



**Castledine
Environmental**

LAND CONTAMINATION SURVEYS

**Phase 1 Land Contamination
Risk Assessment**

for

**The Erection of a Single-Storey
Side Extension & Addition of Front
Porch & Change of Use of Agricultural
Land to Domestic Garden Land (Use
C3)**

on the site of

**Paddock View, Twycross Road,
Sheepy Magna, Atherstone,
Leicestershire CV9 3RT**

Date: September 2026

Status:

Final Report

Reference:

4374D P1 Pratt – Paddock View, Twycross

Date:

28/09/2026

Author:	Checked by:
DW	TR

Tel: 01509 880399 Email: info@castledineenvironmental.co.uk

4 Wymeswold Road, Hoton, Loughborough, Leicestershire, LE12 5SN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The site has seen a limited development legacy and no significant potential sources of soil contamination have been identified – associated site sampling carried out on the proposed garden area has identified no exceedances of metals, metalloids, PAHs, phenol nor the presence of SVOC (i.e. pesticides).

Based on the information contained in this report, it is the opinion of Castledine Environmental that the site represents an estimated **LOW** level of risk with respect to the proposed development.

A watching brief (as outlined in Appendix F) should be carried out by the site supervisor during the course of demolition, site clearance and construction works for any obvious contamination (e.g. oil spillage in ground, buried waste, possible asbestos containing material). Should previously unreported or undiscovered contamination be identified, then development should stop and Castledine Environmental should be contacted to determine if further assessment or changes to the remediation scheme are required

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	I
LIST OF APPENDICES	III
LIST OF TABLES	III
1.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE	1
2.0 LIMITATIONS	1
3.0 INTRODUCTION AND SITE PROPOSALS	2
4.0 SCOPE	2
5.0 SITE DESCRIPTION	3
5.1 SOILS AND GEOLOGY	4
5.1.1 SUPERFICIAL DEPOSITS	4
5.1.2 BEDROCK DEPOSITS	4
5.1.3 ARTIFICIAL GROUND	4
5.1.4 BOREHOLES	5
5.1.5 COAL MINING	5
5.1.6 NON-COAL MINING	5
5.1.7 SURFACE WORKINGS	5
5.1.8 RADON	6
6.0 REGULATORY AUTHORITY AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DATA	6
6.1 HYDROLOGICAL	6
6.1.1 AQUIFER	6
6.1.2 ABSTRACTIONS AND PRIVATE WATER SUPPLIES	7
6.1.3 SOURCE PROTECTION ZONE	7
6.1.4 GROUNDWATER VULNERABILITY AND SOIL LEACHING POTENTIAL	7
6.1.5 SURFACE WATER	8
6.1.6 DISCHARGE CONSENTS	8
6.2 PERMITTED PROCESSES	9
6.3 POLLUTION INCIDENTS	9
6.4 RADIOACTIVE SUBSTANCES REGISTRATIONS	9
6.5 WASTE	9
6.5.1 LICENSED WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES (LOCATIONS)	9
6.5.2 LANDFILL SITES	9
6.6 HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES	9
6.7 ECOLOGICAL RECEPTORS	9
6.8 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY	9
6.8.1 GOOGLE EARTH	9
6.8.2 GOOGLE STREET VIEW	11
6.9 HISTORIC MAPPING	11
6.10 CURRENT LAND USE DATA	12
6.11 PETROL AND FUEL SITES	12
6.12 HISTORICAL PETROL AND FUEL SITE DATABASE	12
6.13 POTENTIAL CONTAMINATIVE LAND USES IDENTIFIED ON MAPPING	12
6.14 HISTORICAL TANK DATABASE	13
6.15 HISTORICAL ENERGY FACILITIES	13
6.16 HISTORICAL GARAGE DATABASE	13

<u>7.0</u>	<u>EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION</u>	<u>13</u>
7.1	CHEMICAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	13
7.2	HUMAN HEALTH	14
7.3	PROPOSED SITE WORKS	15
7.4	SITE WORKS AND FINDINGS	16
7.5	FIELDWORK 14/09/2026	16
	7.5.1 TP HP OR WS LOCATIONS	16
7.6	GROUND CONDITIONS ENCOUNTERED	16
	7.6.1 MADE GROUND	16
	7.6.2 NATURAL DEPOSITS	17
	7.6.3 CORRELATION WITH BGS MAPPING	17
	7.6.4 GROUNDWATER	17
	7.6.5 CONTAMINATION	17
7.7	QUANTITATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT	17
	7.7.1 METALS AND SEMI METALS - RESIDENTIAL WITH PLANT UPTAKE (1% SOM):	18
	7.7.2 NON-METALS - RESIDENTIAL WITH PLANT UPTAKE (1% SOM):	19
7.8	ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	19
<u>8.0</u>	<u>PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL</u>	<u>20</u>
8.1	SOURCES	21
8.2	PATHWAYS	21
8.3	RECEPTORS	22
<u>9.0</u>	<u>CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>10.0</u>	<u>ENVIRONMENTAL RISK ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>26</u>
10.1	RESIDENTS / END-USERS	26
10.2	SITE WORKERS	26
10.3	CONTROLLED WATERS	26
10.4	FLORA AND FAUNA	27
10.5	GROUND GASES	27
10.6	HAZARDOUS VAPOURS	27
10.7	POTABLE WATER SUPPLY PIPING	27
<u>11.0</u>	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>12.0</u>	<u>REFERENCES</u>	<u>29</u>
12.1	LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS	29
	12.1.1 ACTS	29
	12.1.2 PLANNING REGULATIONS	29
	12.1.3 CONTAMINATED LAND REGULATIONS	29
12.2	STATUTORY GUIDANCE	29
12.3	BRITISH STANDARDS	30
12.4	NON-STATUTORY TECHNICAL GUIDANCE	30
	12.4.1 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	30
	12.4.2 CIRIA PUBLICATIONS	30
	12.4.3 CL:AIRE	30
<u>13.0</u>	<u>APPENDICES</u>	<u>31</u>

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	ENVIRONMENTAL SEARCH	31
APPENDIX B	HISTORICAL MAPPING	31
APPENDIX C	PROPOSED AND CURRENT SITE PLANS	32
APPENDIX D	SITE PHOTOS AND LOCATIONS	33
APPENDIX E	HP PHOTOGRAPHS	35
APPENDIX F	LABORATORY RESULTS	38
APPENDIX G	WATCHING BRIEF	39
APPENDIX H	DISCOVERY STRATEGY	41

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1.	RISK CLASSIFICATION MATRIX	23
TABLE 2.	CLASSIFICATION OF RISK	24
TABLE 3.	SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT POLLUTION LINKAGES	25

1.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE

Castledine Environmental confirm that all reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the information outlined within this report is accurate.

