6 Geotechnical Testing

3.6.1 In-situ Onsite Geotechnical Testing

In-situ geotechnical tests were performed in the boreholes to further characterise the sub-soil conditions. The following tests were undertaken:

[7] CIRIA (2007). “Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings.” CIRIA C665.
[8] CIRIA (2007). “Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings.” CIRIA C665.

- Standard Penetration Tests (SPTs) were performed in the window sample boreholes at approximately 1m intervals.
- Pocket -penetrometer tests (giving undrained shear strength) were performed in the window sample boreholes.

Laboratory geotechnical testing was not undertaken as part of this investigation.

The SPT and shear vane readings are provided within the profile logs (Appendix B).

4 Ground Conditions

4.1 Geology – Generalised Sequence

The ground conditions beneath the site comprised made ground underlain by variably gravelly sandy clay. A summary section of the logs is provided in Plate 4-1, with additional comments below.




Plate 4-1: Summary of ground conditions.

Additional information on ground conditions:

Made Ground

Made ground was recorded in all investigation locations to depths of 1.00-3.20mbgl, which is consistent with the depths recorded by EnviroSolution (0.50-3.30mbgl).

The made ground comprised horizons of sand / sand and gravel / clay / silt with anthropogenic material including ash, brick, coal, concrete, slate, glass and clinker. Exceptions to this include:

- Predominantly ash and clinker in: TP101 (0.40-0.75mbgl, 1.40-2.20mbgl), SA101 (0.30-1.90mbgl), WS102 (1.50-1.50mbgl), WS103 (0.90-3.20mbgl), WS105 (1.00-1.60mbgl) and WS106 (1.30-2.10mbgl).
- Slightly organic sandy silty clay with coal, ash and brick fragments in WS106 (2.10-2.90mbgl) and WS109 (0.90-1.30mbgl).

Natural Strata

Natural strata comprised stiff to very stiff consistency variably gravelly sandy clay, with occasional bands of sand with depth.

Contamination

The following evidence of hydrocarbon contamination was observed:

- Slight hydrocarbon odour between 0.80-1.50mbgl in WS102;
- Very slight hydrocarbon odour between 1.50-2.00mbgl in WS102;
- Slight hydrocarbon odour between 2.00-3.20mbgl in WS103.

The PID recorded a maximum of 1.1ppm TVOC in the samples.

No visible fragments of asbestos containing material (ACM) were identified.

As summarised in Section 2.2, visual and olfactory evidence of hydrocarbon contamination was encountered in 5no. investigation locations during the EnviroSolution investigation. The following evidence was observed:

- A strong hydrocarbon odour and an oily sheen was recorded in WS7 between 0.30-1.10mbgl;
- A slight hydrocarbon odour noted within the superficial clay in TP1 (1.00-1.50mbgl);
- A hydrocarbon odour was noted at 1.00mbgl in TP7, and a slight hydrocarbon odour noted at 1.10mbgl in TP13;
- Made ground with an oily sheen and strong hydrocarbon odour was recorded in TP14 between 0.30-1.20mbgl;
- A hydrocarbon odour was noted in TP16 at 1.20mbgl.

4.2 Groundwater

4.2.1 Groundwater Levels

A slow seepage of water was recorded in TP101 at 2.20mbgl and a water strike recorded in WS103 at 2.00mbgl. No groundwater strikes were recorded in the remainder of the investigation locations. Groundwater monitoring within the monitoring wells has been undertaken on six occasions.

Results are summarised in Table 4-2.

BH/TP	Water Strike Depths (mbgl)	Well Response Zone (mbgl)	No. of Monitoring Visits	Monitoring Depths (mbgl)		
				Min	Max	Base
SA101	Dry	-	-	-	-	-
TP101	2.2	-	-	-	-	-
WS101	Dry	1.0-5.0 (MG/C)	6	4.17	4.91	4.90-4.91
WS102	Dry	1.0-5.0-(MG/C)	5	0.72	3.02	4.85-4.87
WS103	2.0	1.0-4.0 (MG/C)	6	1.55	2.01	3.90-3.92
WS104A	Dry	1.0-5.0 (MG/C)	6	0.66	4.57	4.86-4.89
WS105	Dry	1.0-5.0 (MG/C)	6	1.34	3.88	3.91-3.95
WS106	Dry	1.0-5.0 (MG/C)	6	1.68	2.01	4.83-4.88

Table 4-2: Summary of water strike depths within boreholes and trial pits.
Response Zones:
MG=Made Ground; C=Clay.

4.3 In-Situ Geotechnical Testing

4.3.1 Standard Penetration Tests

In-situ standard penetration tests (SPTs) were undertaken, predominantly in the natural ground. The results are provided within the profile logs in Appendix B.

4.3.2 Pocket Penetrometer Tests

Pocket penetrometer tests, recording undrained shear strength (s_u), were taken within the clay strata. The results are provided within the profile logs in Appendix B.

5 Further Assessment of Pollutant Linkages

5.1 Introduction

Current good practice requires that the findings from a site investigation should be evaluated on a site-specific basis, using a risk-based approach. Risk assessment involves identification and evaluation of the hazards presented by the concentrations of contaminants measured followed by an evaluation of the risks which are associated with these hazards (LCRM[9]). Information gathered from the risk assessment has been collated in the contamination conceptual model in Section 5.6.

Where LKC identify a low to very low risk, limited intrusive investigation work, a watching brief (during enabling work) or no investigation work will be recommended. This is decided on a site-specific basis, dependent on the nature of the site and the proposed development.

Where the risk falls into the moderate / low risk, LKC will undertake an assessment to establish what category the pollutant linkage will fall into (i.e. moderate or low risk will be chosen). Where LKC identifies a moderate or higher risk, further works or precautionary remedial measures will be recommended.

5.1.1 Direct Contact Risk – Pollutant Linkage 1

In the EnviroSolution site investigation report soil laboratory analysis results were compared against Generic Assessment Criteria (GAC) for a residential without homegrown produce land-use scenario and against commercial land-use scenario for comparative purposes.

The EnviroSolution site investigation report lists individual PAHs elevated above the GAC separately. LKC consider the main risk drivers for PAHs are benzo(a)pyrene (B(a)P) and naphthalene. This is due to B(a)P possibly being a carcinogen and most toxic of the PAHs[10,11] and naphthalene the most volatile and soluble[12].

Category 4 Screening Levels (C4SLs) advocate using the B(a)P as a surrogate marker for carcinogenic PAHs, if it falls within appropriate limits and in the absence of coal tar.[13]. In LKC's experience the vast majority of samples pass the assessment to confirm B(a)P is a suitable surrogate marker. This approach will therefore be used for Pollutant Linkage 1. Naphthalene will be treated separately using the LQM S4ULs.

Elevated PAHs (B(a)P used as a surrogate marker) were identified in seventeen samples analysed as part of the EnviroSolution site investigation.

[9] Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/land-contamination-risk-management-lcrm
[10] EA (2002). "Contaminants in Soils: Collation of Toxicological Data and Intake Values for Humans. Benzo[a]pyrene." R&D Publication TOX2.
[11] USEPA (1984). "Health Effects Assessment of Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs). EPA 540/1-86-013."
[12] EA (2003). "Review of the Fate and Transport of Selected Contaminants in the Soil Environment." Draft technical report P5- 079/TR1.
[13] CL:AIRE (2013). "SP1010: Development of Category 4 Screening Levels and Assessment of Land Affected by Contamination – Final project Report."

Elevated heavy metals (arsenic and lead) were identified in fourteen analysed. The source of the elevated PAHs and heavy metals is anticipated to be the ash, clinker and coal noted in the made ground.

Elevated aromatic C16-21 and C21-35 were identified in four samples analysed, and elevated C35-44 was identified in one sample analysed. As detailed in Section 4.1, visual and olfactory evidence of hydrocarbon contamination was recorded during the site investigations undertaken by EnviroSolution and by LKC. It is therefore possible that further small pockets of hydrocarbon contamination may be present across the site.

No discrete fragments of asbestos containing material (ACM) were identified during the site investigations undertaken by EnviroSolution and LKC. Asbestos fibres (chrysotile) were identified in one sample of made ground analysed (TP9 at 0.30mbgl). Quantification testing stated the sample contained 0.015% asbestos.

LKC have used the Joint Industry Working Group (JIWG) assessment tool for the site. The model was run assuming an environmental cover system where material will be buried at depth and the receptor classified as infant (<5 years old) as a conservative approach. This identified a very low risk when Made Ground is placed beneath clean cover soils. The output sheets are presented in Appendix D.

At the concentrations identified, heavy metals, PAHs, petroleum hydrocarbons and asbestos are considered to pose a potential risk to future site users in soft landscaped areas. The principal pathways are inhalation of fibres (asbestos), ingestion pathways (soil and dust) and dermal contact.

The probability of heavy metals, PAHs, petroleum hydrocarbon and asbestos contamination affecting site users is likely. With a medium consequence, the risk is considered to be moderate and remediation is recommended, as per the recommendation in the EnviroSolution site investigation report. This is to include an environmental cover system in areas of proposed soft landscaping.

Notwithstanding the above recommendation, a watching brief should also be maintained during earthworks. If any unusual ground conditions / unexpected contamination encountered, further assessment may be required.

Additional consideration should also be given to the risk from asbestos to workers and offsite receptors during groundworks and construction. This is discussed further in Section 6.

5.1.2 Risk from Inhalation of Vapours – Pollutant Linkage 2

An assessment of the risk from inhalation of vapours was not included as part of the EnviroSolution site investigation report.

LKC has compared the laboratory results in the EnviroSolution report against the GAC for residential without plant uptake criteria.

Elevated results have been identified for VOCs (naphthalene, 2-methylnaphthalene) in seven locations, SVOCs (dibenzofuran, carbazole) in two locations, and aromatic C10-12 in one location when compared to 1% soil organic matter (SOM). The GAC for naphthalene can be modified based on a linear relation between naphthalene and SOM concentration, however LKC have not been provided with the SOM of the samples analysed therefore this cannot be undertaken.

Visual and olfactory evidence of hydrocarbon contamination was identified in several locations during the site investigations undertaken by LKC and by EnviroSolution. The PID recorded maximum TVOCs of 1.1ppm,

The elevated VOCs and SVOCs are mainly located in the investigation locations in the northern / north eastern part of the site. However given the bands of ash and clinker encountered during the additional site investigation, and evidence of hydrocarbon contamination recorded during the site investigations undertaken by LKC and EnviroSolution (including in the western part of site), LKC consider that further contamination may be present across the site.

The probability of vapours posing a risk to site users is considered to be likely. With a medium consequence, the risk is moderate and remediation is recommended. This is to include installing a vapour resistant membrane in proposed buildings.

In addition, a watching brief for the presence of any significant hydrocarbon contamination should also be maintained during earthworks. Further assessment may be required.

5.2 Gas Risk Assessment

Six gas monitoring visits have been undertaken at the site. Gas monitoring results in full are presented in Appendix C. It should be noted that the gas monitoring results are reported together with the Nelson Street site adjacent to the west. Data from WS101, WS102, WS103, WS104A, WS105 and WS106 apply to this report.

Following guidance set out in CIRIA C665[14] and BS8485[15] peak methane and carbon dioxide concentrations have been used in the gas risk assessment. In addition, and as per guidance, flow rates were measured first.

All gas concentrations, flow, pressure and groundwater levels are shown on Table 5-1.

[14] CIRIA (2007). “Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings.” CIRIA C665.
[15] BSI (2019). “Code of Practice for the Design of Protective Measures for Methane and Carbon Dioxide Ground Gases for New Buildings.” BS8485:2015+A1 2019.

Boreholes	Visit	CH_4 (%v/v)	CO_2 (%v/v)	O_2 (%v/v)	H_2S (ppm)	CO (ppm)	Flow (l/h)	Groundwater (mbgl)	Pressure (mb)
WS101	1	<0.1	**15.7**	4.4	<1	26	<0.1	4.85	1014 (s)
	2	<0.1	**17.2**	0.1	1	30	<0.1	4.91	1008 (r)
	3	<0.1	**16.8**	0.1	5	9	<0.1	4.89	1003 (s)
	4	0.1	**16.0**	0.1	7	3	<0.1	4.86	1007 (s)
	5	0.7	**14.8**	<0.1	6	4	<0.1	4.17	1009 (f)
	6	**1.2**	**15.3**	<0.1	6	4	<0.1	4.60	1004 (fs)
WS102	1	<0.1	1.8	18.9	<1	5	<0.1	1.71	1015 (s)
	2	<0.1	4.3	6.1	<1	4	8.6	0.95	1008 (r)
	3	<0.1	0.6	20.0	<1	<1	<0.1	3.02	1005 (s)
	4	<0.1	**5.2**	6.4	<1	2	14.2 (<0.1)*	0.79	1007 (s)
	5	UR							
	6	<0.1	3.1	14.1	<1	3	6.3 (2.0)*	0.72	1005 (fs)
WS103	1	<0.1	**13.2**	0.4	<1	12	<0.1	1.94	1015 (s)
	2	<0.1	**15.4**	0.1	<1	6	<0.1	1.97	1009 (r)
	3	<0.1	**15.8**	0.5	<1	2	<0.1	3.02	1004 (s)
	4	<0.1	**16.0**	0.5	<1	4	<0.1	1.96	1007 (s)
	5	0.1	**21.8 (13.6)**	5.2	<1	4	<0.1	1.55	1010 (f)
	6	<0.1	**15.2**	2.6	<1	3	<0.1	1.67	1005 (fs)
WS104 A	1	<0.1	**14.4**	4.9	<1	12	<0.1	4.57	1015 (s)
	2	<0.1	**6.5**	8.6	<1	6	<0.1	3.77	1009 (r)
	3	<0.1	**8.1**	3.7	<1	3	<0.1	2.92	1004 (s)
	4	<0.1	**11.0**	1.3	<1	1	13.9 (<0.1)*	0.66	1007 (s)
	5	<0.1	**9.3**	1.5	8	7	<0.1	0.68	1010 (f)
	6	<0.1	2.6	17.2	2	8	1.8 (0.2)*	0.69	1005 (fs)
WS105	1	<0.1	**9.2**	5.7	<1	3	<0.1	3.88	1015 (s)
	2	<0.1	**11.1**	2.4	<1	2	<0.1	3.44	1009 (r)
	3	<0.1	**12.5**	0.4	<1	2	<0.1	3.07	1004 (s)
	4	<0.1	**12.6**	0.2	<1	2	<0.1	2.63	1007 (s)
	5	<0.1	**11.3**	0.2	<1	2	<0.1	1.34	1009 (f)
	6	<0.1	**12.1**	0.1	<1	2	<0.1	1.49	1006 (fs)
WS106	1	<0.1	**7.6**	2.8	<1	9	<0.1	2.01	1015 (s)
	2	<0.1	**8.8**	0.2	<1	16	<0.1	1.79	1008 (r)
	3	<0.1	**11.4**	0.1	<1	2	<0.1	1.89	1004 (s)
	4	<0.1	**13.3**	0.1	<1	4	<0.1	2.01	1007 (s)
	5	<0.1	**11.3**	0.1	<1	4	<0.1	1.68	1010 (f)
	6	<0.1	**12.0**	0.1	<1	4	<0.1	1.75	1006 (fs)

Table 5-1: Summary of gas monitoring.

Notes:

If concentrations / flow is zero, then equipment detection limits are assumed.

Table shows peak concentrations of CH_4, CO_2, O_2, H_2S and CO. Where peak and steady vary significantly, steady concentration shown in brackets.

Bold where CO_2 exceeds 5%v/v and CH_4 exceeds 1%v/v.

Atmospheric pressure (over past 24hrs): r=rising, s=steady, f=falling, fs=falling then steady.

Blue shading where borehole flooded (groundwater level above the response zone).

UR=unable to record as unable to locate well.

*Steady flow provided in brackets.

