






- Key**
- Approximate MRT East Scheme Boundary
 - Approximate P+R Scheme Boundary
 - Approximate Extent of Historical Landfill
 - Approximate Extent of Former Railway Land
 - Approximate Extent of Former Tank Area
 - Approximate Extent of Former Tanks
 - Approximate Extent of Historical Gravel Pits
 - Ecology Compensation Area
 - Flood Compensation Areas

- Notes:**
- Topographical survey was carried out by MK Surveys (Oxford) in April 2016, Drawing Project Reference 22109
 - This drawing has been produced in colour. Reproduction in black and white may result in misinterpretation of the data and features being presented.

PROPOSED MRT SCHEME , EAST READING

GEOENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS PLAN

Client
Reading Borough Council
Working better with you

Date of 1st Issue
18.05.2017
A2 Scale
1:1250

Drawn by
davco
Checked by
AZ

Figure Number
4

pba peterbrett
Offices throughout the UK and Europe
www.peterbrett.com
© Peter Brett Associates LLP
READING
Tel: 0118 950 0761

Reproduced from/based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey © on behalf of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Licence No. 100019672 Year of Publication 2012 Owner/Purchaser of Mapping Reading Borough Council

user name: david cotton

File Location: \\pba.int\csh\projects\28791 rbc brito le scheme\03 east reading mrt\geo\03 figures & dwgs\dwgs\2016\figure 4 (phase 1).dwg

APPENDIX 1

1 Introduction

The objective of this Phase 1 Ground Condition Assessment is to identify the likely ground conditions and environmental setting of a defined site and assess the information to identify potential issues that may have associated environmental liabilities or land stability hazards that could affect the site redevelopment.

The Phase 1 Desk Study and contamination risk assessment is the minimum requirement under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Clause 121 and the definition of “*Site Investigation Information*” given in the Glossary Page 56, to support any planning application on a site that might be potentially affected by contamination. Also, a desk study and site reconnaissance is the minimum information that should be provided for a site potentially at risk from land instability. Further information is given in the Planning Practice Guidance Notes on “Land affected by contamination” and “Land stability” published by DCLG in March 2014.

The data gathering stages of each assessment have many aspects in common and it is usually very cost effective to prepare a single combined report covering both contamination and instability requirements. The assessments are an important first step in the investigation of ground conditions at most sites, and can provide an early indication of geo-hazards, environmental liabilities, constraints and opportunities to feed into the master-planning process and development budgets. They are usually a pre-requisite for the planning application.

2 Scope of Works

The following sources of information will be included in our standard combined Phase 1 Contamination and Land Stability desk study:

- A site reconnaissance visit to verify the current condition of the site and its immediate surroundings.
- Purchase of historical Ordnance Survey maps.
- Third party database search to obtain environmental information in the public domain.
- Review of readily available published geological maps and memoirs, and review of technical papers or reports relating to the geology, geomorphology or geotechnics e.g. mineral assessment reports.
- Reference to useful publications on land stability (such as those in Appendix B of now withdrawn PPG14).
- Review of published texts on the general properties of the geological horizons.
- Review of British Geological Survey Borehole Records (if appropriate/available).
- Review of PBA's national natural and mining cavities (non-coal) databases, and PBA's internal database of ground investigation reports and surveys.
- Review of published maps on hydrogeology and groundwater vulnerability.
- Liaison with the local authority for information that can be provided.
- An internet search (Google or a similar)
- Web based information on ecological sites with international and national designations using a search radius of 1, 2 or 5km depending on the site specific circumstances.

The factual data will be presented and assessed in a report that will include an assessment of the potential for natural and anthropogenic geo-hazards to be present, a preliminary conceptual site model (CSM), a Tier 1 Qualitative Risk Assessment based on a source-pathway-receptor model to identify potential pollutant linkages, and a preliminary review of potential liabilities and constraints that might affect the development.

The anticipated ground conditions and geology will be reviewed in respect of possible geological and other factors that could give rise to a risk of land instability, and a preliminary hazard assessment will be carried out. This will include the risk of natural and man-made (mining) cavities, landslide, compressible soils, subsidence and heave due to volume change. Outline recommendations for further work such as specialist surveys or intrusive ground investigation will be included as required.