Castledine Environmental would further confirm that due care, attention and technical skill were used in the creation of this report.

2.0 LIMITATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations made in this report are limited to those based on the findings of the investigation. Where comments are made based on information obtained from third parties, Castledine Environmental assumes that all third-party information is true and correct. No independent action has been undertaken to validate the findings of third parties. The assessments and interpretation have been made in line with legislation and guidelines in force at the time of writing, representing best practice at the time.

This survey has not included asbestos within existing structures, invasive plant species, geotechnical considerations or any elements unconnected with potential ground contamination at the site. If required, such surveys should be undertaken by suitably accredited organisations.

There may be other conditions prevailing at the site which have not been disclosed by this investigation and which have not been taken into account by this report. Responsibility cannot be accepted for conditions not revealed by the investigation.

3.0 INTRODUCTION AND SITE PROPOSALS

Castledine Environmental have been appointed by Mr. G. Pratt to undertake a Phase 1 Desk study on land adjacent to Paddock View, Twycross Road, Sheepy Magna, Leicestershire CV9 3RT.

The site development proposals consist of the erection of a single-storey side extension to the northern face of the extant dwelling on site, atop a former area of agricultural land, alongside development of garden and a front porch.

4.0 SCOPE

Castledine Environmental have prepared this report for the sole use and reliance of Mr. G. Pratt and associated appointees for the purpose of ensuring compliance with:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2025;
- Part C1 of the building regulations;
- Support of Planning Application No: 26/00504/FUL

This report may not be used or relied upon by any unauthorised third party, or for any other proposed use than that specified above, without the explicit written agreement of Castledine Environmental.

This report is to be regarded as a Preliminary Risk Assessment in accordance with the Environment Agency's Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM – 2021), which replaces CLR11 *“Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination”*, carried out in accordance with BS 10175:2011+A2:2017, *“Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Land - Code of Practice”* and relevant sections of BS5930:2015+A1:2020, *“Code of Practice for Ground Investigations”*.

The objectives of the report are:-

- To assess historical activities at the site with respect to their potential impact on the site environment;

- To assess historical and current surrounding land use in relation to known or potential off-site contamination issues that may impact on the subject site;
- Review of geological, hydrogeological and hydrological conditions at the site, pertaining to land contamination issues;
- To characterise the environmental setting of the site, identify migration pathways and vulnerable receptors for contamination originating at the site, focusing on potential soil and groundwater liabilities; and
- To develop a preliminary conceptual site model (CSM).

This report has been produced in order to discharge any relevant planning conditions outlined by the Local Authority and Environment Agency; however, further requirements may be imposed after the findings of this report that may need to be addressed at a later date.

5.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is located in Sheepy Magna, Hinckley and Bosworth, Leicestershire at National Grid Reference: 432873,301891 and is approximately 0.08ha in area.

The site is irregular in shape and is orientated east to west. The site is located towards the north of the small village of Sheepy Magna, itself set within a wider, predominantly rural area. The site is directly bounded by agricultural field to the north, Twycross Road with dwellings beyond to the south, neighbouring dwellings and their gardened spaces to the south and woodland to the west.

The site interior comprises a dwelling and its front- and rear-gardened areas, alongside a plot of vacant garden forming the northern extent of site (formerly agricultural land and the area where the proposed side-extension will be erected). The eastern extent of site is formed by hardstanding driveway and access; the central by the relatively modern dwelling itself; and gardened areas form the western and northern areas. The garden

areas were seen to be well-maintained and formed by a mixture of hardstanding patio and lawn.

No significant potential sources of contamination were noted on the walkover. Topographically, the site and surrounding areas are level, however the northern garden area and the adjacent field are slightly raised above the remainder of site.

Photos of the site are present in Appendix D.

5.1 SOILS AND GEOLOGY

British Geological Survey materials © NERC 2026 obtained from <http://www.bgs.ac.uk/data/mapViewers/home.html> under the [Open Government Licence](#).

5.1.1 SUPERFICIAL DEPOSITS

Both BGS geological mapping and the Groundsure report record superficial geological deposits of River Terrace Deposits located on site, comprising sands and gravels with lenses of silt, clay or peat.

Further records of River Terrace Deposits and Alluvium are located 57m north east and 132m east of site with further River Terrace Deposits located beyond this.

5.1.2 BEDROCK DEPOSITS

Both BGS geological mapping and the Groundsure report records bedrock geology of the Gunthorpe Member underlying site, comprising a red-brown mudstone with subordinate dolomitic siltstones and fine-grained sandstone.

5.1.3 ARTIFICIAL GROUND

BGS geological mapping records no artificial deposits located on or within 500m of site.

5.1.4 BOREHOLES

No nearby or relevant BGS historical borehole records are available for the site.

5.1.5 COAL MINING

The site is not located in a coal mining reporting area and the local geology is not considered appropriate for such extraction. As such the risk from coal mining activities is considered to be negligible.

5.1.6 NON-COAL MINING

The Groundsure report records no non-coal mining operations, activities or features located within 500m of site.