Six monitoring visits have been undertaken at the site during high atmospheric pressure conditions (1003mB-1015mB). Carbon dioxide concentrations were recorded at 0.6-21.8%v/v. Methane concentrations were recorded at <0.1-1.2%v/v in WS101 and <0.1-0.1%v/v in WS103. Methane concentrations were recorded at <0.1%v/v during all visits in the remainder of the boreholes.

Flow rates were all recorded as less than limits of detection in WS101, WS103, WS105 and WS106. Peak flow rates were recorded at 6.3-14.2l/h in WS102 and at 1.8-13.9l/h in WS104A. The groundwater levels in WS102 and WS104A during the visits with high flow rates were above the height of the slotted pipe (i.e. above the response zone, borehole flooded). The flow rates recorded are therefore most likely due to pressurisation of the well, rather than an accurate representation of flow rates. This data has not been used in the risk assessment or to calculate gas screening values.

Reduced oxygen concentrations were recorded in all of the wells with the lowest concentrations recorded at <0.1%v/v (WS101). Depleted oxygen levels may be potentially associated with localised biological respiration and quickly equilibrate with ambient air concentrations near the surface. We do not consider the low oxygen levels to be a significant risk to the site and no further action is considered necessary.

Carbon monoxide was >1ppm in all boreholes. The maximum concentration was recorded as 30ppm (WS101). Most carbon monoxide peak readings decreased during the gas monitoring to steady concentrations of <5ppm. Only workplace exposure limits defined by the HSE are available for carbon monoxide and are not fully applicable to a residential setting. A Short-Term Exposure Limit of 200ppm (15-minute period) and Long-Term Exposure Limit of 30ppm have been defined (8-hour period).

Based on the above exposure limits, carbon monoxide is not expected to pose a significant risk to the proposed site receptors.

Gas Screening Value

In accordance with CIRIA C665[16], a Gas Screening Value (GSV) may be calculated. Assuming worst-case scenario maximum gas concentrations and flow for each borehole have been used to calculate the GSV. The GSV can be used to determine the characteristic situation (CS).

Table 5-2 shows the maximum GSV for each borehole and the appropriate characteristic situation (based on GSV only). An overall site assessment (WS101-WS106) has also been included (worst case values across the site). It should be noted that GSVs have been calculated using data from boreholes where the response zone was not flooded by groundwater.

Boreholes	Max GSV (l/hr)	CS
WS101	0.0172	CS1
WS102	0.0018	CS1
WS103	0.0218	CS1
WS104A	0.0144	CS1
WS105	0.0126	CS1
WS106	0.0133	CS1
WS101-WS106	0.0012 (CH_4) 0.0218 (CO_2)	CS1

Table 5-2: Summary of worst-case Gas Screening Values (GSV).
Notes:
CS – Characteristic Situation.
GSVs calculated using data from boreholes where response zone not flooded by groundwater.

[16] CIRIA (2007). "Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings." CIRIA C665.

In addition, in accordance with CIRIA C665[17], if carbon dioxide and methane are recorded above 5%v/v and 1%v/v respectively, you should consider upgrading the characteristic situation from CS1 to CS2.

The assessment for ground / hazardous gas also needs to take into account the release of CL:AIRE guidance on Coal Mine Gas[18].CLAIRE guidance states that the gas screening value is not considered appropriate in isolation for assessing mine gas risk on sites where there are complex conceptual site models.

As part of the shallow coal mining site investigation a shaft (ref. 386399-016) was identified in the southern part of the site.

Depth to rockhead was recorded as between 23.00-27.80mbgl and the depth to intact coal was recorded as between 34.00-34.50mbgl. The thickness of the coal ranged between 0.50-1.00mbgl.

Viable sources of mine gas have been identified on site associated with shallow worked coal seams.

Despite thick low permeability superficial deposits having been recorded across the site (depth to rockhead between 23.00-27.80mbgl) potential preferential pathways are present associated with the mineshaft located in the south of the site, the shaft mapped 5m south east of the site and rotary investigation boreholes.

No significant flow has been identified during gas monitoring (except for boreholes that are flooded, whereby the data has been discounted), indicating that mine gas is not impacting the surface of the site. However, should hazardous ground gases be encountered as part of routine monitoring undertaken as part of coal mining remediation (including the shaft and shallow coal mining), then further gas monitoring and/ or upgrading of gas protection rating may be required.

Taking the risks associated with coal mine gas, and the elevated carbon dioxide concentrations recorded, it is recommended that the site is upgraded from CS1 to CS2.

Gas can potentially migrate into buildings, accumulate in confined spaces and cause explosions (methane) and asphyxiation. LKC consider the probability of carbon dioxide and methane gas affecting site users and buildings as a low likelihood. Assuming a severe consequence, there is a moderate risk associated with Pollutant Linkage 3 and remediation is required in line with CS2 in proposed buildings.

Should hazardous ground gases be encountered as part of routine monitoring undertaken as part of coal mining remediation (including the shaft and shallow coal mining), then further gas monitoring and/ or upgrading of gas protection rating may be required.

5.3 Controlled Water Assessment

A Secondary Undifferentiated Aquifer is present in the superficial strata below the site. A Secondary A Aquifer is present in the bedrock below the site. No groundwater abstractions have been identified within 400m of the site and the site is not within a Source Protection Zone.

[17] CIRIA (2007). “Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings.” CIRIA C665.
[18] CL:AIRE. “Good Practice for Risk Assessment for Coal Mine Gas Emissions”. October 2021.

Rochdale Canal is located 110m south of the site. Given the low permeability clay deposits beneath the site, assumed clay lining of the canal and likely head of water above groundwater on site it is not considered to be a feasible receptor.

During the monitoring undertaken by EnviroSolution, the groundwater levels in four of the wells were recorded between 0.85-4.95mbgl. No groundwater was recorded in the remaining two wells installed. Groundwater levels have been recorded between 0.66-4.91mbgl during the six monitoring visits undertaken by LKC. Given that cohesive superficial deposits were recorded during the site investigations (gravelly sandy clay with occasional sand lenses), it is considered that the water strikes recorded are representative of perched water. LKC therefore consider that the main controlled waters receptor is the Secondary A bedrock aquifer.

Visual / olfactory evidence of hydrocarbons were identified during the site investigation undertaken by EnviroSolution, and during the investigation undertaken by LKC.

Three groundwater samples were collected as part of the EnviroSolution site investigation report and compared to UK Drinking Water Standards. Exceedances of arsenic were detected in two of the samples analysed. All other contaminants tested (TPH, PAHs, VOCs, SVOCs, BTEX) were recorded as less than limits of detection.

LKC consider use of UK DWS as overly conservative given the environmental setting of the site. Moreover, most likely 'elevated' concentrations noted in the EnviroSolution report are associated with colloidal components within the sample associated with perched and sporadic made ground and results are not considered representative of groundwater quality beneath the site.

LKC therefore considers the probability of onsite contamination affecting the Secondary A Aquifer is a unlikely likelihood. With a medium consequence the risk is anticipated to be low and no remediation is required.

Notwithstanding the above, a watching brief should be maintained during earthworks. If any unusual ground conditions / unexpected contamination encountered (particularly hydrocarbon contamination), further assessment may be required.

5.4 Additional Risk Assessments

5.4.1 Potable Water Supply (Pollutant Linkage 5)

A United Utilities water pipeline risk assessment is recommended and will be required for a new connection. Numerous elevated contaminants have been identified on site. With a likely probability and medium consequence, the risk is considered moderate and it is likely that barrier pipe will be required. Once details of the pipeline location and depths are known a UU Risk Assessment should be undertaken.

5.5 Contamination Conceptual Model

A preliminary contamination conceptual model has been produced following the risk assessments undertaken in Sections 5.1-5.4 and is presented in Table 5-3. The risk matrix is provided in Appendix A.

Where a very low risk is identified, no specific remediation is required.

Where a low risk is identified, some form of remediation may be required depending on the pollutant linkage, the type and concentration of contaminants present and the proposed development.

Where a moderate/low risk is identified, an assessment will be undertaken to establish what category the pollutant linkage will fall into.

Where a moderate or higher risk is identified, remediation or further investigation work is recommended.

Further details of the remedial proposals and a remedial option appraisal are given in Section 6.

Pollutant Linkage	Pathway	Receptor	Contaminant	Probability	Consequence	Risk	Assessment
PL1	- Dermal contact. - Inhalation of soil, fibres and dust. - Ingestion of soils, dust. - Windblown dust.	- Future site users. - Offsite receptors.	Heavy metals: - Arsenic, lead. PAHs: - B(a)P. Petroleum hydrocarbons: -Aro C16-21, C21-35, C35-44. ACM: -Chrysotile.	Likely	Medium	**Moderate**	- Likely probability as elevated contaminants identified in the made ground which could come into contact with site users in soft landscaping areas. - **Recommendation:** Remediation required, to include an environmental cover system in soft landscaping areas. A watching brief should also be maintained during earthworks.
PL2	- Inhalation of vapours. - Migration through permeable strata and preferential pathways.	- Future site users. - Offsite receptors.	Volatile Contaminants: - Aro C10-12. -Naphthalene. -2-methylnaphthalene. SVOCs: - Dibenzofuran, carbazole.	Likely	Medium	**Moderate**	- Likely probability as elevated VOCs and SVOCs contaminants identified and further contamination may be present. - **Recommendation**: Remediation required, to include installing a vapour resistant membrane in proposed buildings. A watching brief should also be maintained during earthworks.
PL3	- Inhalation of gas. - Migration through permeable strata and preferential pathways. - Explosion in confined spaces (methane only).	- Future site users. - Buildings. - Offsite land users.	- Carbon dioxide, methane.	Low Likelihood	Severe	**Moderate**	- Elevated carbon dioxide identified in all monitoring wells and mine shaft located on site. - **Recommendation:** Gas protection measures in line with CS2 recommended. Should hazardous ground gases be encountered as part of routine monitoring undertaken as part of coal mining remediation, then further gas monitoring and/ or upgrading of gas protection rating may be required
PL4	- Surface Run-off. - Migration through permeable strata and preferential pathways - Perched waters migration.	- Groundwater (Secondary A Aquifer).	Mobile contaminants: - Metals.	Unlikely	Medium	**Low**	- Although elevated metals identified in one groundwater sample tested, given the environmental settings and ground conditions encountered not considered to pose a significant risk to groundwater. - **Recommendation**: No remediation required. However a watching brief should be maintained during earthworks, particularly for petroleum hydrocarbons.
PL5	- Ingestion of tainted water supply.	- Future site users (via potable water).	Organic Contaminants: - VOCs. - SVOCs - Petroleum hydrocarbons.	Likely	Medium	**Moderate**	- Likely probability as elevated organic contaminants identified which could permeate water pipes and contaminate water supply. - **Recommendation:** UU risk assessment undertaken. Barrier piping likely to be required.

Table 5-4: Revised Contamination Conceptual Model.

6 Remediation Strategy

6.1 Introduction

Remediation works may be spilt in to the 'pre-construction' (or enabling works) phase and the 'build phase' (i.e. during the residential development works) phase. The recommended remedial works and validation works are outlined in the following Sections.

6.2 Summary of Recommended Remediation & Validation Works

The remediation works may be split into 'pre-construction' (or enabling works) phase and the 'build phase' (i.e. during the redevelopment works) phase. The following earthworks, remediation and validation required for this site are summarised in Table 6-1. More detail of proposed works will be provided in the following Sections.

No specific remediation is required for Pollutant Linkage 4 (Controlled Waters).

Due to the minor consequence associated with the phytotoxic effect to flora (i.e. loss of plants in a landscaping scheme), the overall risk for the majority of sites will be very low to low. Where soils contain significant concentrations of heavy metals, in general there will other pollutant linkages (i.e. the risk to human health) that will trigger the requirement for remediation (e.g. a clean environmental cover system). As such the risk to flora associated with phytotoxic contaminants will not be considered further.

The risk to buildings associated with elevated sulphate should be considered by a structural engineer as part of the geotechnical assessment and will not be included in the contamination risk assessment.

It should be noted that there may be risk from short term exposure from contaminated soil to site workers. The Contamination Conceptual Model deals with long term exposure to key receptors. Acute risks can be easily mitigated by good environmental management of the site during site works. Standard health and safety precautions (as per HSE guidance[19]) should be adopted by all workers involved with site enabling and construction works. Therefore, this receptor is not considered in the contamination conceptual model.

[19] HSE (1991). "Protection of Workers and the General Public During Development of Contaminated Land". London HMSO.

Phase	Remediation Requirements	Validation Requirements
Pre-Construction (enabling)	<u>Excavation, processing and stockpiling</u> This will include the grubbing out and processing of hardstanding and unsuitable material. Any oversize material, if encountered will be processed and re-used as appropriate. Appropriate site won material will be stockpiled for potential reuse. Additionally, suspect material will be quarantined for characterisation prior to possible offsite disposal.	Log of work undertaken including photographs. Re-use of material will be under suitable exemption or MMP. Testing of site won/ imported soil as per Table 6-2.
	<u>Earthworks Site Inspections & Unexpected Contamination</u> A watching brief should be maintained by a suitably qualified and experienced person during enabling works to identify any unusual ground conditions. If any visual or olfactory evidence of contamination be encountered at the site, further assessment of the material may be required. Particular attention should be paid to hydrocarbons, as visual and olfactory evidence of contamination identified during site investigations. Should hazardous ground gases be encountered as part of routine monitoring undertaken as part of coal mining remediation, then further gas monitoring and/ or upgrading of gas protection rating may be required	Log of work undertaken including photographs. Details of any sampling undertaken and validation of any potential additional remedial work. Further assessment of gas risk if hazardous ground gas encountered.
	<u>Segregation and removal of unsuitable materials</u> As part of the watching brief during earthworks, areas of unexpected contamination (including hazardous waste) and geotechnically unsuitable material will be delineated, excavated and removed following suitable testing and verification.	Log of work undertaken including photographs. Consignment notes confirming removal of unsuitable material.
Build Phase	<u>Vapour Membrane</u> Elevated petroleum hydrocarbon (aromatic C10-12) and VOCs were identified on site. Given the ground conditions encountered, further contamination may be present across the site. It is therefore recommended that buildings are to include a vapour resistant membrane.	Plan including foundation design. Photographic evidence showing installation of membrane.

Table 6-1: Summary of Remediation Requirements

Phase	Remediation Requirements	Validation Requirements
Build Phase	Gas Protection Measures In line with CS2 as per UK guidance[20,21]. This is likely to / should include: • Passive subfloor or active subfloor ventilation system. • Methane and carbon dioxide resistant membrane installed as per manufacturer's instructions. • Ventilation of confined spaces within the building. • Well-constructed reinforced suspended, raft or cast in situ ground slab. • Minimum penetration of ground slab by services. • All joints and penetrations to be sealed. Depending on the type of building and foundation design the protection measures can vary. The gas protection measures will be detailed and approved with the Local Authority once the foundation design has been confirmed.	Supply and review of foundation designs. Photographic evidence of sub-floor void, ventilation and suitably sealed gas membrane. Validation of gas protection measures should be in line with CIRIA 735[22]
	Environmental Cover System Shared Landscaping: 450mm thick environmental cover system comprising: geotextile membrane and at least 450mm comprising clean inert fill and sufficient topsoil for a growing medium.	Measured thickness of environmental cover system via hand dug pits and staff and/or as-built survey at each layer. Photographic evidence throughout each stage, showing geotextile membrane, subsoil and topsoil installation process and completion. Chemical validation of imported/ site-won soils.: See Table 6-2.
	United Utilities (UU) Risk Assessment UU Potable Water Risk Assessment to be undertaken once the location and depth of potable water pipes are known and following completion of the earthworks. Barrier pipe likely to be required.	To be completed following completion of the remediation earthworks.

Table 6-1 (continued): Summary of Remediation Requirements.