3 Clarifications and Limitations

- Some of the searches will be undertaken using computerised database facilities. All databases have the limitation that they may not be up to date because they are only periodically updated. No guarantee can be given for the accuracy or completeness of third party information.
- Based on a review of the initial data the collection of further information, e.g. via formal requests to the relevant authorities, may be recommended. Any additional costs will be notified and approval sought.
- The absence of cavity records in the PBA natural and mining cavities (non-coal) databases is not considered as conclusive as to their absence.
- Information presented on maps / photographs represents the situation as surveyed at a given time. It is possible for developments to have occurred between surveys that are not shown or for the map record to have been censored for military security.
- It should be noted that the Tier 1 risk assessment may determine that the identification of potential ecological receptors is inconclusive and recommend a Phase 1 habitat survey is required.
- The comments and the opinions expressed will be based on the information obtained from the specified sources. However, there may be conditions pertaining to the site, which are not disclosed by this information and, therefore, cannot be taken into consideration.
- Any interpretation is carried out based on a scientific and engineering appraisal and does not take into account the perceptions of, for example banks, insurers, lay people etc.
- When data is insufficient or inadequate to support a robust assessment we will state that any conclusions are provisional and recommend further works.
- It should be noted that NPPF requires that “*planning decisions should also ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented*”. A desk study may not be sufficient to enable the authority to grant planning permission. An intrusive ground investigation may be required to confirm the actual site conditions.

It should be noted that the Combined Phase 1 Ground Condition Assessment described above does not purport to be an ecological, flood risk or archaeological survey. Additional specific surveys may be required to support a planning application.

APPENDIX 2

PBA Methodology for Assessing Land Contamination in England

1 Introduction

This document defines the approach adopted by PBA in relation to the assessment of land contamination in England. The aim is for the approach to (i) be systematic and objective, (ii) provide for the assessment of uncertainty and (iii) provide a rational, consistent, transparent framework.

When preparing our methodology we have made reference to various technical guidance documents and legislation referenced in Section 7 of which the principal documents are (i) Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance (Defra 2012), (ii) the Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination (CLR 11) (EA 2004), (iii) Contaminated land risk assessment: A guide to good practice (C552) (CIRIA 2001) and (iv) National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012).

2 Dealing with Land Contamination

Government policy on land contamination aims to prevent new contaminated land from being created and promotes a risk based approach to addressing historical contamination. With regard to historical contamination, regulatory intervention is held in reserve for land that meets the legal definition and cannot be dealt with through any other means, including through planning. Land is only considered to be "contaminated land" in the legal sense if it poses an unacceptable risk.

UK legislation on contaminated land is principally contained in Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act, 1990 (which was inserted into the 1990 Act by section 57 of the Environment Act 1995). Part 2A was introduced in England on 1 April 2000 and provides a risk-based approach to the identification and remediation of land where contamination poses an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment. In 2004 the Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination (CLR 11) were published providing guidance on how the statutory requirements were to be delivered. The approach, concepts and principles for land contamination management promoted by CLR 11 are applied to the determination of planning applications.

Other legislative regimes may also provide a means of dealing with land contamination issues, such as the regimes for waste, water, environmental permitting, and environmental damage. Further, the law of statutory nuisance may result in contaminants being unacceptable to third parties whilst not attracting action under Part 2A or other environmental legislation.

2.1 Part 2A

The Regulations and Statutory Guidance that accompanied the Act, including the Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2006, has been revised with the issue of The Contaminated Land (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012/263) and the Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance for England 2012.

Part 2A defines contaminated land as "*land which appears to the Local Authority in whose area it is situated to be in such a condition that, by reason of substances in, on or under the land that significant harm is being caused, or there is a significant*

possibility that such harm could be caused, or pollution of controlled waters is being, or likely to be, caused".

Harm is defined as "*harm to the health of living organisms or other interference with the ecological systems of which they form part, and in the case of man, includes harm to his property*".

For the purposes of Part 2A, land is contaminated if it poses a significant possibility of significant harm (SPOSH).

Part 2A provides a means of dealing with unacceptable risks posed by land contamination to human health and the environment, and under the guidance enforcing authorities should seek to find and deal with such land. It states that "*under Part 2A the starting point should be that land is not contaminated land unless there is reason to consider otherwise. Only land where unacceptable risks are clearly identified, after a risk assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Guidance, should be considered as meeting the Part 2A definition of contaminated land*". Further the guidance makes it clear that "*regulatory decisions should be based on what is reasonably likely, not what is hypothetically possible*".

The overarching objectives of the Government's policy on contaminated land and the Part 2A regime are:

- "(a) To identify and remove unacceptable risks to human health and the environment.
- (a) To seek to ensure that contaminated land is made suitable for its current use.
- (b) To ensure that the burdens faced by individuals, companies and society as a whole are proportionate, manageable and compatible with the principles of sustainable development".