5.1.7 SURFACE WORKINGS

ID	Distance (m)	Direction	Land Usage	Year of Mapping
A	170	SW	Pond	1982
A	170	SW	Pond	1966
A	170	SW	Pond	1950
A	171	SW	Pond	1901
B	171	SW	Pond	1925
B	171	SW	Ponds	1885
C	213	S	Pond	191
C	215	S	Pond	1982
C	215	S	Pond	1966
C	215	S	Pond	1950
B	220	SW	Pond	1982
B	220	SW	Pond	1966
B	220	SW	Pond	1950

5.1.8 RADON

The property is not in a Radon Affected Area, as less than 1% of properties are above the Action Level. No radon protective measures are necessary as described in publication BR211:2015 by the Building Research Establishment.

6.0 REGULATORY AUTHORITY AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

An environmental search listing historical and environmental factors likely to affect the property has been reviewed.

The most pertinent information is summarised in the following sections.

A copy is presented in Appendix A.

Additional geological and hydrological data was obtained from the British Geological Survey.

6.1 HYDROLOGICAL**6.1.1 AQUIFER****6.1.1.1 SUPERFICIAL DEPOSIT AQUIFER**

ID	Distance (m)	Direction	Designation	Description
1	0	On Site	Secondary A	Permeable layers capable of supporting water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale, and in some cases forming an important source of base flow to rivers. These are generally aquifers formerly classified as minor aquifers

6.1.1.2 SUPERFICIAL DEPOSITS PERMEABILITY

The Groundsure report records the site as being within an area where the maximum permeability of superficial deposits is recorded as 'very high' and the minimum permeability as 'high' and facilitated by intragranular flow mechanisms.

This is a qualitative classification of estimated rates of vertical movement of water from the ground surface through the unsaturated zone of any superficial deposits (the zone between the land surface and the water table).

6.1.1.3 BEDROCK GEOLOGY AQUIFER

ID	Distance (m)	Direction	Designation	Description
1	0	On Site	Secondary B	Predominantly lower permeability layers which may store/yield limited amounts of groundwater due to localised features such as fissures, thin permeable horizons and weathering. These are generally the water-bearing parts of the former non-aquifers

6.1.1.4 BEDROCK PERMEABILITY

The Groundsure report records the site as being within an area where the maximum permeability of bedrock geology is recorded as 'low' and the minimum permeability as 'low' and facilitated by fracture flow mechanisms.

6.1.2 ABSTRACTIONS AND PRIVATE WATER SUPPLIES

The Groundsure report records an active groundwater abstraction site located 464m south of site and related to make-up or top-up waters sourced direct from midlands groundwaters (effective circa.2005 onwards). No further active groundwater abstraction sites are located within 1000m of site.

6.1.3 SOURCE PROTECTION ZONE

Site is not in a source protection zone (SPZ).

6.1.4 GROUNDWATER VULNERABILITY AND SOIL LEACHING POTENTIAL

An assessment of the vulnerability of groundwater to a pollutant discharged at ground level based on the hydrological, geological,

hydrogeological and soil properties within a one-kilometre square grid.

Groundwater vulnerability is described as High, Medium or Low as follows:

- High - Areas able to easily transmit pollution to groundwater. They are likely to be characterised by high leaching soils and the absence of low permeability superficial deposits.
- Medium - Intermediate between high and low vulnerability.
- Low - Areas that provide the greatest protection from pollution. They are likely to be characterised by low leaching soils and/or the presence of superficial deposits characterised by a low permeability.

ID	Location	Summary	Soil / Surface	Superficial Geology	Bedrock Geology
1	On site	Summary Classification: Secondary superficial aquifer - High Vulnerability Combined classification: Productive Bedrock Aquifer, Productive Superficial Aquifer	Leaching class: High Infiltration value: >70% Dilution value: <300mm/year	Vulnerability: High Aquifer type: Secondary Thickness: <3m Patchiness value: <90% Recharge potential: High	Vulnerability: High Aquifer type: Secondary Flow mechanism: Well connected fractures

6.1.5 SURFACE WATER

The Groundsure report records a drain located on site and forming the northern boundary of site, extending westwards and offsite. The Groundsure report further records a small lake located 181m south west of site and further drains 194m south west, 198m west with unnamed surface level watercourses located 221m and 215m south east of site.

6.1.6 DISCHARGE CONSENTS

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.2 PERMITTED PROCESSES

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.3 POLLUTION INCIDENTS

The Groundsure report records no pollution incidents located within 250m of site and no significant impact incidents located within 500m of site.

6.4 RADIOACTIVE SUBSTANCES REGISTRATIONS

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.5 WASTE**6.5.1 LICENSED WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES (LOCATIONS)**

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.5.2 LANDFILL SITES

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.6 HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.7 ECOLOGICAL RECEPTORS

The Groundsure report records as being located within the River Trent (from source to confluence with the River Derwent) surface waters Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ) and an area of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) named Sheepy Fields located 591m north of site. No further sensitive land usages are recorded within 1000m of site.

6.8 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

Aerial photography shows the following:

6.8.1 GOOGLE EARTH

16 No. images are held in the historic imagery dataset, as follows:

Date	Description
December 1999	The site is shown as a vacant, heavily overgrown plot of land. The surrounding areas comprise field to the north, roadside with field beyond east, dwellings south and further overgrown areas and field west.
December 2000	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.
July 2006	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.
December 2010	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.
September 2011	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.
April 2015	The site has been cleared of the vegetation and overgrowth and is now shown as under residential development. Adjacent overgrown areas have also been removed.
April 2016	The dwelling on site has been completed, as have those directly south. An area approx.61m south of site is now also shown as under residential development.
April 2018	No major or discernible change on site. The residential development approx.61m south of site appears largely finished. The present-day dwellings seen east of site, on the opposite side of Twycross Road, are now under development. Areas directly west of site appear to have been seeded with trees, to form a woodland.
April 2020	No major or discernible change on site. All nearby residential developments are completed.
June 2021	No major or discernible change on site. The woodland west of site is now established.
January 2022	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.
June 2023	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.
November 2024	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.
April 2025	The northern extent of site has now been demarcated from the former agricultural field into the site boundary and formed into the lawned garden area seen in the present-day.
April 2026	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.
July 2026	No major or discernible change on site nor site relevant change to the surrounding areas.