[20] CIRIA (2007). "Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings." CIRIA C665
[21] BSI (2015). "Code of Practice for the Design of Protective Measures for Methane and Carbon Dioxide Ground Gases for new buildings." BS8485:2015.
[22] CIRIA (2014). "Good Practice on the Testing and Verification of Protection Systems for Building Against Hazardous Ground Gas". CIRIA C735.

6.3 General Remediation & Enabling Works Requirements

6.3.1 Construction Management Plan and Health and Safety

A Construction Management Plan and Method Statement should be produced which details appropriate Health and Safety measures to be employed during the site works.

Risks to site workers and adjacent receptors from contamination present in the site soils can be easily mitigated by good environmental management of the site during site works. Standard health and safety precautions (as per HSE guidance) should be adopted by all workers involved with site enabling and construction works.

6.3.2 Asbestos in Soils Management Plan

Due to the presence of asbestos containing material, it is recommended that additional precautions are taken during site clearance, earthworks and construction in the areas of concern. The presence of asbestos in the made ground at the site presents a potential risk of generation of airborne fibres if this material is disturbed, such as for excavations to construct new foundations.

This risk can be managed by careful procedures and site monitoring to reduce the risk of airborne fibres, and it is recommended that an appropriate 'Asbestos in soils Management Strategy' is developed and adopted for all intrusive ground works which disturb the made ground in the area of concern. This should be carried out in line with CIRIA C733.

This may include asbestos awareness training for all site staff, provision of suitable personal and respiratory protective equipment and air monitoring.

With regards to cement bound asbestos, this can be handpicked, doubled bagged and disposed of appropriately to a licenced landfill. Guidance on removing asbestos cement is described in HSE (2012) .

If ACM is identified in soil arisings, then soil should be placed directly into covered skips and disposed of at a suitable licenced landfill, after further testing to quantify the extent of asbestos contamination of the soils. It should be considered that blue asbestos is notifiable and must be removed by a licenced contractor.

6.3.3 Segregation & Removal of Unsuitable Material

There is potential for some unidentified geotechnically or chemically unsuitable material to be encountered during enabling works.

Such materials will undergo appropriate investigation and testing to ascertain their suitability for re-use, if feasible. Should material be considered either chemically or geotechnically unsuitable then this material will be removed from site (including hazardous waste) under the protocols described in the following sections.

6.3.4 Materials Management

To ensure material is compliant with appropriate waste regulations, any site won material re-used onsite should be in recourse to appropriate exemptions. A U1 and T5 exemption should be registered.

This will allow the following to be used onsite or brought in for use onsite (refer to guidance for types of waste that can be used [23]):

- -5,000 tonnes (*c.* 2,500m^3) treatment of crushed concrete / stone.
- -1,000 tonnes (*c.* 500^3) use of non-hazardous soil
- -5,000 tonnes (*c.* 2,500m^3) use of clays, sand, gravel, brick, concrete, stone etc.
- -50,000 tonnes (*c.* 25,000m^3) use of bituminous material to be used in roadways.

A Materials Management Plan (MMP) with recourse to the CL:AIRE Code of Practice may be required if volumes exceed exemption limits. This must be registered **before** material movement starts onsite.

If an MMP is required, this needs to be registered by a Qualified Person (QP) and there must be 'certainty of use' for any material re-used onsite or exported to site to ensure there is no 'sham recovery'.

For all the above material will need to be tested at the rate and analytical suites presented in Table 6-2.

6.3.5 Removal of Below Ground Obstructions & Crushing

It is envisaged that grubbing out of in-ground structures is undertaken as part of enabling works.

Site turn over to remove relict structures including relict drainage, brick walls, concrete / stone slabs, etc should be included. Note that it may not be possible to include full turnover in areas of deep made ground due to limits of plant and constraints from adjacent properties.

Suitable materials derived from grubbing-up should be stored in a location on site, to be agreed with the Engineer, prior to crushing. Any unsuitable materials should be removed to a suitably licensed landfill site.

There is potential that some of the grubbed-up concrete and brick arisings may be coated with, and possibly impregnated by, hydrocarbon contaminants. Consideration could be given to steam-cleaning of these arisings in order to generate material suitable for crushing and re-use.

6.3.6 Control of Water

It is considered that significant de-watering is unlikely to be required across the majority of the site. Perched groundwater was encountered during the site investigation, therefore some localised ingress of small volumes of perched groundwater should be anticipated.

Arrangements should be made to prevent ponding in shallow excavations; the Contractor should ensure that ground levels are of sufficient gradient to enable the collection of surface water run-off in sumps or grips. Pumping from over-excavated sumps may be required to maintain satisfactory working conditions.

[23] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/waste-exemptions-using-waste

Contingency arrangements to remove groundwater (including contamination groundwater if encountered) from excavations/ relict structures should be allowed. Small volumes of pumped fluids / groundwater should be stored in appropriate, sealed tanks / containers and analysed for a range of determinants prior to disposal to suitable facility. Alternatively, a temporary discharge licence, including their requirements for treatment / testing, should be agreed with local utility providers prior to start on site.

6.3.7 Disposal

Material required to be removed from site should be undertaken under an appropriate duty of care and the results of chemical analysis should be provided to a licensed landfill for confirmation of waste classification.

Waste records such as disposal tickets and waste carrier licences should be provided in the Site Completion Report. Photographic evidence of removal and waste removal tickets should be retained and included in the validation report.

6.4 Pre-Construction (Enabling Works)

6.4.1 Watching Brief for Unexpected Contamination

A watching brief will be maintained for evidence of previously unidentified contamination (including asbestos containing material and areas of hydrocarbon contamination) during the remediation earthworks and development works.

If evidence of contamination is identified, then works in the area will stop pending further sampling and assessment, and the Local Authority will be informed.

Delineation works will be undertaken, and this may include collection of appropriate samples for laboratory analysis to further characterise the material and allow a risk assessment to be undertaken or removal of the impacted material to quarantine.

Soil samples will be taken and analysed for a suite of contaminants, including *inter alia* heavy metals, Soil Organic Matter, VOCs, SVOCs, BTEX, TPHCWG and asbestos (depending on ground conditions). Soil samples should represent the impacted material. In order to determine that significantly impacted soils have been removed, verification samples will be collected from the base and sides of the excavation.

Quarantined material may be removed offsite to a licensed treatment facility or an assessment made of its potential for treatment and / or retention on site.

6.5 Build Phase Remediation Works

The scope of the build phase remediation works will comprise the following:

- Gas protection measures installed in line with CS2.
- Vapour membrane installed in proposed buildings.
- Environmental cover system in areas of soft landscaping.
- Risk assessment for potable water pipes and installation of barrier pipes, as required.

Further details are given in the following Sections. LKC recommend that the proposed works are prior approved by the regulators prior to the commencement of construction works.

6.5.1 Environmental Cover System

In soft landscaping areas, remediation will be required and comprise and environmental cover system which should be constructed as follows:

- **450mm thick environmental cover system comprising:** geotextile membrane and at least 450mm comprising clean inert fill and sufficient topsoil for a growing medium.

A diagram of a typical environmental cover system is shown in Plate 6-1 below.




Plate 6-1: Typical Environmental Cover System Construction.
Notes: Subsoil can be replaced with additional topsoil.
Hardstood areas– No Remediation Required.

Validation of the provision of environmental cover soils should be provided in the completion report and should include evidence of thickness of clean cover soils construction, including geotextile membrane, subsoil and topsoil.

Suitable evidence includes a measured thickness of environmental cover system via hand dug pits and staff and / or as-built surveys at each layer. Photographic evidence throughout each stage, showing geotextile membrane, subsoil and topsoil installation process and completion should also be provided.

6.5.2 Vapour Membrane

Elevated potentially volatile contaminants were identified on site. Given the ground conditions encountered, further contamination may be present across the site. It is therefore recommended that buildings are to include a vapour resistant membrane.

The vapour membrane will be detailed and approved with the Local Authority once the foundation design has been confirmed. Photographic evidence showing installation of membrane will be required as part of the site completion report.

6.5.3 Gas Protection Measures

Gas protection measures are required in proposed buildings in line with CS2 as per UK guidance[24,25]. This is likely to / should include:

- Passive subfloor or active subfloor ventilation system…
- Methane and carbon dioxide resistant membrane installed as per manufacturer's instructions.
- Ventilation of confined spaces within the building.
- Well-constructed reinforced suspended, raft or cast in situ ground slab.
- Minimum penetration of ground slab by services.
- All joints and penetrations to be sealed.

Depending on the type of building and foundation design the protection measures can vary.

The gas protection measures will be detailed and approved with the Local Authority once the foundation design has been confirmed. Photographic evidence of sub-floor void, ventilation and suitably sealed gas membranes will be required as part of the site completion report. Validation of gas protection measures should be in line with CIRIA 735[26].

6.5.4 Potable Water Pipelines

It is recommended that a Water Pipeline Assessment is undertaken once the location and depth of potable water pipes are known and once enabling works have been completed. Additional sampling may be required following reduced levels and confirmation of pipeline routes. Barrier pipe is likely to be required.

In the event that barrier pipe is required then the risk assessment should be approved by water supply company prior to any installation works. Pipework should be installed in trenches back filled with first generation materials (if installed within made ground).

For the purposes of the build phase validation report (if barrier pipe is required), a works notice, delivery notes indicating the source of the first generation backfill material and photographic evidence of this material in the trenches should be collated along with photographs illustrating the installation of barrier pipe.

6.5.5 Validation of Subsoil / Topsoil

Chemical validation of all imported soils to be used on site soft landscaping areas should be undertaken. Imported soils should be accompanied by a certificate of analysis and source details.

A summary of the required imported material sampling requirements is presented in Table 6-2, based on MCC 'Guidelines to Developer' (2021)[27]. However, LKC consider no testing, but proof of provenance is sufficient for natural, virgin, quarried material. Ideally, the material should be sampled at source to prevent double handling if soil fails, with confirmatory sampling undertaken on importation to site.

[24] CIRIA (2007). "Assessing Risks Posed by Hazardous Ground Gases to Buildings." CIRIA C665
[25] BSI (2015). "Code of Practice for the Design of Protective Measures for Methane and Carbon Dioxide Ground Gases for new buildings." BS8485:2015.
[26] CIRIA (2014). "Good Practice on the Testing and Verification of Protection Systems for Building Against Hazardous Ground Gas". CIRIA C735.
[27] MCC (2021). "Planning & Contaminated Land Technical Guidance." February 2021.

However, where this is not possible then material imported should be segregated based on source and soil type. Validation samples should be taken prior to placement in gardens / soft landscaping to ensure suitability for use.

Material Type	Source	Suite of Analysis	Sampling Rate (min. 3 per source) *		
			Garden	Landscape	Other **
Topsoil / subsoil / Fill material	Greenfield	Suite A	200m^3	200m^3	200m^3
	Remediated	Suite A / B dependent upon original SI	100m^3	150m^3	200m^3
	Brownfield / Unknown	Suite B	50m^3	150m^3	200m^3
Quarried Fill	First Generation i.e. quarried sand (subsoil) or stone (break layer)	No testing is required. Certification of material provenance is required.			

Table 6-2: Sampling requirements for imported and site won soils.

Notes:

Suite A - Heavy metals, pH, water soluble sulphate, speciated PAH, soil organic matter and asbestos screen.

Suite B - Heavy metals, pH, water soluble sulphate, speciated PAH, phenol, total and free cyanide, soil organic matter, asbestos screen, banded petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH CWG), BTEX, MTBE.

** Other assumed to be stone / 6F2 / mass fill etc.

Any soil with visual or olfactory evidence of hydrocarbons should be rejected.

In addition, it should be ensured that the matrix of the topsoil is suitable as a growing medium and no undesirable material is present (in line with BS3882[28]). LKC advise this information is provided by the supplier before material is imported onto site.

Imported material to be used in gardens will be compared against residential without plant uptake criteria (as used in the contamination risk assessment (Section 5)). Appropriate remedial target criteria are presented in Appendix E.

6.6 Site Completion Report

It is recommended that any remediation carried out on the site is validated by a third party and suitable documentary evidence provided in a Site Completion Report, such as photographs, consignment documents and analytical results. This should include as a minimum:

- Validation of gas protection measures installed.
- Validation of vapour membrane installed.
- Provision of waste transfer documents.
- Validation of environmental cover system.
- Verification testing of all imported soil for soft landscaping areas.
- Information on the installation of protective pipes and / or sterile trenches.
- Details of any unexpected contamination identified onsite, suitably risk assessed and / or validated.

The Site Completion Report will assist the Local Authority in the discharge of any future relevant planning condition and will also be of use to solicitors acting on behalf of any prospective conveyancer who may have concerns over the former use of the site.

[28] BS (2015). "Specifications for Topsoil and Requirements for use." BS3882:2015.


Figures





Client: ISG Ltd		Title: Site Location & Boundary Plan	
Site: Varley Street, Manchester		Scale (see scale bar): 1:25,000 & 1:2000 @ A4	Figure: 1
Job No.: LKC 22 1670	Drawn By: EM / Checked By: PD / Drawn: July 2023		Revision:

LK CONSULT



Extract from: DEP Landscape Architecture Ltd
Drawing Ref: Proposed Landscape Layout, No.VAR-DEP-XX-XX-DR-L-00001, Rev:P07 (02/02/2023)

KEY

Site Boundary

LEGEND

Surfaces

- Pedestrian asphalt to footpaths and hard play area
- Vehicular asphalt to parking area, access roads and service yard
- Porous pedestrian asphalt surface to hard surface games court

Boundaries

- Secure Line: 2.4m height weldmesh fence (Colour TBC)
- 2.0m Close-boarded timber fence
- 1.2m Vertical bar railings (Colour TBC)
- 1.2m Timber post and rail fencing

Soft Landscaping

- Existing trees to be retained (TBC)
- Existing trees to be removed (TBC)
- Proposed tree planting - 14-16cm girth
- Proposed tree planting - 10-12cm girth
- Native hedge 60-80cm height
- Ornamental planting beds, 2-3L stock
- Grass seeding: Eco-rich amenity seed mix
- Grass seeding: Flowering meadow mix

Landscape Features

- External benches TBC
- Cycle store
- EV Charging 8No.
- Accessible parking bay 8No.
- Parking bay 60No.

Key:

Potential area of investigation

Line between Ground Bearing and Suspended Slab

Sampling Locations and features annotated by LK Consult Ltd are approximate and are based upon observed measurements unless otherwise stated. Do not scale from this drawing and work from marked dimensions only. All dimensions and features should be confirmed on site by the Contractor. Where this drawing includes information provided to LK Consult Ltd by others, LK Consult Ltd gives no warranty, representation or assurance as to the accuracy of such information.

LK CONSULT LIMITED


Client: ISG Ltd

Site: Varley Street, Manchester

Title: Proposed Development Plan

Job No.:	Scale (See Scale Bar):	Figure:	Revision:
LKC 22 1670	See Scale Bar	2	A

Drawn By:	Checked By:	Drawn:
AC	EM	Jul 2023



Extract from: © Apple Maps
Drawing Ref: Nelson Street, Manchester

KEY

- Site Boundary
- Window Sample Borehole (WS)
- Trial Pit (TP)
- Soakaway Test (SA)

COAL MINING SITE INVESTIGATION:

- Mine Entry
- Rotary Borehole (RBH)
- Excavation
- Excavation Identification Number (9)

Sampling Locations and features annotated by LK Consult Ltd are approximate and are based upon observed measurements unless otherwise stated. Do not scale from this drawing and work from marked dimensions only. All dimensions and features should be confirmed on site by the Contractor. Where this drawing includes information provided to LK Consult Ltd by others, LK Consult Ltd gives no warranty, representation or assurance as to the accuracy of such information.