The enforcing authority may need to decide whether and how to act in situations where decisions are not straight forward, and where there is uncertainty. "*In so doing, the authority should use its judgement to strike a reasonable balance between: (a) dealing with risks raised by contaminants in land and the benefits of remediating land to remove or reduce those risks; and (b) the potential impacts of regulatory intervention including financial costs to whoever will pay for remediation, health and environmental impacts of taking action, property blight, and burdens on affected people*". The authority is required to "*take a precautionary approach to the risks raised by contamination, whilst avoiding a disproportionate approach given the circumstances of each case*". The aim is "*that the regime produces net benefits, taking account of local circumstances*".

The guidance recognises that "*normal levels of contaminants in soils should not be considered to cause land to qualify as contaminated land, unless there is a particular reason to consider otherwise*".

Normal levels are quoted as:

- "a) natural presence of contaminants' such as from underlying geology 'that have not been shown to pose an unacceptable risk to health and the environment
- b) ...low level diffuse pollution, and common human activity..."

PBA Methodology for Assessment of Potentially Contaminated Land

Similarly the guidance states that significant pollution of controlled waters is required for land to be considered contaminated and the *"fact that substances are merely entering water"* or *"where discharge from land is not discernible at a location immediately downstream"* does not constitute contaminated land.

To help achieve a more targeted approach to identifying and managing contaminated land in relation to the risk (or possibility) of harm to human health, the revised Statutory Guidance presented a new four category system for considering land under Part 2A, ranging from Category 4, where there is no risk that land poses a significant possibility of significant harm (SPOSH), or the level of risk is low, to Category 1, where the risk that land poses a significant possibility of significant harm (SPOSH) is unacceptably high.

For land that cannot be readily placed into Categories 1 or 4 further assessment is required. If there is a sufficiently strong case that the risks are of sufficient concern to cause significant harm/pollution or have the significant possibility of significant harm/pollution the land is to be placed into Category 2. If the concern is not met land is considered Category 3.

The technical guidance clearly states that the currently published SGV and GAC's represent *"cautious estimates of level of contaminants in soils"* which should be considered *"no risk to health or, at most, a minimal risk"*. These values do not represent the boundary between categories 3 and 4 and *"should be considered to be comfortably within Category 4"*.

At the end of 2013 technical guidance in support of Defra's revised Statutory Guidance (SG) was published (CL:AIRE 2013) which provided:

- A methodology for deriving C4SLs for four generic land-uses comprising residential, commercial, allotments and public open space; and
- A demonstration of the methodology, via the derivation of C4SLs for six substances – arsenic, benzene, benzo(a)pyrene, cadmium, chromium (VI) and lead.

2.2 Planning

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) is responsible for the control of development, and in doing so it has a duty to take account of all material considerations, including contamination.

Section 11, Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DCLG 2012) states the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by *"preventing both new and existing developments from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water pollution"* and *"remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate"*. Paragraphs 120 and 121 describe the policy considerations the Government expects LPA to have in regard to land affected by contamination when preparing policies for development plans and in taking decisions on applications.

For planning purposes, the NPPF requires that the assessment of risks arising from contamination and remediation requirements should be considered on the

basis of the current environmental setting, the current land use, and the circumstances of its proposed new use. The NPPF stipulates that planning policies and decisions should ensure that *"the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation"*; and that *"after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented."*

The level at which contamination is deemed to be unacceptable, or, gives rise to adverse effects under a planning context has not been identified but is envisaged to be more precautionary than the level required to determine land as contaminated under Part 2A.

In paragraph 121 the developer is required to ensure that land, after development, is not capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part 2A of the EPA 1990.

The principal planning objective is to ensure that any unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment from the contaminated condition of the land are identified so that appropriate action can be considered and taken to address those risks. In order to grant a planning permission the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has to be satisfied that there is sufficient information about the condition of the land, its impacts and the availability of viable remedial options. NPPF Paragraph 21 states that *"planning policies and decisions should also ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented"*. Site investigation information is further defined in the NPPF Glossary page 56 and that also states that investigations should be carried out in accordance with established procedures, including BS10175 (BSI 2011) that in turn links procedure to the requirements of CLR11.

A key distinction between the Soil Guideline Values (SGVs) and the C4SLs is the level of risk that they describe. As described by the Environment Agency (2009a):

"SGVs are guidelines on the level of long-term human exposure to individual chemicals in soil that, unless stated otherwise, are tolerable or pose a minimal risk to human health."