6.8.2 GOOGLE STREET VIEW

Google Street View imagery is dated circa.2009 to 2026 with the site viewed from Twycross Road and facing east. Imagery dated circa.2009 shows the main site area as a plot of overgrown, densely vegetated vacant land with the northern extent of site being formed by open agricultural field at this time. The site then sees little change until circa,2021 imagery when the present-day dwelling is shown as erected on site, however the northern extent of site remains as field as this time. The northern extent of site is then demarcated into the site boundary by circa.2026 imagery, as seen in the present-day.

6.9 HISTORIC MAPPING

The following historic maps have been reviewed as part of this assessment:

Map	Onsite	Offsite
OS County Series: 1885, 1:10,560	The site is shown as formed by field.	The immediate surroundings comprise field to the north, roadside west with field beyond, a dwelling and garden area south and open field west of site. Notable features beyond this include linear lakes or ponds located approx.170m SW, 220m SW & south.
OS County Series: 1886, 1:2,500	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.
OS County Series: 1901, 1:10,560	No major or discernible change on site.	Outbuilding located directly west of site.
OS County Series: 1903, 1:2,500	No major or discernible change on site.	A pond is now located approx.220m NW of site.
OS County Series: 1924, 1:2,500	Site is now likely part of a cricket ground.	A pavilion associated with a cricket ground is now located directly NW of site. The dwelling south of site has been demolished and a pump is marked in the area.
OS County Series: 1924-1925, 1:10,560	No major or discernible change on site.	The cricket ground north of site is now marked as such.
Provisional: 1950, 1:10,560	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.

Map	Onsite	Offsite
National Grid: 1957, 1:2,500	No major or discernible change on site.	Cricket ground north, pavilion NW and outbuilding west no longer marked on mapping.
Provisional: 1966, 1:10,560	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.
National Grid: 1975, 1:2,500	Outbuilding in NE corner of site now removed.	Pump south of site no longer marked on mapping.
National Grid: 1982, 1:10,000	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.
National Grid: 1994, 1:2,500	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.
National Grid: 2001, 1:10,000	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.
Landline: 2003, 1:1,250	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.
National Grid: 2010, 1:10,000	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.
National Grid: 2015, 1:10,000	No major or discernible change on site.	Surrounding areas see little site relevant change.
National Grid: 2025, 1:10,000	Site is now shown as occupied by the present-day dwelling.	Present-day woodland area west of site now present. All ponds south and NW of site remains persistent.

6.10 CURRENT LAND USE DATA

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.11 PETROL AND FUEL SITES

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.12 HISTORICAL PETROL AND FUEL SITE DATABASE

The Groundsure report records a historical filling station formerly located 384m south of site and identified from historical mapping dated circa.1975.

6.13 POTENTIAL CONTAMINATIVE LAND USES IDENTIFIED ON MAPPING

ID	Distance (m)	Direction	Use	Date
1	256	N	Cemetery	1950-1982
A	266	S	Electricity substation	1975
A	290	S	Smithy	19019
B	308	E	Boat house	1966-1982
B	310	E	Boat house	1925-1950

ID	Distance (m)	Direction	Use	Date
B	311	E	Boat house	1975
C	367	S	Flour mills	1925
C	369	S	Flour mills	1885
C	372	S	Flour mills	1950
C	373	S	Unspecified factory	1975-1982
D	384	S	Filling station	1975
C	392	S	Flour mills	1901
C	395	S	Unspecified mills	1966
2	476	S	Flour mills	1950
E	494	SW	Electricity substation	1975

6.14 HISTORICAL TANK DATABASE

None recorded within 500m of site.

6.15 HISTORICAL ENERGY FACILITIES

ID	Distance (m)	Direction	Use	Date
A	265	S	Electricity substation	1975-1994
E	493	SW	Electricity substation	1975-1994

6.16 HISTORICAL GARAGE DATABASE

None recorded within 500m of site.

7.0 PRELIMINARY INTRUSIVE INVESTIGATION

7.1 CHEMICAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

On establishing the presence of pollutant linkages, it is then necessary to assess whether or not any of the linkages are significant, whereby significant harm is being caused or there is significant possibility of significant harm being caused to human health or the environment. In the absence of any evidence of 'significant harm', the risks will be assessed on the basis of a 'significant possibility of significant harm' being caused. In order to initially assess the risks, appropriate Tier 1 assessment criteria are derived which represent benchmark contamination concentrations with respect to relevant receptors. Concentrations recorded in excess of these

levels **may** represent a significant risk to a specific receptor when considered as part of a pollutant linkage

7.2 HUMAN HEALTH

The Environment Agency, through its Contaminated Land Exposure Assessment (CLEA) framework, published toxicological reports (TOX) and soil guideline values (SGVs).

SGVs are science-based generic assessment criteria that indicate human health risks from long-term exposure to soil contaminants. They are set at levels where there are 'no appreciable' or 'minimal' risks to human health. For each substance, different SGVs are applicable according to land use, for example, whether residential, allotment or commercial. They have been widely seen as over precautionary and offering councils a very weak indication of whether sites represent a "significant possibility of significant harm" (SPOSH) requiring determination under the contaminated land regime.

Following publication of the revised Part IIa Statutory Guidance DEFRA has commissioned the creation of Category 4 Screening levels (C4SL's). They are set at levels where there is a "Low" risk to Human Health (i.e. higher than that of SGV's but still sufficiently low to defiantly not be "Contaminated Land" as defined by section 78A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 as amended). The C4SL's are calculated using the CLEA model using less conservative exposure and toxicological assumptions than the SGV's. C4SL's have also been calculated for Open Space land use. Atkins Ltd has derived ATRISKsoil Soil Screening Values SSVs using the 2009 guidance (SC050021/SR3 (the CLEA Report) and SC050021/SR2 (the TOX report)) for commercial/industrial, residential without home grown produce, residential with home grown produce and allotment land uses. These are based these on the default assumptions provided in the CLEA framework. Atkins SSVs for 6% soil organic matter (SOM) have been derived in line with the new guidance using the CLEA model.