LK CONSULT LIMITED

Client: ISG Ltd

Site: Nelson Street, Manchester

Title: Site Investigation Location Plan (East Land Parcel)

Job No.:	Scale (See Scale Bar):	Figure:	Revision:
LKC 22 1670	See Scale Bar	3	

Drawn By:	Checked By:	Drawn:
AC	EM	Jul 2023

Appendix A

Risk Matrix

Risk Evaluation

The method for risk evaluation is a qualitative method of interpreting the output from the risk estimation stage of the assessment, based on CIRIA 552[29]. It involves the classification of the:

- Magnitude of the potential consequence (severity) of the risk occurring (Table A).
- Magnitude if the probability (likelihood) of the risk occurring (Table B).

Consequence (Severity)		
Classification	**Definition**	**Example**
Severe	6.6.1.1.1 Short term (acute) risk to human health likely to results in 'significant harm' as defined by the Environment Protection Act 1990, Part IIA. 6.6.1.1.2 Short term risk of pollution (note: water Resources Act contains no scope for considering significance of pollution) of sensitive water resource. 6.6.1.1.3 Catastrophic damage to buildings/properties. 6.6.1.1.4 A short-term risk to a particular ecosystem, or organism forming part of such ecosystem (note: the definition of ecological systems within the Draft Circular on Contaminated Land, DETR, 2000).	6.6.1.1.5 High Concentrations of cyanide on the surface of an informal recreation area. 6.6.1.1.6 Major spillage of contaminants from site into controlled waters. 6.6.1.1.7 Explosion, causing building collapse (can also equate to short term human health risk if buildings are occupied).
Medium	6.6.1.1.8 Chronic damage to Human Health ('significant harm' as defined in DETR, 2000). 6.6.1.1.9 Pollution of sensitive water resources (note Water Resources Act contains no scope for considering significance of pollution). 6.6.1.1.10 A significant change in a particular ecosystem, or organism forming part of such ecosystem.	6.6.1.1.11 Concentrations of a contaminant from site exceed generic, or site-specific assessment criteria. 6.6.1.1.12 Leaching of contaminants from a site to a major or minor aquifer (Principal and Secondary). 6.6.1.1.13 Death of a species within a designated nature reserve.
Mild	6.6.1.1.14 Pollution of non-sensitive water resources. 6.6.1.1.15 Significant damage to crops, buildings, structures and services ('significant harm' as defined in DETR, 2000). 6.6.1.1.16 Damage to sensitive buildings/structures/services or the environment.	6.6.1.1.17 Pollution of non-classified groundwater. 6.6.1.1.18 Damage to building rendering it unsafe to occupy (e.g. foundation damage resulting in instability).
Minor	6.6.1.1.19 Harm, although not necessarily significant harm, which may result in a financial loss, or expenditure to resolve. 6.6.1.1.20 Non-permanent health effects to human health (easily prevented by means such as personal protective clothing etc). 6.6.1.1.21 Easily repairable damage to buildings, structures and services.	6.6.1.1.22 The presence of contaminants at such concentrations that protective equipment is required during site works. 6.6.1.1.23 The loss of plants in a landscaping scheme. 6.6.1.1.24 Discoloration of concrete.

Table A. Classification of Consequence

Probability (Likelihood)	
Classification	**Definition**
High Likelihood	6.6.1.1.25 There is a pollutant linkage and an event that either appears very likely in the short term and almost inevitable over the long term, or there is evidence at the receptor of harm or pollution.
Likely	6.6.1.1.26 There is a pollutant linkage and all the elements are present and in the right place, which means that it is probable that an event will occur. 6.6.1.1.27 Circumstances are such that an event is not inevitable, but possible in the short term and likely over the long term.

[29] CIRIA C552 (2001) Contaminated Land Risk Assessment - A Guide to Good Practice.

Low Likelihood	6.6.1.1.28 There is a pollutant linkage and circumstances are possible under which an event could occur. 6.6.1.1.29 However, it is by no means certain that even over a longer period such event would take place and is less likely in the shorter term.
Unlikely	6.6.1.1.30 There is a pollutant linkage, but circumstances are such that it is improbable that an event would occur in the very long term.

Table B. Classification of Probability.

These classifications are then compared to indicate the risk presented by each pollutant linkage (Table C). It is important that this classification is only applied where there is a possibility (which can range from high likelihood to unlikely) of a pollutant linkage existing.

		Consequence			
		Severe	**Medium**	**Mild**	**Minor**
Probability	**High Likelihood**	Very High Risk	High Risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk
	Likely	High Risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk
	Low Likelihood	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk	Very Low Risk
	Unlikely	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk	Very Low Risk	Very Low Risk

Table C. Comparison of Consequence against Probability

Once the risk has been determined the corresponding action can be assessed (Table D).

Risk	**Action Required**
Very High Risk	6.6.1.1.31 There is a high probability that severe harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard, OR, there is evidence that sever harm to a designated receptor is currently happening. 6.6.1.1.32 This risk, if realised, is likely to results in a substantial liability. 6.6.1.1.33 Urgent investigation (if not already undertaken) and remediation are likely to be required.
High Risk	6.6.1.1.34 Harm is likely to arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard. 6.6.1.1.35 Realisation of the risk is likely to present a substantial liability. 6.6.1.1.36 Urgent investigation (if not undertaken already) is required and remedial works may be necessary in the short term and are likely over the longer term.
Moderate Risk	6.6.1.1.37 It is possible that harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard. However, it is either relatively unlikely that any such harm would be severe, or if any harm were to occur it is more likely that the harm would be relatively mild. 6.6.1.1.38 Investigation (if not already undertaken) is normally required to clarify the risk and to determine the potential liability. Some remedial works may be required in the longer term.
Low Risk	6.6.1.1.39 It is possible that harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard, but it is likely that this harm, if realised, would at worst normally be mild.
Very Low Risk	6.6.1.1.40 There is a low possibility that harm could arise to a receptor. In the event of such harm being realised it is not likely to be severe.

Table D. Description of the Classification and Likely Action Required.

Where a very low risk is identified no specific remediation is required. Where a low risk is identified, some form of remediation may be required depending on the pollutant linkage, the type and concentration of contaminants present and the proposed development.

Where there is a moderate/low risk is identified, an assessment will be undertaken to establish what category the pollutant linkage will fall into. Where LKC identifies a moderate or higher risk, remediation or further investigation work is recommended.

Appendix B

Profile Logs

LK GROUP	**LK CONSULT LTD** Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com	**Site** Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester	**Number** **WS101**

Excavation Method	**Dimensions**	**Ground Level (mOD)**	**Client**	**Job Number**
Drive-in Windowless Sampler driven to 5.45mbgl.		60.44	ISG Ltd	LKC 22 1670
	Location (Handheld GPS) 386166 E 399659 N	**Dates** 23/05/2023	**Engineer** LKC	**Sheet** 1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water	Instr
0.00-0.40	ES PID<0.1ppm				(0.40)	MADE GROUND: Dark brown slightly gravelly very sandy SILT with occasional rootlets, rare coal and ash, becoming increasingly gravelly with depth. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone.			
0.40-0.70	ES PID<0.1ppm			60.04	0.40				
0.70-1.00	ES			59.74	(0.30) 0.70	MADE GROUND: Dark grey slightly gravelly silty SAND with frequent ash, occasional coal, slate, brick fragments and glass. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone.			
1.10-1.30	PP 85.8kPa			59.34	(0.40) 1.10				
1.20-1.65	SPT N=13		2,2/3,3,3,4	59.14	(0.20) 1.30	MADE GROUND: Brown very clayey SAND with occasional brick fragments and rare coal. Sand is fine to medium.			
1.20-1.65	D								
1.30-2.00	PP 196.2kPa								
1.60-1.80	D					Stiff consistency high strength orangish brown and light grey mottled sandy silty CLAY with occasional rootlets. Sand is fine to medium.			
2.00-2.45	SPT N=22		3,3/4,5,6,7						
2.00-2.45	D					Very stiff consistency very high strength brown and light grey mottled slightly gravelly sandy silty CLAY with occasional rootlets. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone. Rare rootlets and coal gravel from 2.30mbgl.			
2.00-3.00	PP 213.4kPa								
2.50-2.70	D				(2.70)				
3.00-3.45	SPT N=18		3,3/4,4,4,6						
3.00-4.00	PP 171.7kPa								
4.00-4.45	SPT N=18		2,3/3,4,5,6	56.44	4.00	Very stiff consistency high strength sandy silty CLAY with occasional bands of sand. Sand is fine to medium.			
4.00-4.45	D								
4.00-5.00	PP 112.1kPa				(1.45)				
5.00-5.45	SPT N=16		3,3/3,4,4,5						
				54.99	5.45	Complete at 5.45m			

Remarks
Borehole dry and stable.

Scale (approx)	**Logged By**
1:40	EM

Figure No.
LKC 22 1670.WS101

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

LK CONSULT LTD

Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS
Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com

Site
Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester

Number
WS102

Excavation Method	Dimensions	Ground Level (mOD)	Client	Job Number
Drive-in Windowless Sampler driven to 5.45mbgl.		60.41	ISG Ltd	LKC 22 1670
	Location (Handheld GPS) 386176.1 E 399632.5 N	**Dates** 23/05/2023	**Engineer** LKC	**Sheet** 1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water	Instr
0.00-0.40	ES PID=0.3ppm			60.01	(0.40) 0.40	MADE GROUND: Dark brown slightly gravelly very sandy SILT with occasional rootlets, rare coal and glass fragments, becoming increasingly gravelly with depth. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone.			
0.40-0.80	ES PID=0.1ppm				(0.40)				
0.80-1.00	ES PID=0.2ppm			59.61	0.80 (0.20)	MADE GROUND: Brown very sandy silty CLAY with frequent brick fragments, occasional ash, coal and concrete fragments. Sand is fine to coarse.			
1.00-1.50	ES PID=1.1ppm			59.41	1.00	MADE GROUND: Black with slight hydrocarbon odour gravelly slightly silty SAND predominantly comprising ash with frequent clinker. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded.			
1.20-1.65	SPT N=7		1,0/1,1,2,3		(0.50)				
1.50-2.00	ES PID=0.1ppm			58.91	1.50	MADE GROUND: Black with slight hydrocarbon odour sandy silty CLAY with occasional ash and rare brick fragments, becoming grey in colour with depth. Sand is fine to coarse.			
1.50-2.00	ES PID=0.1ppm				(0.50)				
1.50-2.00	PP 118.5kPa								
1.80-2.00	D			58.41	2.00	Stiff consistency high strength light orangish brown and light grey mottled with very slight hydrocarbon odour slightly gravelly slightly sandy silty CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.			
2.00-2.45	SPT N=15		2,2/3,3,4,5						
2.00-3.00	PP 161.5kPa								
3.00-3.45	SPT N=23		3,3/4,6,6,7		(2.00)	Very stiff consistency very high strength brown with occasional light grey mottling slightly gravelly slightly sandy silty CLAY with rare bands of sand. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.			
3.00-3.45	D					Band of brown silty SAND at approximately 3.50-3.70mbgl. Strata is damp.			
3.00-4.00	PP 194.2kPa								
4.00-4.45	SPT N=26		3,4/5,6,7,8	56.41	4.00	Very stiff consistency very high strength brown gravelly slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone, mudstone and coal.			
4.00-5.00	PP 194.7kPa				(1.45)				
5.00-5.45	SPT N=30		4,4/6,6,8,10						
				54.96	5.45	Complete at 5.45m			

Remarks
Borehole stable and dry.

Scale (approx)	Logged By
1:40	EM

Figure No.
LKC 22 1670.WS102

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

LK GROUP	**LK CONSULT LTD** Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com	**Site** Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester	**Number** **WS103**

Excavation Method	**Dimensions**	**Ground Level (mOD)**	**Client**	**Job Number**
Drive-in Windowless Sampler driven to 5.45mbgl.		59.90	ISG Ltd	LKC 22 1670
	Location (Handheld GPS) 386153.3 E 399590.3 N	**Dates** 23/05/2023	**Engineer** LKC	**Sheet** 1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water	Instr
0.00-0.15	ES PID=0.1ppm			59.75	(0.15) 0.15	MADE GROUND: Brown very silty SAND with frequent rootlets and rare brick fragments. Sand is fine to medium.			
0.15-0.60	ES PID=0.5ppm				(0.45)				
0.60-0.90	ES PID=0.1ppm			59.30	0.60	MADE GROUND: Dark greyish brown slightly gravelly clayey SAND with frequent ash, occasional brick fragments, clinker, ceramic fragments and slate. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.			
0.90-1.30	ES PID=0.3ppm				(0.30)				
1.20-1.65	SPT N=0		0,0/0,0,0,0	59.00	0.90	MADE GROUND: Firm consistency light brown sandy CLAY with occasional brick fragments and bands of ash. Sand is fine to medium.			
					(1.10)	MADE GROUND: Black SAND and GRAVEL predominantly comprising ash and clinker with occasional brick fragments. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded.			
2.00-3.00 2.00-2.45	ES PID=0.3ppm SPT N=0		Water strike(1) at 2.00m. 0,0/0,0,0,0	57.90	2.00	Approximately 20% recovery between 1.00-2.00mbgl.		▽1	
					(1.20)	MADE GROUND: Brownish grey with slight hydrocarbon odour silty SAND and GRAVEL predominantly comprising ash and clinker with occasional bands of clay. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded. Strata is wet. Very slight sheen to water.			
3.00-3.45 3.00-4.00 3.20-3.50	SPT N=7 PP 137.4kPa ES		0,0/0,2,2,3	56.70	3.20	Approximately 70% recovery between 2.00-3.00mbgl.			
3.80-4.00	D				(1.30)	Stiff to very stiff consistency high strength brown with occasional light grey mottling slightly gravelly slightly sandy silty CLAY with rare rootlets. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to medium, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.			
4.00-4.45 4.00-5.00	SPT N=16 PP 125.7kPa		2,2/3,4,4,5			Very stiff consistency from 4.00mbgl.			
				55.40	4.50	Very stiff consistency high strength brown slightly gravelly slightly sandy CLAY with rare bands of sand. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to medium, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.			
5.00-5.45	SPT N=18		6,5/3,4,5,6		(0.95)				
				54.45	5.45	Orange fine to medium SAND between 5.30-5.45mbgl.			
						Complete at 5.45m			

Remarks
Strata is wet between 2.00-3.20mbgl. Perched water.
Borehole unstable between 1.00-3.00mbgl due to wet made ground.

Scale (approx)	**Logged By**
1:40	EM

Figure No.
LKC 22 1670.WS103

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

LK GROUP	**LK CONSULT LTD** Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com	**Site** Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester	**Number** **WS104**

Excavation Method	**Dimensions**	**Ground Level (mOD)**	**Client**	**Job Number**
Drive-in Windowless Sampler driven to 2.03mbgl.			ISG Ltd	LKC 22 1670
	Location	**Dates** 23/05/2023	**Engineer** LKC	**Sheet** 1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water
0.00-0.40	ES PID=0.8ppm				(0.40)	MADE GROUND: Dark brown slightly gravelly very sandy SILT with occasional coal fragments, ash, rootlets and rare ceramic fragments. Gravel content increases with depth. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone.		
0.40-1.00	ES PID<0.1ppm				0.40			
					(0.60)	MADE GROUND: Stiff consistency dark greyish brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY with frequent brick fragments, ash, occasional coal, clinker, ceramic fragments and glass fragments. Decreasing brick and ash content with depth. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.		
1.20-1.65	SPT N=10		2,2/2,2,3,3		1.00			
1.20-1.65	D							
					(1.03)	Stiff becoming very stiff consistency very high strength brown and light grey mottled slightly gravelly slightly sandy silty CLAY with rare rootlets. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone. Very stiff consistency from 1.40mbgl.		
1.60-2.00	PP 179kPa							
1.80-2.00	D							
2.00-2.03	SPT 25*/10 50/20		25/50		2.03	Terminated at 2.03m		

Remarks
SPT refusal at 2.03mbgl on possible sandstone cobble.
Borehole dry and stable.
Borehole repositioned approximately 1.00m to the south west (Ref. WS104A).