A letter from Lord de Mauley dated 3rd September 2014 provides more explicit direction to local authorities on the use of the C4SL in a planning context. The letter identifies four key points:

- 1) that the screening values were developed expressly with the planning regime in mind
- 2) their use is recommended in DCLG's planning guidance
- 3) soil concentrations below a C4SL limit are considered to be 'definitely not contaminated' under Part IIA of the 1990 Environmental Protection Act and pose at most a 'low level of toxicological concern' and
- 4) exceedance of a C4SL screening value does not mean that land is definitely contaminated, just that further investigation may be warranted.

PBA Methodology for Assessment of Potentially Contaminated Land

2.3 Building Control

The building control department of the local authority or private sector approved inspectors are responsible for the operation and enforcement of the Building Regulations (DCLG 2010) to protect the health, safety and welfare of people in and around buildings. Approved Document C requires the protection of buildings and associated land from the effects of contamination, to be applied (non-exclusively) in all changes of use from commercial or industrial premises, to residential property.

3 Approach

CLR 11 recommends a phased or tiered approach to risk assessment with the three tiers being:-

- Tier 1 - preliminary – a qualitative assessment forming part of a Phase 1 report,
- Tier 2 - generic - a quantitative assessment using published criteria to screen site specific ground condition data forming part of a Phase 2 report
- Tier 3 - detailed – a quantitative assessment involving the generation of site specific assessment criteria

Each tier of risk assessment comprises the following four stages:-

1. Hazard Identification – identifying potential contaminant sources on and off site;
2. Hazard Assessment – assessing the potential for unacceptable risks by identifying what pathways and receptors could be present, and what pollutant linkages could result (forming the Conceptual Site Model (CSM));
3. Risk Estimation – estimating the magnitude and probability of the possible consequences (what degree of harm might result to a defined receptor and how likely); and
4. Risk Evaluation – evaluating whether the risk needs to be, and can be, managed.

A PBA Phase 1 report normally comprises a desk study, walkover and Tier 1 risk assessment (the project specific offer defines the actual scope of work). This is the minimum requirement as defined by the NPPF, pp56. At Tier 1 the PBA approach to risk estimation involves identifying the magnitude of the potential consequence (taking into account both the potential severity of the hazard and the sensitivity of the receptor) and the magnitude of the likelihood i.e. the probability (taking into account the presence of the hazard and the receptor and the integrity of the pathway). This approach is promoted in current guidance such as R&D 66 (NHBC 2008).

The PBA approach is that if a pollution linkage is identified then it represents a potential risk which requires further consideration and either (1) remediation / direct risk management or (2) further tiers of assessment.

A PBA preliminary Phase 2 report comprises an intrusive investigation to collect site specific information, a Tier 2 quantitative generic risk assessment and a refinement of the CSM using the site specific data. Depending on the findings further investigation and/or progression to Tier 3 risk assessment and the generation of site specific assessment criteria may be required.

The PBA methodology provides an estimate of the level of risk, it does not identify a risk level at which the risk is considered “significant” and/or “unacceptable” as this is dependant on the view of the individual / stakeholder. For example; to a risk adverse stakeholder even a risk level of “very low” may be considered unacceptable and as such this stakeholder may require risk management options to be implemented.

4 Identification of Pollutant Linkages and Conceptual Site Model (CSM)

For all Tiers the underlying principle to ground condition assessment is the identification of *pollutant linkages* in order to evaluate whether the presence of a source of contamination could potentially lead to harmful consequences. A pollutant linkage consists of the following three elements:-

- A source/hazard – a substance or situation which has the potential to cause harm or pollution;
- A pathway – a means by which the hazard moves along / generates exposure; and
- A receptor/target – an entity which is vulnerable to the potential adverse effects of the hazard.

The *Conceptual Site Model* identifies the types and locations of potential contaminant sources/hazards and potential receptors and potential migration/transportation pathway(s). The CSM is refined as the assessment progresses through the Tiers.

4.1 Hazard Identification

A hazard is a substance or situation that has the potential to cause harm. Hazards may be chemical, biological or physical (e.g. explosive gases).

At Tier 1 the potential for hazards to be present is determined from consideration of the previous or ongoing activities on or near to the site in accordance with the criteria presented in the **Table 1**.

Based on the land use information Potential Contaminants of Concern (PCOC) are identified. The PCOC direct the scope of the collection of site specific data and the analytical testing selected for subsequent Tiers.