LAQM in association with the CIEH have produced S4UL's are reproduced with permission; Publication Number S4UL3693

The pathways considered for the standard land uses include:

- Ingestion of soils;
- Ingestion of household dust;
- Ingestion of contaminated vegetables (residential with plant uptake only);
- Ingestion of soil attached to vegetables (residential with plant uptake only);
- Dermal contact with soils;
- Dermal contact with household dust;
- Inhalation of fugitive dusts from soils;
- Inhalation of fugitive household dust;
- Inhalation of vapours in outdoor air; and
- Inhalation of vapours in buildings.

These exposure routes have been evaluated independently of one another to identify the most sensitive exposure route. The SSV adopted for a given land use scenario is the most stringent screening value of all those relevant to the site.

The current proposals are to redevelop the site for a residential use with gardens. It is considered appropriate to compare the chemical testing results to those SGVs/SSVs with the appropriate 'residential with plant uptake' settings.

7.3 PROPOSED SITE WORKS

On the basis of the information found in the previous Phase 1 Report and Section 7.0 above, the proposed site investigation for the site is as follows:

HP Sampling	Purpose of the Location and Sampling
Hand-pits (HP)	Excavated by hand due as only shallow samples required for laboratory analysis.

Targeted Sampling	Both locations tested for generic soil suite (i.e. Standard metals/metalloids (As,Cd,Cr,CrVI,Cu,Hg,Ni,Pb,Se,Zn), Poly-Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) (16 USEPA Speciation), pH & SOM & SVOC presence (outlined contaminant of concern).
--------------------------	--

7.4 SITE WORKS AND FINDINGS

7.5 FIELDWORK 14/09/2026

Castledine Environmental attended site on the 14th of September with the intention of forming hand-excavated inspection pits on site. The purpose of the HP formation was to facilitate the assessment of ground conditions on site (i.e. made ground, natural or reworked natural deposits, their nature, extent and depth) and the taking of environmental samples for laboratory analysis.

7.5.1 TP HP OR WS LOCATIONS

A total of 2 No. hand-excavated inspection pits (HP01 & HP02) were formed to depths of 0.70m. The purposes of the locations were to assess any potential impact from the prior agricultural usage of the now garden space. The locations of all exploratory holes formed during the investigation were laid out by Castledine Environmental and a location plan of the exploratory hole locations can be found as **Appendix C**.

7.6 GROUND CONDITIONS ENCOUNTERED

The ground conditions on site can be broadly summarised as topsoils overlying natural deposits. All soil descriptions, logging and sampling were carried out in accordance with BS:5930:2015+A1:2020.

7.6.1 MADE GROUND

No made ground was encountered during the site works within either hand-excavated inspection pit.

7.6.2 NATURAL DEPOSITS

Natural deposits comprising brown, slightly gravelly, clayey sand topsoil were encountered at both locations to a depth of 0.60m, the gravel inclusions consisted of rounded, medium to coarse mixed natural lithologies (i.e. flint, chert, quartzite). Underlying the topsoil was brown, slightly clayey sand.

7.6.3 CORRELATION WITH BGS MAPPING

The deposits encountered are considered to represent superficial geology of River Terrace Deposits (i.e. sands and gravels) that are mapped in the area.

7.6.4 GROUNDWATER

Groundwater was not encountered during the site investigation.

7.6.5 CONTAMINATION

No significant visual, textural or olfactory evidence of contamination was identified in site soils.

7.7 QUANTITATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT

Sample results have been compared directly against a generic screening criterion (GAC) for a residential end-usage with plant uptake. In order to adopt a conservative approach, a Soil Organic Matter (SOM) of 1% has been used in the below assessment.

7.7.1 METALS AND SEMI METALS - RESIDENTIAL WITH PLANT UPTAKE (1% SOM):

Determinant	Units	Accreditation	S4UL (mg/kg)	Highest Value(s) (mg/kg)	Location of exceedances	Exceedance? Y/N
Arsenic	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	37	<LOD	-	N
Cadmium	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	11	0.80	-	N
Chromium (total)	(mg/kg)	UKAS	910	10	-	N
Chromium (VI)	(mg/kg)	U	6	<LOD	-	N
Copper	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	2400	33	-	N
Lead	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	200	55	-	N
Mercury	(mg/kg)	UKAS	1.2	<LOD	-	N
Nickel	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	180	15	-	N
Zinc	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	3700	97	-	N
Selenium	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	250	<LOD	-	N
Total Phenols	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	280	<LOD	-	N
pH	pH units	MCERTS	-	6.8, 6.9	-	-

7.7.2 NON-METALS - RESIDENTIAL WITH PLANT UPTAKE (1% SOM):

Determinant	Units	Accreditation	S4UL (mg/kg)	Highest Value(s) (mg/kg)	Location of Highest value	Exceedance? Y/N
Naphthalene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	2.3	<LOD	-	N
Acenaphthylene	(mg/kg)	UKAS	170	0.10	-	N
Acenaphthene	(mg/kg)	UKAS	210	0.47	-	N
Fluorene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	170	0.11	-	N
Phenanthrene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	95	1.4	-	N
Anthracene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	2400	0.47	-	N
Fluoranthene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	280	3.4	-	N
Pyrene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	620	2.9	-	N
Benzo(a)anthracene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	7.2	1.4	-	N
Chrysene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	15	1.3	-	N
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	2.6	1.5	-	N
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	77	0.66	-	N
Benzo(a)pyrene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	2.2	1.5	-	N
Indeno(1, 2, 3,-cd)pyrene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	27	1.1	-	N
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	0.24	0.24	-	N
Benzo(g, h, i)perylene	(mg/kg)	MCERTS	320	0.94	-	N
Total PAH (Sum of USEPA 16)	(mg/kg)	UKAS	NC	17	-	-

7.8 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Laboratory analysis has identified no exceedances of metals, metalloids, PAHs nor the presence of phenol nor elevated SVOC, with all SVOC testing below laboratory limits of detection (<LOD).