Scale (approx)	**Logged By**
1:40	EM

Figure No.
LKC 22 1670.WS104

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

LK GROUP	**LK CONSULT LTD** Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com	**Site** Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester	**Number** **WS104A**

Excavation Method	**Dimensions**	**Ground Level (mOD)**	**Client**	**Job Number**
Drive-in Windowless Sampler driven to 5.45mbgl.		60.23	ISG Ltd	LKC 22 1670
	Location (Handheld GPS) 386138.2 E 399621.1 N	**Dates** 23/05/2023	**Engineer** LKC	**Sheet** 1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water	Instr
					(0.40)	MADE GROUND: Dark brown slightly gravelly very sandy SILT with occasional rootlets, coal and brick fragments. Gravel content increases with depth. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone.			
				59.83	0.40				
					(0.60)	MADE GROUND: Stiff consistency dark greyish brown slightly gravelly sandy CLAY with frequent brick fragments, ash, occasional coal, clinker, ceramic fragments and glass fragments. Decreasing brick and ash content with depth. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.			
1.00-1.40	PP 71.1kPa			59.23	1.00				
1.20-1.65	SPT N=9		2,2/2,2,2,3						
1.40-2.00	PP 153.3kPa					Stiff becoming very stiff consistency medium to very high strength brown and light grey mottled slightly gravelly slightly sandy silty CLAY with rare rootlets. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone, mudstone and rare coal. Very stiff consistency and very high strength from 1.50mbgl. Occasional grey mottling from 2.00mbgl.			
2.00-2.45	SPT N=14		3,2/3,3,4,4						
2.00-3.00	PP 179.9kPa								
2.50-2.70	D				(3.00)				
3.00-3.45	SPT N=23		3,4/5,6,6,6						
3.00-3.45	D								
3.00-4.00	PP 152.4kPa								
4.00-4.45	SPT N=23		3,3/5,5,6,7	56.23	4.00	Very stiff consistency very high strength brown gravelly slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to medium, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone, mudstone and occasional coal.			
4.00-5.00	PP 205kPa								
					(1.45)				
5.00-5.45	SPT N=27		4,4/5,6,7,9						
				54.78	5.45	Complete at 5.45m			

Remarks
Borehole dry and stable.

Scale (approx)	**Logged By**
1:40	EM

Figure No.
LKC 22 1670.WS104A

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

LK GROUP	**LK CONSULT LTD** Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com	**Site** Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester	**Number** **WS105**

Excavation Method	**Dimensions**	**Ground Level (mOD)**	**Client**	**Job Number**
Drive-in Windowless Sampler driven to 5.45mbgl.		59.83	ISG Ltd	LKC 22 1670
	Location (Handheld GPS) 386101.5 E 399594.9 N	**Dates** 23/05/2023	**Engineer** LKC	**Sheet** 1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water	Instr
0.00-0.30	ES PID=0.3ppm				(0.30)	MADE GROUND: Dark brown slightly gravelly very silty SAND with occasional coal, brick fragments, rootlets and rare ash. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone.			
0.30-1.00	ES			59.53	0.30				
					(0.70)	MADE GROUND: Firm consistency brown very sandy CLAY with frequent brick fragments, occasional coal, ash, glass and ceramic fragments. Sand is fine to coarse.			
1.00-1.60	ES			58.83	1.00				
1.20-1.65	SPT N=6		3,3/3,1,1,1		(0.60)	MADE GROUND: Black slightly silty SAND and GRAVEL predominantly comprising ash and clinker. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded.			
1.60-2.00	ES			58.23	1.60				
1.60-2.00	PP 154.5kPa					Stiff consistency very high strength brown with light grey mottling slightly sandy silty CLAY with rare rootlets and coal fragments. Sand is fine to coarse.			
2.00-2.45	SPT N=11		2,2/2,3,3,3						
2.00-2.45	D								
2.00-3.00	PP 165.5kPa				(1.40)				
3.00-3.45	SPT N=19		3,3/3,5,7,4	56.83	3.00	Very stiff consistency very high strength brown gravelly slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising mudstone and sandstone.			
3.00-4.00	PP 165kPa								
4.00-4.45	SPT N=20		3,3/4,5,5,6						
4.00-5.00	PP 193.1kPa				(2.45)				
5.00-5.45	SPT N=22		3,4/4,5,6,7						
				54.38	5.45	Complete at 5.45m			

Remarks
Borehole dry and stable.

Scale (approx)	**Logged By**
1:40	EM

Figure No.
LKC 22 1670.WS105

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

LK CONSULT LTD

Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS
Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com

Site
Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester

Number
WS106

Excavation Method
Drive-in Windowless Sampler driven to 5.45mbgl.

Dimensions

Ground Level (mOD)
59.34

Client
ISG Ltd

Job Number
LKC 22 1670

Location (Handheld GPS)
386098.6 E 399552.5 N

Dates
25/05/2023

Engineer
LKC

Sheet
1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water	Instr
0.00-0.50	D PID=0.2ppm				(0.50)	MADE GROUND: Dark brown slightly gravelly very sandy silty CLAY with occasional brick fragments, coal, rootlets and glass fragments. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone.			
0.50-0.90	D PID=0.3ppm			58.84	0.50				
					(0.40)	MADE GROUND: Blackish brown slightly gravelly slightly silty SAND with frequent ash, occasional brick fragments and rare coal. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone.			
0.90-1.30	D PID=0.3ppm			58.44	0.90				
					(0.40)				
1.20-1.65	SPT N=20		1,0/4,7,5,4	58.04	1.30	MADE GROUND: Firm consistency brown with occasional grey mottling sandy CLAY with occasional brick fragments and ash. Sand is fine to medium.			
1.30-2.00	D PID=0.4ppm								
					(0.80)	MADE GROUND: Black slightly silty SAND and GRAVEL predominantly comprising ash and clinker with occasional brick fragments, coal and bands of slightly organic very sandy clay. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded.			
2.00-2.45	SPT N=4		1,2/0,1,1,2	57.24	2.10				
					(0.80)	MADE GROUND: Soft becoming firm consistency light greyish brown slightly organic sandy silty CLAY with occasional bands of coal and ash and rare brick fragments. Sand is fine to coarse. Bands of coal and ash are wet. Firm consistency from 2.30mbgl.			
				56.44	2.90				
3.00-3.45	SPT N=17		2,2/3,3,5,6			Stiff becoming very stiff consistency very high strength brown with occasional light grey mottling slightly gravelly slightly sandy silty CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone. Stiff consistency sandy silty CLAY between 2.90-3.20mbgl. Very stiff consistency from 3.20mbgl.			
3.20-4.00	PP 177.8kPa				(1.90)				
4.00-4.45	SPT N=26		4,4/5,6,7,8			Rare grey mottling from 4.00mbgl.			
4.00-5.00	PP 192.1kPa								
				54.54	4.80				
5.00-5.45	SPT N=28		3,4/5,7,7,9			Very stiff consistency very high strength brown gravelly slightly sandy CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone. Occasional bands of brown silty SAND between 4.80-5.00mbgl. Sand is fine to medium.			
					(0.65)				
				53.89	5.45				
						Complete at 5.45m			

Remarks
Borehole stable.

Scale (approx)
1:40

Logged By
EM

Figure No.
LKC 22 1670.WS106

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

LK CONSULT LTD Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com		**Site** Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester	**Trial Pit Number** **SA101**
Excavation Method Machine excavated pit to 2.40mbgl to undertake soakaway test.	**Dimensions** 0.60m x 2.00m x 2.40m **Location** (Handheld GPS) 386091.3 E 399579.6 N	**Ground Level (mOD)** 59.61 **Dates** 10/05/2023	**Client** ISG Ltd **Engineer** LKC	**Job Number** LKC 22 1670 **Sheet** 1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water
					(0.30)	MADE GROUND: Brown slightly gravelly very silty SAND with occasional rootlets and brick fragments. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.		
				59.31	0.30	MADE GROUND: Brownish grey slightly clayey SAND and GRAVEL predominantly comprising ash and clinker with occasional coal, brick fragments, bands of firm consistency slightly gravelly slightly sandy clay and rare whole bricks. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.		
					(1.60)			
				57.71	1.90	Stiff consistency light brown and light grey mottled slightly gravelly slightly sandy silty CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising mudstone, sandstone and coal.		
					(0.50)			
				57.21	2.40	Complete at 2.40m		



Remarks

Pit dry and stable.
Soakaway test undertaken in pit, refer to separate output sheet (ref. SA101).

Scale (approx)	Logged By	Figure No.
1:20	EM	LKC 22 1670.SA101

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

LK CONSULT LTD

Eton Business Park, Eton Hill Road, Radcliffe, M26 2ZS
Tel: 0161 763 7200 web: www.thelkgroup.com

Site	Trial Pit Number
Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester	TP101

Excavation Method	Dimensions	Ground Level (mOD)	Client	Job Number
Machine excavated pit to 2.20mbgl.	0.60m x 2.00m x 2.20m	59.67	ISG Ltd	LKC 22 1670
	Location (Handheld GPS) 386122 E 399576.4 N	**Dates** 10/05/2023	**Engineer** LKC	**Sheet** 1/1

Depth (m)	Sample / Tests	Water Depth (m)	Field Records	Level (mOD)	Depth (m) (Thickness)	Description	Legend	Water
					(0.40)	MADE GROUND: Brown slightly gravelly very silty SAND with occasional rootlets and brick fragments. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.		
				59.27	0.40			
					(0.35)	MADE GROUND: Black slightly silty SAND and GRAVEL predominantly comprising ash and clinker with occasional brick fragments. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded.		
				58.92	0.75			
					(0.65)	MADE GROUND: Stiff consistency brown and light grey mottled slightly gravelly slightly sandy CLAY with occasional coal and brick fragments. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded comprising sandstone and mudstone.		
				58.27	1.40			
					(0.80)	MADE GROUND: Black slightly silty SAND and GRAVEL predominantly comprising ash and clinker with occasional brick fragments. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to coarse, sub-angular to sub-rounded. Strata is damp.		
			Slow seepage(1) at 2.20m.	57.47	2.20	Complete at 2.20m		▽1



Remarks

Soakaway pit not undertaken due to depth of made ground encountered, and due to refusal on dense made ground at 2.20mbgl.
Pit relocated (ref. SA101).
Perched water slowly seeping into base of pit at 2.20mbgl. Strata between 1.40-2.20mbgl is damp.

Scale (approx)	Logged By	Figure No.
1:20	EM	LKC 22 1670.TP101

Produced by the GEOtechnical DAtabase SYstem (GEODASY) © all rights reserved

Appendix C

Gas Monitoring Results

LK CONSULT LTD

GAS MONITORING RECORD

Site	Varley and Nelson Street
Job Number	LKC 22 1670
Date	08/06/2023
Engineer	CD
Visit	1 of 6

Equipment[1]		
Instrument	**Serial Number**	**Comments**
Gas Analyser GA5000	G507783	Serviced, calibrated, gas checked.
HydroTechnik	HT-03	Operating normally.
Pho-Check Tiger	T-106802	Serviced, calibrated.

Atmospheric / Ground Conditions	
Atmospheric pressure trend onsite	Rising then steady
Atmospheric pressure (prev 24hrs)	Steady
Weather Conditions	Clear, Hot, No wind.
Ground Conditions	Dry

Borehole ID	**Date & Time**	**CH_4 (%v/v)**	**CO_2 (%v/v)**	**O_2 (%v/v)**	**Peak CH_4 (%v/v)**	**Peak CO_2 (%v/v)**	**Min O_2 (%v/v)**	**% LEL[2]**	**Peak CO (ppm)**	**Peak H_2S (ppm)**	**Balance (%)**	**Barometric Pressure (mb)**	**Internal Flow[3] (l/hr)**	**PID (ppm)**	**Standing water level (mbgl)**	**Installation base depth (mbgl)**	**Notes**
WS101	08/06/2023 11:57	0	15.7	4.4	0	15.7	4.4	0	26	0	79.9	1014	0	2.1	4.85	4.90	Steady CO=3ppm.
WS102	08/06/2023 14:03	0	1.8	18.9	0	1.8	18.9	0	5	0	79.3	1015	0	0.6	1.71	4.85	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS103	08/06/2023 12:22	0	13.2	0.4	0	13.2	0.4	0	12	0	86.4	1015	0	0.9	1.94	3.95	Steady CO=2ppm, Slightly Silty.
WS104A	08/06/2023 12:33	0	4.9	14.4	0	4.9	14.4	0	12	0	80.7	1015	0	0.8	4.57	4.89	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS105	08/06/2023 12:44	0	9.2	5.7	0	9.2	5.7	0	3	0	85.1	1015	0	1.1	3.88	3.95	Steady CO=2ppm.
WS106	08/06/2023 13:00	0	7.6	2.8	0	7.6	2.8	0	9	0	89.6	1015	0	0.8	2.01	4.83	Steady CO=4ppm.
WS107	08/06/2023 13:16	0	8.8	4.4	0	8.8	4.4	0	28	0	86.8	1015	0	1.3	2.57	4.86	Steady CO=2ppm.
WS108	08/06/2023 13:27	0	7.3	11.9	0	7.4	11.9	0	7	0	80.8	1015	0	0.7	4.13	4.85	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS109	08/06/2023 13:37	0	6.2	15.5	0	6.2	15.5	0	29	0	78.3	1015	0	1.4	4.19	4.44	Steady CO=1ppm, Peak PID=2.0
WS110	08/06/2023 13:47	0	3.9	17.4	0	3.9	17.2	0	9	0	78.7	1015	0	0.7	4.40	4.91	Steady CO=1ppm.

ABBREVIATIONS	
ND	Not detected
NR	Not recorded
UR	Unable to record
OS	Off recordable scale
N/A	Not applicable
ppm	Parts per million
mb	Millibars
l/hr	Litres per hour
mbgl	Metres below ground level
LEL	Lower explosive limit in air

NOTES

All monitoring is carried out in line with LK Consult Ltd procedures, with reference to CIRIA C665.

[1]Equipment is serviced and checked as recommended by the manufacturer. Refer to calibration records and service certificates.

[2]CH4 is explosive between the range of 5-15%v/v. 100% lower explosive limit is equal to 5%v/v CH4.

[3]Flow readings are based on a 1 minute average value where flow is detected (equipment range of +/- 12 ltr/hr).

LK CONSULT LTD

GAS MONITORING RECORD

Site	Varley and Nelson Street, Manchester
Job Number	LKC 22 1670
Date	21/06/2023
Engineer	CD
Visit	2 of 6

Equipment[1]		
Instrument	**Serial Number**	**Comments**
Gas Analyser GA5000	G507783	Serviced, calibrated, gas checked.
HydroTechnik	HT-04	Operating normally.
Mini Rae Lite	PGM7300	Serviced, calibrated.

Atmospheric / Ground Conditions	
Atmospheric pressure trend onsite	Rising
Atmospheric pressure (prev 24hrs)	Rising
Weather Conditions	Slight Breeze, Warm, Sudden Showers
Ground Conditions	Initially Dry, Damp after Rain.