At Tier 2 the site specific data is screened using published assessment criteria (refer to PBA document entitled Rationale for the Selection of Tier 2 Assessment Criteria). In general, published criteria have been developed using highly conservative assumptions and therefore if the screening criterion is not exceeded then the PCOC is eliminated as a potential Hazard. It should be noted that exceedance does not necessarily indicate that a site is contaminated and/or unsuitable for use only that the PCOC is retained as a potential Hazard. Published criteria are generated using models based on numerous and complex assumptions. Whether or not these assumptions are appropriate in a site-specific context requires confirmation on a project by project basis and would form part of a Tier 3 assessment.

When reviewing or assessing site specific data PBA utilise published guidance on comparing contamination

PBA Methodology for Assessment of Potentially Contaminated Land

data with a critical concentration (CL:AIRE/CIEH 2008) which presents a structured process for employing statistical techniques for data assessment purposes. The benefit of the statistical tool is uncertainty is quantified and decisions are made knowing the strength of the evidence. Correct decision probability is a function of sample size, difference in the mean and the critical concentration, variation in measured values and the significance level.

4.2 Receptor and Pathway Identification

For all Tiers the potential receptors (for both on site and adjoining land) that will be considered are:

- Human Health – including current and future occupiers, construction and future maintenance workers, and neighbouring properties/third parties;
- Ecological systems; ^{*1}
- Controlled waters ^{*2} – including surface water and groundwater;
- Property, Animal or Crop (existing or proposed) - including buildings, service lines and pipes, crops, livestock, pets, woodland; and
- Archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

^{*1} International or nationally designated sites (as defined in the statutory guidance (Defra Circular 04/12)) “in the local area” will be identified as potential ecological receptors. A search radius of 1, 2 or 5km will be utilised depending on the site specific circumstances (see also pathway identification). The Environment Agency has published an ecological risk assessment framework (EA 2008) which promotes (as opposed to statutorily enforces) consideration of additional receptors to include locally protected sites and protected or notable species. These additional potential receptors will only be considered if a Phase 1 habitat survey, undertaken in accordance with guidance (JNCC 1993), is commissioned and the data provided to PBA. It should be noted that without such a survey the Tier 1 risk assessment may conclude that the identification of potential ecological receptors is inconclusive (refer to PBA Specification for Phase 1).

^{*2} the definition of “pollution of controlled water” was amended by the introduction of Section 86 of the Water Act 2003. For the purposes of Part 2A groundwater does not include waters above the saturated zone and our assessment does not therefore address perched water other than where development causes a pathway to develop.

If a receptor is taken forward for further assessment it will be classified in terms of its sensitivity, the criteria for which are presented in **Table 2**. Table 2 has been generated using descriptions of environmental receptor importance/value given in various guidance documents including R&D 66 (NHBC 2008) and Transport Analysis Guidance (based on DETR 2000). Human health and buildings classifications have been generated by PBA using the attribute description for each class.

The exposure pathway and modes of transport that will be considered are presented in **Table 3**.

4.3 Note regarding Ecological Systems

The Environment Agency (EA) has developed an ecological risk assessment framework which aims to provide a structured approach for assessing the risks to ecology from chemical contaminants in soils (EA 2008). In circumstances where contaminants in water represent a potential risk to aquatic ecosystems then risk assessors will need to consider this separately.

The framework consists of a three tiered process:-

- Tier 1 is a screening step where the site soils chemical data is compared to a soil screening value (SSV)
- Tier 2 uses various tools (including surveys and biological testing) to gather evidence for any harm to the ecological receptors
- Tier 3 seeks to attribute the harm to the chemical contamination

Tier 1 is preceded by a desk study to collate information about the site and the nature of the contamination to assess whether pollutant linkages are feasible. The framework presents ten steps for ecological desk studies and development of a conceptual site model as follows.

- 1 Establish Regulatory Context
- 2 Collate and Assess Documentary Information
- 3 Summarise Documentary Information
- 4 Identify Potential Contaminants of Concern
- 5 Identify Likely Fate Transport of Contaminants
- 6 Identify Potential Receptors of Concern
- 7 Identify Potential Pathways of Concern
- 8 Create a Conceptual Site Model
- 9 Identify Assessment and Measurement Endpoints
- 10 Identify Gaps and Uncertainties

The information in a standard PBA Phase 1 report covers Steps 1 to 4 inclusive. Step 5 considers fate and transport of contaminants and it should be noted that our standard report adopts a simplified approach considering only transport mechanisms. A simplified approach has also been adopted in respect of Steps 6 and 7 receptors (a detailed review of the ecological attributes has not been undertaken) and pathways (a food chain assessment has not been undertaken). Step 9 is outside the scope of our standard Phase 1 report.