8.0 PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL

The risk posed by any contaminants in soil or groundwater will depend on the nature of the hazard, the probability of exposure, the pathway by which exposure occurs, and the likely effects on the receptors. A contaminant is defined as a substance in, on or under land (or within groundwaters) that has the potential to cause harm, while a risk is considered to exist if such a substance is present in sufficient concentration to cause harm and a pathway exists for a receptor to be exposed to the substance. The following sections discuss all the identified potential on and off-site sources, pathways and receptors in the context of the proposed development and plausible pollutant linkages which may represent a risk to identified receptors from the data gained from the desk study. At this stage the assessment is qualitative and aimed to determine all pollutant linkages, irrespective of significance or allowing for uncertainty.

Source	A contaminant or pollutant that is in, on or under land that has the potential for cause harm or pollution to a receptor.
Pathway	The physical route by which a receptor is or could be affected by a contaminant or pollutant.
Receptor	Something or someone that could be adversely affected by a contaminant, i.e. people, controlled waters, ecological systems, buildings, crops, livestock.

By considering each of the three elements above, an assessment of actual and potential hazards to receptors can be carried out, taking into account the significance and degree of risk of each. The three elements above can exist separately; however, they only create a risk where they are linked together, thus creating a contaminant linkage. During the Preliminary Risk Assessment Stage, the linkages are referred to as 'Potential Contaminant Linkages', until they are confirmed via intrusive sampling, thus becoming 'Relevant Contaminant Linkages'. A tabled, diagrammatic or matrix of pollutant linkages is considered to be a Conceptual Site Model (CSM), the source-pathway-receptor linkages are reviewed and displayed, apportioning a risk-rating and mitigation suggestion after each summary.

Three impact potentials exist for any given site, these are:

- The site impacting upon itself;
- The site impacting on its surroundings; and
- The surroundings impacting on the site.

All three impacts need to be considered in a risk assessment.

8.1 SOURCES

The following potential sources of contamination were identified by the desk study

Potential Sources and Associated Contaminants Identified	
Source (On Site)	Potential Contaminants of Concern
Arable agricultural usage of the site (northern extent, formed in garden space by circa.2025)	Agrichemicals (i.e. SVOC – pesticides, insecticides, herbicides)
Source (Off Site)	Potential Contaminants of Concern
Demolition of dwelling (directly south of site, circa.1924)	Asbestos, heavy metals, metalloids, PAHs
Pump (directly south, present circa.1924-1975)	Heavy metals, metalloids

Laboratory testing of soils on the site has found that none of these contaminants have impacted the site soils.

8.2 PATHWAYS

A pathway is defined as a mechanism or route by which a contaminant comes into contact with, or otherwise affects a receptor. Pathways by which the identified receptors may be impacted upon in the context of the proposed development are identified as follows:

- Ingestion (direct and indirect via crop uptake);
- Dermal contact;
- Inhalation;
- Plant uptake;
- Direct contact by buried structures (i.e. pipe degradation and leaching, pH & Sulphate attack on concrete); and
- Leaching of soluble contamination into groundwater.

8.3 RECEPTORS

Receptors are defined as people, living organisms, ecological systems, controlled waters, atmosphere, structures and utilities that could be adversely affected by contaminant(s).

- Human Health;
 - Current users of the site;
 - Future users of the site;
 - Users of neighbouring sites;
 - Construction workers;
 - Services personnel working in trenches;
- Buried concrete, which may be affected by high concentrations of sulphate and/or low pH, in the soils and groundwater underlying the site;
- Construction Materials;
- Buried water pipes;
- Controlled Waters;
- Ecological Receptors; and
- Flora and fauna using the proposed development.

The site proposals are understood to be **residential**, as such the likely receptors are site workers during site development, end-users of the site following redevelopment (i.e. residents / tenants, children, visitors, service personnel), controlled waters (i.e. aquifers, watercourses), adjacent receptors (neighbours, flora and fauna, ecological receptors) and building fabric and buried utilities.

9.0 CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL

The Conceptual Site Model (CSM) is a hypothesis of the nature and sources of contamination, potential receptors that may be the recipient of contamination arising from those sources and any pathways that may exist. It creates a plausible source-pathway-receptor pollutant linkage (hazard), set within the context of the ground and proposed end use of the site.

Based on the preliminary CSM for the site, an environmental risk assessment has been undertaken. A simple matrix can provide a consistent basis for decision making. It should be used with caution, recognising the over-simplification that it will normally represent. The probability and consequences are defined according to parameters relevant to the situation; the boundaries of risk acceptability (and tolerability, where relevant) indicated on the matrix provided below, can be tailored to the factors influencing the significance of the risk. Individual situations are mapped onto the matrix to provide a ready and consistent indication of their acceptability or tolerability.

TABLE 1. RISK CLASSIFICATION MATRIX

		Consequence			
		Severe (Sv)	Medium (Md)	Mild (Mi)	Minor (Mr)
Probability	High (Hi)	Very high risk	High risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate/Low Risk
	Likely (Li)	High risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate/Low Risk	Low Risk
	Low Likelihood (Lw)	Moderate Risk	Moderate/Low Risk	Low Risk	Very Low Risk
	Unlikely (Ul)	Moderate/Low Risk	Low Risk	Very Low Risk	Very Low Risk

Source: CIRIA Report C552, Contaminated Land Risk Assessment. A Guide to Good Practice, 2001

These attributes are evaluated qualitatively against individual hazard assessments to determine the likelihood of a given hazard occurring. The risk evaluations for each plausible pollutant linkage are given in the last three columns of Table 1.

TABLE 2. CLASSIFICATION OF RISK

Very high risk (Vh)	There is a high probability that severe harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard, OR, there is evidence that severe harm to a designated receptor is currently happening. This risk, if realised, is likely to result in a substantial liability. Urgent investigation (if not undertaken already) and remediation are likely to be required.
High risk (Hi)	Harm is likely to arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard. Realisation of the risk is likely to present a substantial liability. 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 (Md)	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. 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 (Lw)	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 (VI)	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.