Borehole ID	Date & Time	CH_4 (%v/v)	CO_2 (%v/v)	O_2 (%v/v)	Peak CH_4 (%v/v)	Peak CO_2 (%v/v)	Min O_2 (%v/v)	% LEL[2]	Peak CO (ppm)	Peak H_2S (ppm)	Balance (%)	Barometric Pressure (mb)	Internal Flow[3] (l/hr)	PID (ppm)	Standing water level (mbgl)	Installation base depth (mbgl)	Notes
WS101	21/06/2023 10:58	0	17.1	0.1	0	17.2	0.1	0	30	1	0	1008	0	5	4.91	4.91	Steady CO=30ppm.
WS102	21/06/2023 11:14	0	4.3	6.1	0	4.3	6.1	0	4	0	0	1008	8.6	1.9	0.95	4.87	Steady CO=3ppm.
WS103	21/06/2023 11:29	0	15.4	0.1	0	15.4	0.1	0	6	0	0	1009	0	1.2	1.97	3.91	Steady CO=3ppm, Very Silty.
WS104A	21/06/2023 11:40	0	6.5	8.6	0	6.5	8.6	0	6	0	0	1009	0	1.1	3.77	4.87	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS105	21/06/2023 11:57	0	11.1	2.4	0	11.1	2.4	0	2	0	0	1009	0	1.6	3.44	3.95	Steady CO=2ppm.
WS106	21/06/2023 12:27	0	8.7	0.2	0	8.8	0.2	0	16	0	0	1008	0	1.4	1.79	4.87	Steady CO=16ppm.
WS107	21/06/2023 12:34	0	10.9	3.1	0	10.9	3.1	0	13	0	0	1009	0	1.1	2.23	4.72	Steady CO=2ppm.
WS108	21/06/2023 12:54	0	9.4	6.4	0	9.4	4.5	0	17	0	0	1009	0	0.6	3.26	4.85	Steady CO=0ppm.
WS109	21/06/2023 13:08	0	8.1	10.4	0	8.1	10.4	0	14	0	0	1009	0	0.9	2.18	4.46	Steady CO=0ppm.
WS110	21/06/2023 13:20	0	6	3.7	0	6	3.7	0	2	0	0	1009	0	1	2.18	4.90	Steady CO=2ppm.

ABBREVIATIONS	
ND	Not detected
NR	Not recorded
UR	Unable to record
OS	Off recordable scale
N/A	Not applicable
ppm	Parts per million
mb	Millibars
l/hr	Litres per hour
mbgl	Metres below ground level
LEL	Lower explosive limit in air

NOTES

All monitoring is carried out in line with LK Consult Ltd procedures, with reference to CIRIA C665.

[1]Equipment is serviced and checked as recommended by the manufacturer. Refer to calibration records and service certificates.

[2]CH4 is explosive between the range of 5-15%v/v. 100% lower explosive limit is equal to 5%v/v CH4.

[3]Flow readings are based on a 1 minute average value where flow is detected (equipment range of +/- 12 ltr/hr).

LK CONSULT LTD

GAS MONITORING RECORD

Site	Varley and Nelson Street
Job Number	LKC 22 1670
Date	05/07/2023
Engineer	CD
Visit	3 of 6

Equipment[1]		
Instrument	**Serial Number**	**Comments**
Gas Analyser GA5000	G507783	Serviced, calibrated, gas checked.
HydroTechnik	HT-01	Operating normally.
Mini Rae Lite	PGM7300	Serviced, calibrated.

Atmospheric / Ground Conditions	
Atmospheric pressure trend onsite	Rising
Atmospheric pressure (prev 24hrs)	Steady
Weather Conditions	Partial Cloud Cover, Slight Wind, Dry
Ground Conditions	Dry

Borehole ID	**Date & Time**	**CH_4 (%v/v)**	**CO_2 (%v/v)**	**O_2 (%v/v)**	**Peak CH_4 (%v/v)**	**Peak CO_2 (%v/v)**	**Min O_2 (%v/v)**	**% LEL[2]**	**Peak CO (ppm)**	**Peak H_2S (ppm)**	**Balance (%)**	**Barometric Pressure (mb)**	**Internal Flow[3] (l/hr)**	**PID (ppm)**	**Standing water level (mbgl)**	**Installation base depth (mbgl)**	**Notes**
WS101	05/07/2023 10:38	0	16.8	0.1	0	16.8	0.1	0	9	5	83.1	1003	0	4.3	4.89	4.90	Steady CO=8ppm.
WS102	05/07/2023 12:25	0	0.6	20	0	1.4	19.7	0	0	0	79.4	1005	0	1.3	3.02	4.86	Steady CO=0ppm, Bung removed, measured 1hr 30 later.
WS103	05/07/2023 11:10	0	15.8	0.5	0	15.8	0.5	0	2	0	83.7	1004	0	1.3	2.01	3.90	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS104	05/07/2023 11:39	0	8.1	3.7	0	8.1	3.7	0	3	0	88.2	1004	-0.1	1.1	2.92	4.86	Steady CO=1ppm
WS105	05/07/2023 12:03	0	12.5	0.4	0	12.5	0.4	0	2	0	87.1	1004	0	1.2	3.07	3.91	Steady CO=1ppm
WS106	05/07/2023 12:14	0	11.4	0.1	0	11.4	0.1	0	2	0	88.5	1005	0	1.3	1.89	4.86	Steady CO=1ppm
WS107	05/07/2023 12:40	0	11.9	6.4	0	11.9	6.4	0	6	0	81.7	1005	0	1.5	2.23	4.83	Steady CO=1ppm
WS108	05/07/2023 12:51	0	11	6.4	0	11	6.4	0	9	0	82.6	1005	-0.1	1.5	2.60	4.85	Steady CO=1ppm
WS109	05/07/2023 13:03	0	8	13.1	0	8	13.1	0	5	0	78.9	1005	-0.1	0.4	1.97	4.45	Steady CO=0ppm
WS110	05/07/2023 13:12	0	9	3.2	0	9	3.2	0	2	0	87.8	1005	0	1	2.31	4.90	Steady CO=1ppm

ABBREVIATIONS	
ND	Not detected
NR	Not recorded
UR	Unable to record
OS	Off recordable scale
N/A	Not applicable
ppm	Parts per million
mb	Millibars
l/hr	Litres per hour
mbgl	Metres below ground level
LEL	Lower explosive limit in air

NOTES

All monitoring is carried out in line with LK Consult Ltd procedures, with reference to CIRIA C665.

[1]Equipment is serviced and checked as recommended by the manufacturer. Refer to calibration records and service certificates.

[2]CH4 is explosive between the range of 5-15%v/v. 100% lower explosive limit is equal to 5%v/v CH4.

[3]Flow readings are based on a 1 minute average value where flow is detected (equipment range of +/- 12 ltr/hr).

LK CONSULT LTD

GAS MONITORING RECORD

Site	Varley and Nelson Street
Job Number	LKC 22 1760
Date	21/07/2023
Engineer	CD
Visit	4 of 6

Equipment[1]		
Instrument	**Serial Number**	**Comments**
Gas Analyser GA5000	G502417	Serviced, calibrated, gas checked.
HydroTechnik	HT-02	Operating normally.

Atmospheric / Ground Conditions	
Atmospheric pressure trend onsite	Rising then steady
Atmospheric pressure (prev 24hrs)	Steady
Weather Conditions	Heavy Showers and Sun
Ground Conditions	Damp

Borehole ID	Date & Time	CH_4 (%v/v)	CO_2 (%v/v)	O_2 (%v/v)	Peak CH_4 (%v/v)	Peak CO_2 (%v/v)	Min O_2 (%v/v)	% LEL[2]	Peak CO (ppm)	Peak H_2S (ppm)	Balance (%)	Barometric Pressure (mb)	Internal Flow[3] (l/hr)	PID (ppm)	Standing water level (mbgl)	Installation base depth (mbgl)	Notes
WS101	21/07/2023 10:10	0.1	16	0.1	0.1	16	0.1	2	3	7	83.8	1007	0	NR	4.86	4.91	Steady CO=2ppm.
WS102	21/07/2023 10:29	0	5.2	6.4	0	5.2	6.4	0	2	0	88.4	1007	14.2	NR	0.79	4.85	Steady CO=2ppm, Peak flow=14.21 l/hr. Decreased to 0 l/h over 3 minutes.
WS103	21/07/2023 10:47	0	15.9	0.5	0	16	0.5	0	4	0	83.6	1007	0	NR	1.96	3.92	Steady CO=0ppm, Silty.
WS104A	21/07/2023 11:00	0	9.1	1.3	0	11	1.3	0	1	0	89.6	1007	13.9	NR	0.66	4.88	Steady CO=1ppm, Peak flow=13.9 l/hr. Decreased to 0 l/h over 3 minutes.
WS105	21/07/2023 11:12	0	12.6	0.2	0	12.6	0.2	0	2	0	87.2	1007	0	NR	2.63	3.93	Steady CO=0ppm
WS106	21/07/2023 11:26	0	11.3	0.1	0	13.3	0.1	0	4	0	88.6	1007	0	NR	2.01	4.88	Steady CO=1ppm
WS107	21/07/2023 11:49	0	11.8	6.7	0	15.6	6.7	0	3	0	81.5	1007	0	NR	2.20	4.85	Steady CO=0ppm
WS108	21/07/2023 11:39	0	10.6	7.2	0	11.2	7.2	0	5	0	82.2	1007	0	NR	2.16	4.85	Steady CO=0ppm
WS109	21/07/2023 12:03	0	8.4	13.2	0	8.4	13.2	0	4	0	78.4	1007	0	NR	1.78	4.45	Steady CO=0ppm
WS110	21/07/2023 12:13	0	8.6	6.9	0	8.6	6.9	0	1	0	84.5	1007	0	NR	2.35	4.91	Steady CO=1ppm

ABBREVIATIONS	
ND	Not detected
NR	Not recorded
UR	Unable to record
OS	Off recordable scale
N/A	Not applicable
ppm	Parts per million
mb	Millibars
l/hr	Litres per hour
mbgl	Metres below ground level
LEL	Lower explosive limit in air

NOTES

All monitoring is carried out in line with LK Consult Ltd procedures, with reference to CIRIA C665.

[1]Equipment is serviced and checked as recommended by the manufacturer. Refer to calibration records and service certificates.

[2]CH4 is explosive between the range of 5-15%v/v. 100% lower explosive limit is equal to 5%v/v CH4.

[3]Flow readings are based on a 1 minute average value where flow is detected (equipment range of +/- 12 ltr/hr).

LK CONSULT LTD

GAS MONITORING RECORD

Site	Varley and Nelson Street
Job Number	LKC 22 1670
Date	11/08/2023
Engineer	CD
Visit	5 of 6

Equipment[1]		
Instrument	**Serial Number**	**Comments**
Gas Analyser GA5000	G507783	Serviced, calibrated, gas checked.
HydroTechnik	HT-04	Operating normally.
Mini Rae Lite	PGM7300	Serviced, calibrated.

Atmospheric / Ground Conditions	
Atmospheric pressure trend onsite	Rising then steady
Atmospheric pressure (prev 24hrs)	Falling
Weather Conditions	Dry, Sunny, Slight Wind, Warm
Ground Conditions	Dry

Borehole ID	**Date & Time**	**CH_4 (%v/v)**	**CO_2 (%v/v)**	**O_2 (%v/v)**	**Peak CH_4 (%v/v)**	**Peak CO_2 (%v/v)**	**Min O_2 (%v/v)**	**% LEL[2]**	**Peak CO (ppm)**	**Peak H_2S (ppm)**	**Balance (%)**	**Barometric Pressure (mb)**	**Internal Flow[3] (l/hr)**	**PID (ppm)**	**Standing water level (mbgl)**	**Installation base depth (mbgl)**	**Notes**
WS101	11/08/2023 10:13	0.7	14.8	0	0.7	14.8	0	14	4	6	84.5	1009	0	6.5	4.17	4.91	Steady CO=3ppm.
WS102	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	UR	Unable to locate well.
WS103	11/08/2023 10:31	0	13.6	5.2	0.1	21.8	5.2	0	4	0	81.2	1010	0	1.4	1.55	3.90	Steady CO=1ppm, Silty.
WS104A	11/08/2023 10:46	0	9.3	2	0	9.3	1.5	0	7	8	88.7	1010	-0.1	5.1	0.68	4.89	Steady CO=2ppm. H2S= 0ppm for first 175 seconds, followed by sharp rise to 8ppm.
WS105	11/08/2023 11:10	0	11.3	0.2	0	11.3	0.2	0	2	0	88.5	1009	0	2.9	1.34	3.93	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS106	11/08/2023 11:28	0	11.3	0.1	0	11.3	0.1	0	4	0	88.6	1010	0	2.1	1.68	4.86	Steady CO=2ppm.
WS107	11/08/2023 11:39	0	11.2	5.2	0	15.7	5.2	0	4	0	83.6	1010	0	2.4	2.21	4.86	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS108	11/08/2023 11:50	0	9.8	8.1	0	11.3	8	0	5	0	82.1	1010	0	2	1.42	4.86	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS109	11/08/2023 12:01	0	8	14.2	0	9.5	14.2	0	6	0	77.8	1010	-0.1	1.6	1.18	4.46	Steady CO=1ppm.
WS110	11/08/2023 12:12	0	8.9	4.2	0	8.9	4.2	0	5	0	86.9	1010	-0.1	2.2	2.38	4.93	Steady CO=2ppm.

ABBREVIATIONS	
ND	Not detected
NR	Not recorded
UR	Unable to record
OS	Off recordable scale
N/A	Not applicable
ppm	Parts per million
mb	Millibars
l/hr	Litres per hour
mbgl	Metres below ground level
LEL	Lower explosive limit in air

NOTES

All monitoring is carried out in line with LK Consult Ltd procedures, with reference to CIRIA C665.

[1]Equipment is serviced and checked as recommended by the manufacturer. Refer to calibration records and service certificates.

[2]CH4 is explosive between the range of 5-15%v/v. 100% lower explosive limit is equal to 5%v/v CH4.

[3]Flow readings are based on a 1 minute average value where flow is detected (equipment range of +/- 12 ltr/hr).

LK CONSULT LTD

GAS MONITORING RECORD

Site	Varley and Nelson Street
Job Number	LKC 22 1670
Date	01/09/2023
Engineer	CD
Visit	6 of 6

Equipment[1]		
Instrument	**Serial Number**	**Comments**
Gas Analyser GA5000	G507783	Serviced, calibrated, gas checked.
HydroTechnik	HT-03	Operating normally.
Mini Rae Lite	PGM7300	Serviced, calibrated.

Atmospheric / Ground Conditions	
Atmospheric pressure trend onsite	Rising
Atmospheric pressure (prev 24hrs)	Falling then steady
Weather Conditions	Sunny, clear to overcast. No wind.
Ground Conditions	Damp.

Borehole ID	**Date & Time**	**CH_4 (%v/v)**	**CO_2 (%v/v)**	**O_2 (%v/v)**	**Peak CH_4 (%v/v)**	**Peak CO_2 (%v/v)**	**Min O_2 (%v/v)**	**% LEL[2]**	**Peak CO (ppm)**	**Peak H_2S (ppm)**	**Balance (%)**	**Barometric Pressure (mb)**	**Internal Flow[3] (l/hr)**	**PID (ppm)**	**Standing water level (mbgl)**	**Installation base depth (mbgl)**	**Notes**
WS101	01/09/2023 10:02	1.2	15.3	0	1.2	15.3	0	0	4	6	83.5	1004	0	4.5	4.60	4.91	Steady CO=2ppm
WS102	01/09/2023 10:29	0	3.1	14.1	0	3.1	14.3	0	3	0	82.8	1005	6.2	2.1	0.72	4,86	Steady CO=3ppm. Peak flow=6.2l/h, decreased to 2.0l/h over 3 minutes. Water taken up tubing at 40 seconds.
WS103	01/09/2023 10:02	0	15.2	2.6	0	15.2	2.6	0	3	0	82.2	1005	-0.1	1.1	1.67	3.90	Steady CO=1ppm, Silty
WS104A	01/09/2023 10:58	0	2.6	17.2	0	2.6	17.2	0	8	2	80.2	1005	0.2	3	0.69	4.88	Steady CO=6ppm. Peak flow=1.8l/h, decreased to 0.2l/h over 3 minutes.
WS105	01/09/2023 11:29	0	12	0.1	0	12.1	0.1	0	2	0	87.9	1006	-0.1	1.5	1.49	3.93	Steady CO=1ppm
WS106	01/09/2023 11:57	0	12	0.1	0	12	0.1	0	4	0	87.9	1006	0	1.2	1.75	4.86	Steady CO=2ppm
WS107	01/09/2023 12:13	0	11.5	4.7	0	11.6	4.7	0	4	0	83.8	1006	-0.1	1.9	2.23	4.85	Steady CO=1ppm
WS108	01/09/2023 12:25	0	9.5	8.8	0	9.5	8.7	0	4	0	81.7	1007	0	1.1	1.55	4.86	Steady CO=1ppm
WS109	01/09/2023 12:39	0	7.8	13.5	0	7.8	13.5	0	4	0	78.7	1007	0	0.6	1.26	4.47	Steady CO=1ppm
WS110	01/09/2023 12:45	0	9.1	6.2	0	9.1	6.2	0	4	0	84.7	1007	0	0.7	2.34	4.91	Steady CO=1ppm

ABBREVIATIONS	
ND	Not detected
NR	Not recorded
UR	Unable to record
OS	Off recordable scale
N/A	Not applicable
ppm	Parts per million
mb	Millibars
l/hr	Litres per hour
mbgl	Metres below ground level
LEL	Lower explosive limit in air

NOTES

All monitoring is carried out in line with LK Consult Ltd procedures, with reference to CIRIA C665.