It should be noted that the Tier 1 assessment for ecological systems (i.e. where designated sites are identified) as part of a Phase 1 report will assess the viability of the mode of transport given the site specific circumstances not specific pathways.

The Tier 1 risk assessment may conclude that the risk to potential ecological receptors is inconclusive (see PBA Specification for Phase 1).

4.4 Note regarding Controlled Waters

Controlled Waters are rivers, estuaries, coastal waters, lakes and groundwaters, but not perched waters.

The EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) 2000/60/EC provides for the protection of sub-surface, surface, coastal and territorial waters through a framework of river basin management. The EU Updated Water Framework Standards Directive 2014/101/EU amended the EU WFD to update the international standards therein; it enters into force on 20 November 2014 and its provisions must be transposed in Member State law by 20 May 2016. Other EU Directives in the European water management framework include:

- the EU Priority Substances Directive 2013/39/EU;

PBA Methodology for Assessment of Potentially Contaminated Land

- EU Groundwater Pollutants Threshold Values Directive 2014/80/EU amending the EU Groundwater Directive 2006/118/EC; and
- EU Biological Monitoring Directive 2014/101/EU.

The Ground Water Daughter Directive (GWDD) was enacted by the Groundwater Regulations (2009), which were subsumed by the Environmental Permitting Regulations (2010) which provide essential clarification including on the four objectives specifically for groundwater quality in the WFD:-

- Achieve 'Good' groundwater chemical status by 2015, commonly referred to as 'status objective';
- Achieve Drinking Water Protected Area Objectives;
- Implement measures to reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in groundwater quality, referred to as 'trend objective'; and
- Prevent or limit the inputs of pollutants into groundwater, commonly referred to as 'prevent or limit' objectives

The Water Act 2003 (Commencement No.11) Order 2012 amends the test for 'contaminated land' which relates to water pollution so that pollution of controlled waters must now be "significant" to meet the definition of contaminated land.

River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) have been developed for the 11 River Basin Districts in England and Wales. These were released by Defra in 2009 (Defra 2009).

These RBMP's establish the current status of waters within the catchments of the respective Districts and the current status of adjoining waters identified. As part of a Tier 2 risk assessment water quality data is screened against the WFD assessment criteria. Compare to the RBMP's current status of waters for the catchment under consideration would form part of a Tier 3 assessment.

5 Risk Estimation

Risk estimation classifies what degree of harm might result to a receptor (defined as consequence) and how likely it is that such harm might arise (probability).

At Tier 1 the consequence classification is generated by multiplying the hazard classification score and the receptor sensitivity score. This approach follows that presented in the republished R&D 66 (NHBC 2008).

The criteria for classifying probability are set out in **Table 4** and have been taken directly from Table 6.4 CIRIA C552 (CIRIA 2001). Probability considers the integrity of the exposure pathway.

The consequence classifications detailed in **Table 5** have been adapted from Table 6.3 presented in C552 and R&D 66 (Annex 4 Table A4.3).

The Tier 1 risk classification is estimated for each pollutant linkage using the matrix given in **Table 6** which is taken directly from C552 (Table 6.5). Subsequent Tiers refine the CSM through retention or elimination of potential hazards and pollutant linkages.

6 Risk Evaluation

In order to put the Tier 1 risk classification into context the likely actions are described in **Table 7** which is taken directly from C552 (Table 6.6). Subsequent Tiers identify potential risk management options through remediation and/or mitigation measures.

7 References

BSI 2007 BS 8485 Code of Practice for characterisation and remediation from ground gas in affected developments.

BSI 2011 BS 10175 (2011) Code of practice - Investigation of potentially contaminated sites

CIRIA 2001: Contaminated land risk assessment – a guide to good practice C552.

CIRIA 2008: Assessing risks posed by hazardous ground gases to buildings C655

CL:AIRE/EIH 2008 Guidance on Company Soil Contamination Data with a Critical Concentration. Published by Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE)

CL:AIRE 2013 SP1010 – Development of Category 4 Screening Levels for Assessment of Land Affected by Contamination. Final Project Report published by Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE) 20th December 2013

DCLG 2010 Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document C Site preparation and resistance to contaminants and moisture.

DCLG 2012 National Planning Policy Framework.

DETR 2000 Methodology for Multi Modal Studies. Volume 2 Section 4. The Environmental Objective.

Defra Circular 01/2006

Defra Circular 04/2012 Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A. Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance.

DEFRA, 2006 The Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2006.

DEFRA, 2012 The Contaminated Land (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (SI2012/263).

DEFRA, 2012 Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A. Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance. April 2012.