Source: CIRIA Report C552, Contaminated Land Risk Assessment. A Guide to Good Practice, 2001

4374D P1 Pratt – Paddock View, Twycross

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT POLLUTION LINKAGES

Source	Receptor	Pathway	Probability of Linkage	Conseq.of Linkage	Risk	Justification
Soil contaminants: - <i>Arable agricultural usage of the site (northern extent, formed in garden space by circa.2025);</i> - <i>Demolition of dwelling (directly south of site, circa.1924);</i> - <i>Pump (directly south, present circa.1924-1975);</i> No exceedances of contaminants identified in laboratory sampling.	Site workers (<i>during site works, excavations, eating and drinking</i>)	Ingestion, direct contact, inhalation of dust and dry arisings	UI	Md	L	Environmental testing has identified no exceedances considered capable of impacting site workers during site redevelopment.
	End users (<i>residents / tenants, children, visitors, service personnel</i>)	Crop uptake, ingestion, direct contact, inhalation of dust and dry arisings	UI	Md	L	Environmental testing has identified no exceedances within proposed garden area.
	Flora and fauna (<i>on and offsite</i>)	Migration, crop uptake	UI	Md	L	Significant, gross or phytotoxic contamination is not considered to exist on site with no clear or significant sources of such identified.
	Controlled waters (<i>Secondary A & B Aquifers, drain</i>)	Vertical and lateral migration (<i>superficial deposits permeable, bedrock low</i>)	UI	Md	L	Significant, gross or highly mobile contamination is not considered to exist on site with no clear or significant sources of such identified.
	Services (<i>new potable supply piping</i>)	Direct contact (<i>pipe degradation and leaching</i>)	UI	Md	L	Environmental testing has identified no exceedances of PAHs.
Ground gas: - No significant potential sources identified.	Site workers & excavations, end users & building envelope (<i>ingress and build-up</i>)	Vertical and lateral migration (<i>superficial deposits permeable, bedrock low</i>)	UI	Md	L	No significant potential sources of ground gas identified, new extension will not require gas protection as original dwelling does not possess gas protection (CIRIA C795)
Vapours: - No significant potential sources identified.	Site workers & excavations, end users & building envelope (<i>ingress and build-up</i>)	Vertical and lateral migration (<i>superficial deposits permeable, bedrock low</i>)	UI	Md	L	No significant potential sources of hydrocarbon contamination nor hazardous vapour generation identified.
Radon:	End users & building envelope	Vertical and lateral migration	UI	Md	L	Site is not located in a Radon Affected Area.

KEY:	Probability of pollutant linkage	Hi = Highly likely,	Li = Likely,	Lw = Low Likelihood,	UI = Unlikely	
	Consequence	Sv = Severe,	Md = Medium,	Mi = Mild,	Mr = Minor,	
	Overall Risk	VH = Very High,	H = High,	M = Moderate,	M/L = Moderate/Low,	L = Low, VL = Very Low

10.0 ENVIRONMENTAL RISK ASSESSMENT

Based on the information contained in this report, it is the opinion of Castledine Environmental that the site represents an estimated **LOW** level of risk with respect to the proposed development. This is summarised below.

10.1 RESIDENTS / END-USERS

Risks to end-users are considered to be constrained to the newly formed garden area and the proposed area of extension erection, with the potential contaminant associated with the prior arable agricultural usage of the site. Potential sources such as the demolition of a dwelling and a pump south of site are considered negated by an intervening dwelling and hardstanding (since developed post-demolition) and their distance from the development area.

Laboratory analysis of the samples taken from the proposed garden area have shown no exceedances of metals, metalloids, PAHs nor elevated phenol. Accordingly, the risks to end-users of the site are estimated to be low when assessed against the residential end-usage of the site.

10.2 SITE WORKERS

As with end-users, the risks to site workers are considered restrained to potential impact from agrichemicals whilst working in site soils - Laboratory analysis of the samples taken from the proposed garden area have shown no exceedances of metals, metalloids, PAHs nor elevated phenol. Accordingly, the provision for standard PPE and adherence to relevant HSE guidance should be sufficient to mitigate inherent site worker hazards and the associated risks to site-workers are estimated to be low.

10.3 CONTROLLED WATERS

Significant, gross or highly mobile forms of contamination are not considered to be associated with the site with no clear or significant sources of such identified. As such, the potential for mobilisation of contamination or impact to controlled waters is considered to be low.

10.4 FLORA AND FAUNA

Significant, gross or phytotoxic contamination is not considered to be associated with the site with no clear or significant sources of such identified. As such, the potential for mobilisation of contamination or impact to controlled waters is considered to be low.

10.5 GROUND GASES

No significant potential sources of hazardous ground gas generation have been identified with organic content in local geologies not considered a significant hazard (i.e. BS8576:2013 – Natural soil strata, e.g. alluvium or peat with low degradable content, considered to be a very low risk). Additionally, no evidence of gas protection was noted in the construction of the extant dwelling and client information appears to confirm this – guidance found in CIRIA C795 states that if an extant dwelling does not possess ground gas protection and it not located atop for instance, a landfill, any extension will not require gas protection). As such, the risks to site structures and end-users from ground gas ingress and impact are estimated to be low.

10.6 HAZARDOUS VAPOURS

No significant potential sources of hydrocarbon contamination nor hazardous vapour generation have been identified on or nearby to site. Accordingly, the risks associated with such are considered to be low.

10.7 POTABLE WATER SUPPLY PIPING

No significant potential sources of either hydrocarbon nor PAH contamination have been identified and environmental sampling carried out on site has identified no exceedances of such contamination. Accordingly, the risks associated with soil contamination to new potable piping laid on site are considered to be low.

11.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

At this stage, based on the desk study and intrusive information collected, it is considered that allowance be made for the following:

A watching brief (as outlined in Appendix F) should be carried out by the site supervisor during the course of demolition, site clearance and construction works for any obvious contamination (e.g. oil spillage in ground, buried waste, possible asbestos containing material). Should previously unreported or undiscovered contamination be identified, then development should stop and Castledine Environmental should be contacted to determine if further assessment or changes to the remediation scheme are required.