[1]Equipment is serviced and checked as recommended by the manufacturer. Refer to calibration records and service certificates.

[2]CH4 is explosive between the range of 5-15%v/v. 100% lower explosive limit is equal to 5%v/v CH4.

[3]Flow readings are based on a 1 minute average value where flow is detected (equipment range of +/- 12 ltr/hr).

Appendix D

JIWG Output Sheet

JIWG

Joint Industry Working Group

Asbestos in Soil and Construction & Demolition Materials

Decision Support Tool for Receptor Risk Ranking

Stage 1

Hazard Identification		Score
Select ACM type (run model for each type to generate 'Worst Case' output)	Free dispersed fibres/fibre bundles	2
Extent of degradation of ACMs	Degraded (Significant degradation in ACM; material has lost its basic integrity)	3
Friability and degree of bonding by matrix (ACM matrix, not ground materials)	Friable ACM or ACM with fibres not linked in any matrix (free dispersed fibres/fibre bundles)	4
Distribution of Visible Asbestos Across Affected Area	No visible ACMs/fibre bundles	0
Asbestos fibre type	Chrysotile alone	0
Sub-total		**9**
Hazard ranking		**Low**

No warranty, expressed or implied, or reliance, is provided in relation to the use of this tool.
It is contingent on users to satisfy themselves that the output from the tool is relevant and appropriate to the assessment being made.

© Joint Industry Working Group, ©CL:AIRE

Stage 2

Emission Factors		Score
Amount of asbestos fibre in selected ACM/fibre type as % of host material	Low quantities - >0.01 to <0.05 %wt/wt	2
Respirable fibre index for ACM - RIVM report 711701034 (2003)	Low	2
Activity type and effect on deterioration of ACMs	Minimal disturbance, no deterioration expected	1
Best description of primary host material matrix	Made Ground - Recycled Aggregate, Track Ballast	4
Sub-total		9
Exposure ranking		Low

© Joint Industry Working Group, ©CL:AIRE

Stage 3

Pathway and Receptor Sensitivity		Score	
Receptor category	Public open space or building	No score required	
Age of Receptor	Infant (under 5)	4	
Duration of exposure/site occupancy	> 1hr <10 hr daily exposure (e.g. part-time to full time occupational exposure or extended daily recreational exposure)	3	
Receptor ranking		**7**	**High**
Combined hazard, exposure and receptor ranking			**Medium**
Pathway: Distance of Receptor from Source	In or within 10m of area of disturbance	4	
Pathway: Depth to impacted material	Material buried at depth, unlikely to be disturbed except for deeper construction related excavation	B	
Pathway ranking		4B	**Very Low**
Overall ranking			**Very Low**

© Joint Industry Working Group, ©CL:AIRE

Project Reference	LKC 22 1670

Site Name	Varley Street, Manchester
Client	ISG Ltd

Run by	EM
Date	14th July 2023
Reviewed by	PD

Characterisation of scenario being evaluated	Assessment based on a cover system in areas of soft landscaping (material buried at depth). Age of receptor classified as infant (<5 years old) as a conservative approach.

Interpretation of scenario ranking by DST	Very low risk assuming environmental cover system.

© Joint Industry Working Group, ©CL:AIRE

Appendix D

Generic Assessment Criteria Values

CATEGORY 4 SCREENING LEVELS

Substance	Residential (with home-grown produce)	Residential (without home-grown produce)	Allotments	Commercial	Public Open Space 1	Public Open Space 2
Arsenic	37 mg/kg	40 mg/kg	49 mg/kg	640 mg/kg	79 mg/kg	170 mg/kg
Benzene	0.87 mg/kg	3.3 mg/kg	0.18 mg/kg	98 mg/kg	140 mg/kg	230 mg/kg
Benzo(a)pyrene	5.0 mg/kg	5.3 mg/kg	5.7 mg/kg	77 mg/kg	10 mg/kg	21 mg/kg
Cadmium	22 mg/kg	150 mg/kg	3.9 mg/kg	410 mg/kg	220 mg/kg	880 mg/kg
Chromium VI	21 mg/kg	21 mg/kg	170 mg/kg	49 mg/kg	21 mg/kg	250 mg/kg
Lead	200 mg/kg	310 mg/kg	80 mg/kg	2300 mg/kg	630 mg/kg	1300 mg/kg
Tetrachlorethene (PCE) – 1% SOM	0.31 mg/kg	0.32 mg/kg	2.0 mg/kg	24 mg/kg	3,200 mg/kg	1,400 mg/kg
Tetrachlorethene (PCE) – 2.5% SOM	0.70 mg/kg	0.71 mg/kg	4.8 mg/kg	55 mg/kg	3,300 mg/kg	1,900 mg/kg
Tetrachlorethene (PCE) – 6% SOM	1.6 mg/kg	1.6 mg/kg	11 mg/kg	130 mg/kg	3,400 mg/kg	2,500 mg/kg
Trichlorethene (TCE) – 1% SOM	0.0093 mg/kg	0.0097 mg/kg	0.032 mg/kg	0.73 mg/kg	76 mg/kg	41 mg/kg
Trichlorethene (TCE) – 2.5% SOM	0.020 mg/kg	0.020 mg/kg	0.072 mg/kg	1.5 mg/kg	78 mg/kg	54 mg/kg
Trichlorethene (TCE) – 6% SOM	0.043 mg/kg	0.045 mg/kg	0.16 mg/kg	3.4 mg/kg	79 mg/kg	69 mg/kg
Vinyl Chloride (VC) – 1%SOM	0.0064 mg/kg	0.015 mg/kg	0.0017 mg/kg	1.1 mg/kg	7.8 mg/kg	18 mg/kg
Vinyl Chloride (VC) – 2.5%SOM	0.010 mg/kg	0.019 mg/kg	0.0031 mg/kg	1.4 mg/kg	7.8 mg/kg	19 mg/kg
Vinyl Chloride (VC) – 6%SOM	0.017 mg/kg	0.029 mg/kg	0.0058 mg/kg	2.2 mg/kg	7.8 mg/kg	19 mg/kg

Summary Table for the Generic Assessment Criteria for Human Health Risk Assessment Land Quality Management (LQM) S4ULs.

All GAC are based on sandy loam soils with a pH 7.

	Contaminant	SOM	LQM Generic Assessment Criteria (mg/kg) Dry weight soil					
			Res +	Res -	Allot.	Comm.	POS_{resi}	POS_{park}
Metals	Inorganic Arsenic	6%	37	40	43	640	79	170
	Beryllium	6%	1.7	1.7	35	12	2.2	63
	Boron	6%	290	11,000	45	240,000	21,000	46,000
	Cadmium	6%	11	85	1.9	190	120	532
	Chromium (III)	6%	910	910	18,000	8,600	1,500	33,000
	Chromium (VI)	6%	6.0	6.0	1.8	33	7.7	220
	Copper	6%	2,400	7,100	520	68,000	12,000	44,000
	Elemental Mercury	6%	1.2	1.2	21	58 (25.8) ^{vap}	16	30 (25.8) ^{vap}
	Inorganic Mercury	6%	40	56	19	1,100	120	240
	Methylmercury	6%	11	15	6.0	320	40	68
	Nickel	6%	180	180	230	980	230	3,400
	Selenium	6%	250	430	88	12,000	1,100	1,800
	Vanadium	6%	410	1,200	91	9,000	2,000	5,000
	Zinc	6%	3,700	40,000	620	730,000	81,000	170,000
BTEX Compounds	Benzene	1%	0.087	0.38	0.017	27	72	90
		2.5%	0.17	0.70	0.034	47	72	100
		6%	0.37	1.4	0.075	90	73	110
	Toluene	1%	130	880 (869) ^{vap}	22	56,000 (869) ^{vap}	56,000	87,000 (869) ^{vap}
		2.5%	290	1,900	51	110,000 (1,920) ^{vap}	56,000	95,000 (1,920) ^{vap}
		6%	660	3,900	120	180,000 (4,360) ^{vap}	56,000	100,000 (4,360) ^{vap}
	Ethylbenzene	1%	47	83	16	5,700 (518) ^{vap}	24,000	17,000 (518) ^{vap}
		2.5%	110	190	39	13,000 (1,220) ^{vap}	24,000	22,000 (1,220) ^{vap}
		6%	260	440	91	27,000 (2,840) ^{vap}	25,000	27,000 (2,840) ^{vap}
	o-xylene	1%	60	88	28	6,600 (478) ^{sol}	41,000	17,000 (478) ^{sol}
		2.5%	140	210	67	15,000 (1,120) ^{sol}	42,000	24,000 (1,120) ^{sol}
		6%	330	480	160	33,000 (2,620) ^{sol}	43,000	33,000 (2,620) ^{sol}
	m-xylene	1%	59	82	31	6,200 (625) ^{vap}	41,000	17,000 (625) ^{vap}
		2.5%	140	190	74	14,000 (1,470) ^{vap}	42,000	24,000 (1,470) ^{vap}
		6%	320	450	170	31,000 (3,460) ^{vap}	43,000	32,000 (3,460) ^{vap}
	p-xylene	1%	56	79	29	5,900 (576) ^{sol}	41,000	17,000 (576) ^{sol}
		2.5%	130	180	69	14,000 (1,350) ^{sol}	42,000	23,000 (1,350) ^{sol}
		6%	310	430	160	30,000 (3,170) ^{sol}	43,000	31,000 (3,170) ^{sol}

NOTES

$^{Sol / vap}$ = solubility / vapour limit (potentially use if free product identified, although highly conservative).

f = oral, dermal and inhalation exposures compared to oral HCV.

All GAC are based on sandy loam soils with a pH 7.

	Contaminant	SOM	LQM Generic Assessment Criteria (mg/kg) Dry weight soil					
			Res +	Res -	Allot.	Comm.	POS_{resi}	POS_{park}
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)	Acenaphthene	1%	210	3,000 (57.1) ^{sol}	34	84,000 (57.0) ^{sol}	15,000	29,000
		2.5%	510	4,700 (141) ^{sol}	85	97,000 (141) ^{sol}	15,000	30,000
		6%	1,100	6,000 (336) ^{sol}	200	100,000	15,000	30,000
	Acenaphthylene	1%	170	2,900 (86.1) ^{sol}	28	83,000 (86.1) ^{sol}	15,000	29,000
		2.5%	420	4,600 (212) ^{sol}	69	97,000 (212) ^{sol}	15,000	30,000
		6%	920	6,000 (506) ^{sol}	160	100,000	15,000	30,000
	Anthracene	1%	2,400	31,000 (1.17) ^{vap}	380	520,000	74,000	150,000
		2.5%	5,400	35,000	950	540,000	74,000	150,000
		6%	11,000	37,000	2,200	540,000	74,000	150,000
	Benz(a)anthracene	1%	7.2	11	2.9	170	29	49
		2.5%	11	14	6.5	170	29	56
		6%	13	15	13	180	29	62
	Benzo(a)pyrene (only)	1%	2.2	3.2	0.97	35	5.7	11
		2.5%	2.7	3.2	2.0	35	5.7	12
		6%	3.0	3.2	3.5	36	5.7	13
	Benzo(b)fluoranthene	1%	2.6	3.9	0.99	44	7.1	13
		2.5%	3.3	4.0	2.1	44	7.2	15
		6%	3.7	4.0	3.9	45	7.2	16
	Benzo(ghi)perylene	1%	320	360	290	3,900	640	1,400
		2.5%	340	360	470	4,000	640	1,500
		6%	350	360	640	4,000	640	1,600
	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	1%	77	110	37	1,200	190	370
		2.5%	93	110	75	1,200	190	410
		6%	100	110	130	1,200	190	440
	Chrysene	1%	15	30	4.1	350	57	93
		2.5%	22	31	9.4	350	57	110
		6%	27	32	19	350	57	120
	Dibenzo(ah)anthracene	1%	0.24	0.31	0.14	3.5	0.57	1.1
		2.5%	0.28	0.32	0.27	3.6	0.58	1.3
		6%	0.3	0.32	0.43	3.6	0.58	1.4
	Fluoranthene	1%	280	1,500	52	23,000	3,100	6,300
		2.5%	560	1,600	130	23,000	3,100	6,300
		6%	890	1,600	290	23,000	3,100	6,400
	Fluorene	1%	170	2,800 (36.0) ^{sol}	27	63,000 (30.9) ^{sol}	9,900	20,000
		2.5%	400	3,800 (76.5) ^{sol}	67	68,000	9,900	20,000
		6%	860	4,500 (183) ^{sol}	160	71,000	9,900	20,000
	Indeno(123-cd)pyrene	1%	27	45	9.5	500	82	150
		2.5%	36	46	21	510	82	170
		6%	41	46	39	510	82	180
	Naphthalene	1%	2.3 ^{f}	2.3 ^{f}	4.1 ^{f}	190 ^{f} (76.4) ^{sol}	4,900 ^{f}	1,200 ^{f} (76.4) ^{sol}
		2.5%	5.6 ^{f}	5.6 ^{f}	10 ^{f}	460 ^{f} (183) ^{sol}	4,900 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f} (183) ^{sol}
		6%	13 ^{f}	13 ^{f}	24 ^{f}	1,100 ^{f} (432) ^{sol}	4,900 ^{f}	3,000
	Phenanthrene	1%	95	1,300 (36.0) ^{sol}	15	22,000	3,100	6,200
		2.5%	220	1,500	38	22,000	3,100	6,200
		6%	440	1,500	90	22,000	3,100	6,300
	Pyrene	1%	620	3,700	110	54,000	7,400	15,000
		2.5%	1,200	3,800	270	54,000	7,400	15,000
		6%	2,000	3,800	620	54,000	7,400	15,000
	Coal Tar (B(a)P as surrogate marker)	1%	0.79	1.2	0.32	15	2.2	4.4
		2.5%	0.98	1.2	0.67	15	2.2	4.7
		6%	1.1	1.2	1.2	15	2.2	4.8

NOTES

$^{sol / vap}$ = solubility / vapour limit (potentially use if free product identified, although highly conservative).

f = naphthalene is based on comparison of inhalation exposure with TDI_{inhal} for localised effect.

All GAC are based on sandy loam soils with a pH 7.