DEFRA, 2013 Environmental Damage (Prevention and Remediation) Regulations 2009: Guidance for England and Wales

Defra '2009 Water for Life and Livelihoods. River Basin Management Plan. (11 Districts: Anglia, Dee, Humber, Northumbria, Northwest, Severn, Solway and Tweed, Southeast, Thames, Western Wales) December 2009

EA 2004: The Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CRL 11 published by the Environment Agency (EA).

EA 2008 Ecological Risk Assessment Science Report Series SC070009 published by the Environment Agency (EA).

JNCC 1993 Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – A Technical for Environmental Audit prepared by the Joint Nature Conservancy Council (JNCC)

NHBC/EA/CIEH 2008: R&D Publication 66 Guidance for the safe development of housing on land affected by contamination.

Table 1: Criteria for Classifying Hazards / Potential for Generating Contamination

Classification/Score	Potential for generating contamination/gas based on land use
Very Low 1	Land Use: greenfield Contamination: None. Gas generation potential : Inert Made Ground
Low 2	Land Use: residential, retail or office use, recent small scale industrial. Contamination: None or locally slightly elevated concentrations. Gas generation potential : Shallow thickness of Alluvium
Moderate 3	Land Use: railway yards, collieries, scrap yards, light industry, engineering works. Contamination: Locally elevated concentrations. Gas generation potential : Dock silt and substantial thickness of organic alluvium/peat
High 4	Land Use: gas works, chemical works, heavy industry, non-hazardous landfills. Contamination: Possible widespread elevated concentrations. Gas generation potential : Shallow mine workings Pre 1960's landfill
Very High 5	Land Use: hazardous waste landfills. Contamination: Likely widespread elevated concentrations. Gas generation potential: Domestic landfill post 1960

"Greenfield" is land which has not been developed including not used for crop production or animal husbandry and no contamination source therefore no pollutant linkages.

Table 2: Criteria for Classifying Receptor Sensitivity/Value

Classification/Score	Definition
Very Low 1	Receptor of limited importance Groundwater: Non aquifer Surface water: Water body within 25m or eliminate Ecology: No local designation Buildings: Replaceable Human health: Unoccupied/limited access
Low 2	Receptor of local or county importance with potential for replacement Groundwater: Secondary B aquifer or Secondary Undifferentiated Surface water: Tertiary water body immediately adjacent Ecology: local habitat resources Buildings: Local value Human health: Minimum score 4 where human health identified as potential receptor
Moderate 3	Receptor of local or county importance with potential for replacement Groundwater: Secondary A aquifer Surface water: Secondary water body immediately adjacent Ecology: County wildlife sites, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Buildings: Area of Historic Character Human health: Minimum score 4 where human health identified as potential receptor
High 4	Receptor of county or regional importance with limited potential for replacement Groundwater: Principal aquifer Surface water: Primary water body immediately adjacent Ecology: SSSI, National or Marine Nature Reserve (NNR or MNR) Buildings: Conservation Area Human health: Minimum score 4 where human health identified as potential receptor
Very High 5	Receptor of national or international importance Groundwater: Source Protection Zone Surface water: Primary water body on site Ecology: Special Areas of Conservation (SAC and candidates), Special Protection Areas (SPA and potentials) or wetlands of international importance (RAMSAR) Buildings: World Heritage site Human health: Residential, open spaces and uses where children are present

Table 3: Exposure Pathway and Modes of Transport

Receptor	Pathway	Mode of transport
Human health	Ingestion	Fruit or vegetable leaf or roots
		Contaminated water
		Soil/dust indoors
		Soil/dust outdoors
	Inhalation	Particles (dust / soil) – outdoor
		Particles (dust / soil) - indoor
		Vapours – outdoor - migration via natural or anthropogenic pathways
		Vapours - indoor - migration via natural or anthropogenic pathways
	Dermal absorption	Direct contact with soil
		Direct contact with waters (swimming / showering)
		Irradiation
Groundwater	Leaching	Gravity / permeation
	Migration	Natural – groundwater as pathway Anthropogenic (e.g. boreholes, culverts, pipelines etc.)
Surface Water	Direct	Runoff or discharges from pipes
	Indirect	Recharge from groundwater
	Indirect	Deposition of wind blown dust
Buildings	Direct contact	Sulphate attack on concrete, hydrocarbon corrosion of plastics
	Gas ingress	Migration via natural or anthropogenic paths
Ecological systems	See Notes	Runoff/discharge to surface water body
	See Notes	Windblown dust
	See Notes	Groundwater migration
	See Notes	At point of contaminant source
Animal and crop	Direct	Wind blown or flood deposited particles / dust / sediments
	Indirect	Plants via root up take or irrigation. Animals through watering
	Inhalation	By livestock / fish - gas / vapour / particulates / dust
	Ingestion	Consumption of vegetation / water / soil by animals