Please contact Castledine Environmental for more information, or to request quotes for the above.

12.0 REFERENCES**12.1 LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS****12.1.1 ACTS**

- [1] Environmental Protection Act 1990, Part IIA: inserted by Environment Act 1995, Section 57. See Environment Act 1995 for text of Part IIA.

12.1.2 PLANNING REGULATIONS

- [2] The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 SI1999/No.293
- [3] The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2000 SI2000/No.2867
- [4] The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2017 SI2017/No.571

12.1.3 CONTAMINATED LAND REGULATIONS

- [5] The Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2000. SI2000/No.227
- [6] The Contaminated Land (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2001 SI2001/No.663
- [7] The Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2006 SI2006/No.1380

12.2 STATUTORY GUIDANCE

- [8] Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. 2012. *Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance*. Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- [9] Communities and local Government, 2024: National Planning Policy Framework.

12.3 BRITISH STANDARDS

- [10] BS 5930:2015+A1:2020 Code of practice for site investigations
- [11] BS 10175:2011+A2:2017 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of practice
- [12] BS 8485:2015+A1:2019 Code of practice for the design of protective measures for methane and carbon dioxide ground gases for new buildings
- [13] BS 8576:2013 Guidance on investigations for ground gas. Permanent gases and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)
- [14] Bs 10176:2020 Taking Soil Sample for Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)

12.4 NON-STATUTORY TECHNICAL GUIDANCE

12.4.1 ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

- [15] Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) 2020, updated 2023

12.4.2 CIRIA PUBLICATIONS

- [16] Wilson, S., Oliver, S., Mallett, H., Hutchings, H., and Card, G.. 2007, *C 665 Assessing risks posed by hazardous ground gases to buildings* London: Construction Industry Research and Information Association
- [17] Mallett, H., Cox, L., Wilson, S. and Corban, M... 2014, *C 735 Good practice on the testing and verification of protection systems for buildings against hazardous ground gases* London: Construction Industry Research and Information Association

12.4.3 CL:AIRE

- [18] Card G, Wilson S, Mortimer S. 2012. *A Pragmatic Approach to Ground Gas Risk Assessment. CL:AIRE Research Bulletin RB17.* CL:AIRE, London, UK. ISSN 2047- 6450 (Online)

13.0 APPENDICES

APPENDIX A ENVIRONMENTAL SEARCH

Separate Groundsure Report

APPENDIX B HISTORICAL MAPPING

Separate Map Packs (2 No. files)

4374D P1 Pratt – Paddock View, Twycross Castledine Environmental

APPENDIX C PROPOSED AND CURRENT SITE PLANS



APPENDIX D

SITE PHOTOS AND LOCATIONS



Site Walkover Photos

Photo No.1: Facing NW showing the front of the onsite dwelling and hardstanding driveway & access



**Address: Paddock View, Twycross Rd, Sheepy Magna
Client: Mr. G. Pratt**

Photo No.2: Facing south showing the rear garden area





Site Walkover Photos

Photo No.3: Facing east showing the northern extent of site and secondary site access (right of photograph)



Address: Paddock View, Twycross Rd, Sheepy Magna
Client: Mr. G. Pratt

Photo No.4: Facing west showing the area of proposed extension, formed on the northern face of the dwelling



APPENDIX E

HP PHOTOGRAPHS



Trial Pit Photographs

Address: Paddock View, Twycross Road, Sheepy Magna
Client: Mr. G. Pratt

Photo No.1: HP01 located in the extant garden plot (eastern extent) and within former agricultural land



Photo No.2: HP01 pit sides and base adj. to arisings





Trial Pit Photographs

Address: Paddock View, Twycross Road, Sheepy Magna
Client: Mr. G. Pratt

Photo No.3: HP01 located in the extant garden plot (western extent) and within former agricultural land

Photo No.4: HP02 pit sides and base adj. to arisings





Trial Pit Photographs

Photo No.5: HP01 reinstated



Address: Paddock View, Twycross Road, Sheepy Magna
Client: Mr. G. Pratt

Photo No.6: HP02 reinstated



APPENDIX F

LABORATORY RESULTS

- Found as separate PDF(s)

APPENDIX G**WATCHING BRIEF**

It remains possible that previously unexpected soil conditions may be encountered during the construction process. Examples may include oily pockets within the soil, potential for asbestos containing materials, black ashy materials, soils exhibiting strong odours, brightly coloured materials, and former demolition materials.

Should previously undiscovered contamination be encountered during the demolition/construction of the new buildings the following course of action should be adhered to:

1. The ground workers should report any suspected contamination immediately to the Client's site supervisor. The supervisor should contact the Client or their appointed agent who will in turn contact Castledine Environmental to request an engineer to visit the site to assess the extent of the 'contamination'.
2. Castledine Environmental shall make records of their inspection, and pass details of these to the Local Authority.
3. Where the conditions revealed differ from those previously anticipated, the Castledine Environmental shall take samples as deemed appropriate to be dispatched for appropriate chemical testing.
4. Depending on the results of the testing either:
 - a. no further work will be required;
 - b. a further detailed risk assessment will be required; and/or
 - c. Localised specific remedial measures will be necessary.Appraisal criteria will vary depending on the nature of the assessment.
5. The results of any such testing will be sent to the Local Authority Pollution Control Section, Local Authority development control section, and the appointed building inspector. If remediation is required, the LA/Building inspector will be informed of the date and time of the proposed works.

6. Remediation will be undertaken in accordance with a method statement submitted for approval. The works shall be supervised where necessary by Castledine Environmental who shall provide a Verification Report for the Local Authorities.
7. A copy of the discovery strategy should be lodged on site and provisions made to ensure that all workers are made aware of their responsibility to observe, report and act on any potentially suspicious or contaminated materials they may encounter.

APPENDIX H

DISCOVERY STRATEGY

