

7B Caxton House
Broad Street
Cambourne
Cambridge CB23 6JN

T +44 (0) 1954 710666
F +44 (0) 1954 710677
E info@epstrategies.co.uk
W www.epstrategies.co.uk



Lesley Keal

Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council
Hinckley Hub
Rugby Road
Hinckley
Leicestershire
LE10 0FR

Telephone: 01954 710666

Email: mcook@epstrategies.co.uk

H&BBC Ref: 25/00670/DISCON

By Email: Lesley.keal@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk

26th August 2025

Subject: Phase II Geo-Environmental Assessment – Basin Bridge Bungalow,
Higham on the Hill

EPS Ref: UK23.6353b (Issue 1)

Dear Lesley,

I am writing to provide additional clarification in response to the points raised which included comments from the Council's Environmental Health Officer on the issue of contamination, as relating to the EPS Report Reference UK23.6353b (Issue 1); *dated March 2025*.

The return comments below are addressed in the order of the received email update, dated 24th July 2025, and I would be grateful if you could forward these onto the Environmental Health Team for review.

Whilst it is acknowledged that soils from selected trial hole positions were not analysed for contaminants of concern by the laboratory, the materials recovered from all locations were continuously assessed for physical evidence of contamination (with the support of a Photoionisation Detector, to highlight the presence of any volatiles), throughout the full duration of the intrusive works.

The sampling strategy was developed to ensure all the different source materials (soil types) were identified and defined by the laboratory analysis. This is why soils from TP02 and TP09 weren't analysed, as the source material appeared consistent with TP01, which was analysed. The results did ultimately confirm the absence of any contaminants of concern above the adopted screening criteria within the sample from TP01, as applicable to planning standards set for modern residential gardens.





Overall, it was concluded that more detailed sampling in the western portion of the site would be of greater value, given the nature of the soils recovered, which were infilled and had significantly greater potential to hold contamination compared with those in the east, which appeared to be natural in most cases. This approach was justified with elevated concentrations of selected contaminants being recorded in TP05 and TP08 particularly, and on balance, the soils in TP11 were considered to be more aligned with the locations in the west as opposed to the east, and therefore the full cover soils thickness of 600mm extended to this section in the north east.

The 'Remedial Strategy Plan' has been presented as a relatively simple guide where the difference in cover system thicknesses is defined based on the lines of evidence presented in the report and is considered reasonably precautionary and practicable given the nature of the ground conditions, but also the scale of the development proposal. However, it is also advised that this should be refined based a watching brief, conducted by EPS (or alternative suitably qualified professional) during the remedial works, to ensure that the extent of the removal and replacement of soils aligns with the approach outlined in the initial report, but also reflects physical evidence during the initial groundworks, which is considered just as valuable in this process.

The client has agreed to EPS supervision throughout future remedial works to guide the extent of the excavations and to show consistency with the approach. To account for any remaining uncertainty, visual inspection and on-site headspace testing would be reinforced by further environmental laboratory analysis of Heavy Metals, PAH Compounds and TPH to confirm the successful removal of soils holding residual contamination.

Overall, we believe this approach will provide sufficient confidence in the separation of soils while maintaining an effective and practical remediation solution. The findings of the watching brief would be included within the Verification Report, which would also include details on the nature and volume of materials/ soils removed from site, as well as those brought on to replace them and form the recommended cover system profiles.

These factors, combined with the Remedial Strategy and supervision plan as presented in the report are considered to be sufficient to reduce the identified risks to an acceptable level. The landowner has demonstrated acceptance of these measures and willing to carry out as defined in the report, and as a result, further sampling prior to commencement is not considered to be warranted in the context of the investigation which has already been completed to date and committed to at the appropriate stage of the redevelopment programme.

I hope this is clear and provides sufficient detail, but if you have any further queries, please feel free to contact me with the details above.

Yours Sincerely,

M Cook

Matthew Cook
Senior Consultant
on behalf of EPS