LQM Generic Assessment Criteria (mg/kg) Dry weight soil

	Contaminant	SOM	Res +	Res -	Allot.	Comm.	POS_{resi}	POS_{park}
Petroleum Hydrocarbons	**Aliphatic**							
	EC 5-6	1%	42	42	730	3,200 (304) ^{sol}	570,000(304)^{sol}	95,000 (304) ^{sol}
	EC>6-8	1%	100	100	2,300	7,800 (144) ^{sol}	600,000	150,000 (144) ^{sol}
	EC>8-10	1%	27	27	320	2,000 (78) ^{sol}	13,000	14,000 (78) ^{vap}
	EC>10-12	1%	130 (48) ^{vap}	130 (48) ^{vap}	2,200	9,700 (48) ^{sol}	13,000	21,000 (48) ^{vap}
	EC>12-16	1%	1,100 (24) ^{sol}	1,100 (24) ^{sol}	11,000	59,000 (24) ^{sol}	13,000	25,000 (24) ^{sol}
	EC>16-35	1%	65,000 (8.48) ^{f,sol}	65,000 (8.48) ^{f,sol}	260,000 ^{f}	160,000 ^{f}	250,000 ^{f}	450,000 ^{f}
	EC>35-44	1%	65,000 (8.48) ^{f,sol}	65,000 (8.48) ^{f,sol}	260,000 ^{f}	160,000 ^{f}	250,000 ^{f}	450,000 ^{f}
	Aliphatic							
	EC 5-6	2.5%	78	78	1,700	5,900 (558) ^{sol}	590,000	130,000 (558) ^{sol}
	EC>6-8	2.5%	230	230	5,600	17,000 (322) ^{sol}	610,000	220,000 (322) ^{sol}
	EC>8-10	2.5%	65	65	770	4,800 (190) ^{vap}	13,000	18,000 (190) ^{vap}
	EC>10-12	2.5%	330 (118) ^{vap}	330 (118) ^{vap}	4,400	23,000 (118) ^{vap}	13,000	23,000 (118) ^{vap}
	EC>12-16	2.5%	2,400 (59) ^{sol}	2,400 (59) ^{sol}	13,000	82,000 (59) ^{sol}	13,000	25,000 (59) ^{sol}
	EC>16-35	2.5%	92,000 (21) ^{f,sol}	92,000 (21) ^{f,sol}	270,000 ^{f}	1,700,000 ^{f}	250,000 ^{f}	480,000 ^{f}
	EC>35-44	2.5%	92,000 (21) ^{f,sol}	92,000 (21) ^{f,sol}	270,000 ^{f}	1,700,000 ^{f}	250,000 ^{f}	480,000 ^{f}
	Aliphatic							
	EC 5-6	6%	160	160	3,900	12,000 (1,150) ^{sol}	600,000	180,000 (1,150) ^{sol}
	EC>6-8	6%	530	530	13,000	40,000 (736) ^{sol}	620,000	320,000 (736) ^{sol}
	EC>8-10	6%	150	150	1,700	11,000 (451) ^{vap}	13,000	21,000 (451) ^{vap}
	EC>10-12	6%	760 (283) ^{vap}	760 (283) ^{vap}	7,300	47,000 (283) ^{vap}	13,000	24,000 (283) ^{vap}
	EC>12-16	6%	4,300 (142) ^{sol}	4,400 (142) ^{sol}	13,000	90,000 (142) ^{sol}	13,000	26,000 (142) ^{sol}
	EC>16-35	6%	110,000^{f}	110,000^{f}	270,000 ^{f}	1,800,000^{f}	250,000 ^{f}	490,000 ^{f}
	EC>35-44	6%	110,000^{f}	110,000^{f}	270,000 ^{f}	1,800,000^{f}	250,000 ^{f}	490,000 ^{f}
	Aromatic							
	EC5-7(benzene as non-threshold)	1%	70	370	13	26,000 (1,220) ^{sol}	56,000	76,000 (1,220) ^{sol}
	EC>7-8(toluene)	1%	130	860	22	56,000 (869) ^{vap}	56,000	87,000 (869) ^{vap}
	EC>8-10	1%	34	47	8.6	3,500 (613) ^{vap}	5,000	7,200 (613) ^{vap}
	EC>10-12	1%	74	250	13	16,000 (364) ^{sol}	5,000	9,200 (364) ^{sol}
	EC>12-16	1%	140	1,800	23	36,000 (169) ^{sol}	5,100	10,000
	EC>16-21	1%	260 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	46 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,600 ^{f}
	EC>21-35	1%	1,100 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	370 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,800 ^{f}
	EC>35-44	1%	1,100 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	370^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,800 ^{f}
	Aromatic							
	EC5-7(benzene as non-threshold)	2.5%	140	690	27	46,000 (2,260) ^{sol}	56,000	84,000 (2,260) ^{sol}
	EC>7-8(toluene)	2.5%	290	1,800	51	110,000 (1,920) ^{sol}	56,000	95,000 (1,920) ^{sol}
	EC>8-10	2.5%	83	110	21	8,100 (1,500) ^{vap}	5,000	8,500 (1,500) ^{vap}
	EC>10-12	2.5%	180	590	31	28,000 (899) ^{sol}	5,000	9,700 (899) ^{sol}
	EC>12-16	2.5%	330	2,300 (419) ^{sol}	57	37,000	5,100	10,000
	EC>16-21	2.5%	540 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	110 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,700 ^{f}
	EC>21-35	2.5%	1,500 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	820 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,800 ^{f}
	EC>35-44	2.5%	1,500 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	820 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,800 ^{f}
	Aromatic							
	EC5-7(benzene as non-threshold)	6%	300	1,400	57	86,000 (4,710) ^{sol}	56,000	92,000 (4,710) ^{sol}
	EC>7-8(toluene)	6%	660	3,900	120	180,000 (4,360) ^{vap}	56,000	100,000 (4,360) ^{vap}
	EC>8-10	6%	190	270	51	17,000 (3,580) ^{vap}	5,000	9,300 (3,580) ^{vap}
	EC>10-12	6%	380	1,200	4	34,000 (2,150) ^{sol}	5,000	10,000
	EC>12-16	6%	660	2,500	130	38,000	5,100	10,000
	EC>16-21	6%	930^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	260 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,800 ^{f}
	EC>21-35	6%	1,700 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	1,600 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,900 ^{f}
	EC>35-44	6%	1,700 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	1,600 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,900 ^{f}
	Aliphatic +Aromatic >EC44	1%	1,600 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	1,200 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,800 ^{f}
		2.5%	1,800 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	2,100 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,800 ^{f}
		6%	1,900 ^{f}	1,900 ^{f}	3,000 ^{f}	28,000 ^{f}	3,800 ^{f}	7,900 ^{f}

NOTES

$^{Sol\ /\ vap}$ = solubility / vapour limit (potentially use if free product identified, although highly conservative).

f = oral, dermal and inhalation exposures compared to oral HCV.

All GAC are based on sandy loam soils with a pH 7.

	Contaminant	SOM	LQM Generic Assessment Criteria (mg/kg) Dry weight soil: Res +	Res -	Allot.	Comm.	POS_{resi}	POS_{park}
Chloalkanes and Alkenes & Explosives	1,2 Dichloroethane (DCA)	1%	7.1E-03	9.2E-03	4.6E-03	0.67	29	21
		2.5%	1.1E-02	1.3E-02	8.3E-03	0.97	29	24
		6%	1.9E-02	2.3E-02	1.6E-02	1.7	29	28
	1,1,1 Trichloroethane (TCA)	1%	8.8	9.0	48	660	140,000	57,000 (1,425) vap
		2.5%	18	18	110	1,300	140,000	76,000 (2,915) vap
		6%	39	40	240	3,000	140,000	100,000 (6,392) vap
	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethanes (PCA)	1%	1.6	3.9	0.41	270	1,400	1,800
		2.5%	3.4	8.0	0.89	550	1,400	2,100
		6%	7.5	17	2.0	1,100	1,400	2,300
	1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethanes (PCA)	1%	1.2	1.5	0.79	110	1,400	1,500
		2.5%	2.8	3.5	1.9	250	1,400	1,800
		6%	6.4	8.2	4.4	560	1,400	2,100
	Tetrachloroethene (PCE)	1%	0.18	0.18	0.65	19	1,400	810 (424) sol
		2.5%	0.39	0.40	1.5	42	1,400	1,100 (951) sol
		6%	0.90	0.92	3.6	95	1,400	1,500
	Tetrachloromethane (carbon tetrachloride)	1%	2.6E-02	2.6E-02	0.45	2.9	890	190
		2.5%	5.6E-02	5.6E-02	1.0	6.3	920	270
		6%	0.13	0.13	2.4	14	950	400
	Trichloroethene (TCE)	1%	1.6E-02	1.7E-02	4.1E-02	1.2	120	70
		2.5%	3.4E-02	3.6E-02	9.1E-02	2.6	120	91
		6%	7.5E-02	8.0E-02	0.21	5.7	120	120
	Trichloromethane (chloroform)	1%	0.91	1.2	0.42	99	2,500	2,600
		2.5%	1.7	2.1	0.83	170	2,500	2,800
		6%	3.4	4.2	1.7	350	2,500	3,100
	Chloroethene (vinyl chloride)	1%	6.4E-04	7.7E-04	5.5E-04	5.9E-02	3.5	4.8
		2.5%	8.7E-04	1.0E-03	1.0E-03	7.7E-02	3.5	5.0
		6%	1.4E-03	1.5E-03	1.8E-03	0.12	3.5	5.4
	2,4,6-Trinitritoluene (TNT)	1%	1.6	65	0.24	1,000	130	260
		2.5%	3.7	66	0.58	1,000	130	270
		6%	8.1	66	1.4	1,000	130	270
	RDX	1%	120	13,000	17	210,000	26,000	49,000 (18.7) sol
		2.5%	250	13,000	38	210,000	26,000	51,000
		6%	540	13,000	85	210,000	27,000	53,000
	HMX	1%	5.7	6,700	0.86	110,000	13,000	23,000 (0.35) vap
		2.5%	13	6,700	1.9	110,000	13,000	23,000 (0.39) vap
		6%	26	6,700	3.9	110,000	13,000	24,000 (0.48) vap
Pesticides	Aldrin	1%	5.7	7.3	3.2	170	18	30
		2.5%	6.6	7.4	6.1	170	18	31
		6%	7.1	7.5	9.8	170	18	31
	Dieldrin	1%	0.97	7.0	0.17	170	18	30
		2.5%	2.0	7.3	0.41	170	18	30
		6%	3.5	7.4	0.96	170	18	31
	Atrazine	1%	3.3	610	0.5	9,300	1,200	2,300
		2.5%	7.8	620	1.2	9,400	1,200	2,400
		6%	17.4	620	2.7	9,400	1,200	2,400
	Dichlorvos	1%	3.2E-02	6.4	4.9E-03	140	16	26
		2.5%	6.6E-02	6.5	1.0E-02	140	16	26
		6%	0.14	6.6	2.2E-02	140	16	27
	Endosulfanns (2 isomers)	1%	7.4	160 (3.0E-03) vap	1.2	5,600 (3.0E-03) vap	1,200	2,300
		2.5%	18	280 (7.0E-03) vap	2.9	7,400 (7.0E-03) vap	1,200	2,400
		6%	41	410 (1.6E-02) vap	6.8	8,400 (1.6E-02) vap	1,200	2,500
	Hexachlorocyclohexane (3 isomers), inc Lindane	1%	8.5E-02	3.7	1.3E-02	65	8.1	15
		2.5%	0.2	3.8	3.2E-02	65	8.1	15
		6%	0.46	3.8	7.7E-02	65	8.1	16

NOTES

Sol / vap = solubility / vapour limit (potentially use if free product identified, although highly conservative).

All GAC are based on sandy loam soils with a pH 7.

	Contaminant	SOM	LQM Generic Assessment Criteria (mg/kg) Dry weight soil					
			Res +	Res -	Allot.	Comm.	POS_{resi}	POS_{park}
Chlorobenzenes	Chlorobenzene	1%	0.46	0.46	5.9	56	11,000	1,300 (675) ^{sol}
		2.5%	1.0	1.0	14	130	13,000	2,000 (1,520) ^{sol}
		6%	2.4	2.4	32	290	14,000	2,900
	Dichlorobenzenes (3 isomers)	1%	23	24	94	2,000 (571) ^{sol}	90,000	24,000 (571) ^{sol}
		2.5%	55	57	230	4,800 (1,370) ^{sol}	95,000	36,000 (1,370) ^{sol}
		6%	130	130	540	11,000 (3,240) ^{sol}	98,000	51,000 (3,270) ^{sol}
	Trichlorobenzenes (3 isomers)	1%	2.6	2.6	55	220	15,000	1,700 (318) ^{vap}
		2.5%	6.4	6.4	140	530	17,000	2,600 (786) ^{vap}
		6%	15	15	320	1,300	19,000	4,000 (1,880) ^{vap}
	Tetrachlorobenzenes (3 isomers)	1%	0.66	0.75	0.38	49 (39.4) ^{vap}	78	110 (39) ^{vap}
		2.5%	1.6	1.9	0.90	120 (98.1) ^{vap}	79	120
		6%	3.7	4.3	2.2	240 (235) ^{vap}	79	130
	Pentachlorobenzene	1%	5.8	19	1.2	640 (43.0) ^{sol}	100	190
		2.5%	12	30	3.1	770 (107) ^{sol}	100	190
		6%	22	38	7.0	830	100	190
	Hexachlorobenzene	1%	1.8 (0.20) ^{vap}	4.1 (0.20) ^{vap}	0.47	110 (0.20) ^{vap}	16	30
		2.5%	3.3 (0.50) ^{vap}	5.7 (0.50) ^{vap}	1.1	120	16	30
		6%	4.9	6.7 (1.2) ^{vap}	2.5	120	16	30
Chlorophenol	Chlorophenols (4 congeners)	1%	0.87 ^{g}	94	0.13 ^{g}	3,500	620	1,100
		2.5%	2.0	150	0.30	4,000	620	1,100
		6%	4.5	210	0.70	4,300	620	1,100
	Pentachlorophenol	1%	0.22	27 (16.4) ^{vap}	3.0E-02	400	60	110
		2.5%	0.52	29	8.0E-02	400	60	120
		6%	1.2	31	0.19	400	60	120
Others	Carbon Disulphide	1%	0.14	0.14	4.8	11	11,000	1,300
		2.5%	0.29	0.29	10	22	11,000	1,900
		6%	0.62	0.62	23	47	11,000	2,700
	Hexachlorobutadiene	1%	0.29	0.32	0.25	31	25	48
		2.5%	0.7	0.78	0.61	66	25	50
		6%	1.6	1.8	1.4	120	25	51
	Phenol	1%	280	750	66	760 ^{dir} (31,000)	760 ^{dir} (11,000)	760 ^{dir} (8,600)
		2.5%	550	1,300	140	1,500 ^{dir} (35,000)	1,500 ^{dir} (11,000)	1,500 ^{dir} (9,700)
		6%	1,100	2,300	280	3,200 ^{dir} (37,000)	3,200 ^{dir} (11,000)	3,200 ^{dir} (11,000)

NOTES

$^{Sol / vap}$ = solubility / vapour limit (potentially use if free product identified, although highly conservative).

^{dir} = S4uls based on threshold protective of direct skin contact with phenol (brackets long term exposure for illustration purposes).

^{g} = derived based on 2,3,4,6-tetrachlorophenol.

Based across the UK with offices in Manchester, London, Liverpool, Swindon and Glasgow.

Manchester (Head Office)
Unit 29
Eton Business Park
Eton Hill Rd, Radcliffe
M26 2ZS

t: 0161 763 7200
e: info@thelkgroup.com

Swindon
39 Bowman House Business Centre
Bowman Court
Whitehill Lane
Royal Wootton Bassett
Swindon
SN4 7DB

t : 01793 987 390
e : info@thelkgroup.com

London
Brooklands Business Park
Wellington Way
Weybridge
KT13 0TT

t: 01932 871872
e: info@thelkgroup.com

Glasgow
Wright Business Centre
1 Lonmay Road
Glasgow
G33 4EL

t: 0141 773 6269
e: info@thelkgroup.com

Liverpool
The Corn Exchange
Fenwick Street
Liverpool
L2 7QL

t: 0151 235 8716
e: info@thelkgroup.com

LK GROUP

- Geotechnical
- Contaminated Land
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Asbestos
- Invasive Species
- Land Remediation
- Project Management
- Land Drilling