Table 4: Classification of Probability

Classification	Definition
High likelihood	There is a pollution linkage and an event either appears very likely in the short-term and almost inevitable over the long-term, or there is already evidence at the receptor of harm / pollution.
Likely	There is a pollution linkage and all the elements are present and in the right place, which means that it is probable that an event will occur. Circumstances are such that an event is not inevitable, but possible in the short-term and likely over the long-term.
Low likelihood	There is a pollution linkage and circumstances are possible under which an event could occur. 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	There is a pollution linkage but circumstances are such that it is improbable that an event would occur even in the very long-term.

PBA Methodology for Assessment of Potentially Contaminated Land

Table 5: Classification of Consequence (score = magnitude of hazard Table 1 and sensitivity of receptor Table 2)

Classification / Score	Examples
Severe 17-25 (3 out of 25 outcomes)	Human health effect - exposure likely to result in "significant harm". Significant harm to humans is defined in circular 01/2006 as death, disease, serious injury, genetic mutation, birth defects or impairment of reproductive function. Controlled water effect - short-term risk of pollution (note: Water Resources Act contains no scope for considering significance of pollution) of sensitive water resource. Equivalent to EA Category 1 incident (persistent and/or extensive effects on water quality leading to closure of potable abstraction point or loss of amenity, agriculture or commercial value. Major fish kill. Ecological effect - short-term exposure likely to result in a substantial adverse effect. Catastrophic damage to crops, buildings or property
Medium 10-16 (7 out of 25 outcomes)	Human health effect - exposure could result in "significant harm". Significant harm to humans is defined in circular 01/2006 as death, disease, serious injury, genetic mutation, birth defects or impairment of reproductive function. Controlled water effect - equivalent to EA Category 2 incident requiring notification of abstractor Ecological effect - short-term exposure may result in a substantial adverse effect. Damage to crops, buildings or property
Mild 5-9 (7 out of 25 outcomes)	Human health effect - exposure may result in "significant harm". Significant harm to humans is defined in circular 01/2006 as death, disease, serious injury, genetic mutation, birth defects or impairment of reproductive function. Controlled water effect - equivalent to EA Category 3 incident (short lived and/or minimal effects on water quality). Ecological effect - unlikely to result in a substantial adverse effect. Minor damage to crops, buildings or property. Damage to building rendering it unsafe to occupy (for example foundation damage resulting in instability).
Minor 1-4 (8 out of 25 outcomes)	No measurable effect on humans. Protective equipment is not required during site works. Equivalent to insubstantial pollution incident with no observed effect on water quality or ecosystems. Repairable effects to crops, buildings or property. The loss of plants in a landscaping scheme. Discolouration of concrete.


Table 6: Classification of Risk (Combination of Consequence Table 5 and Probability Table 4)

	Consequence			
Probability	Severe	Medium	Mild	Minor
High likelihood	Very high	High	Moderate	Low
Likely	High	Moderate	Moderate/	Low
Low likelihood	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Very low
Unlikely	Low	Low	Very low	Very low


Table 7: Description of Risks and Likely Action Required

Risk Classification	Description
Very high risk	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 is likely to be required in the short term.
High risk	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	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	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	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.

APPENDIX 3



1:1250 Scale Grid Index



Site Details:

MRT East Reading

Client Ref: EMS_357251_479571
Report Ref: EMS-357251_479571_1250scale_1_1
Grid Ref: 472267, 173632

Map Name: National Grid

Map date: 1956

Scale: 1:1,250

Printed at: 1:2,000



Surveyed 1956
Revised 1956
Edition N/A
Copyright N/A
Levelled 1951

Surveyed 1956
Revised 1956
Edition N/A
Copyright N/A
Levelled 1951

Surveyed 1956
Revised 1956
Edition N/A
Copyright N/A
Levelled 1951

Surveyed 1956
Revised 1956
Edition N/A
Copyright N/A
Levelled 1951



Produced by
Groundsure Insights
www.groundsure.com




Supplied by:
www.emapsite.com
sales@emapsite.com

© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100035207

Production date: 15 April 2016

To view map legend click here [Legend](#)



Site Details:

MRT East Reading

Client Ref: EMS_357251_479571
Report Ref: EMS-357251_479571_1250scale_1_1
Grid Ref: 472267, 173632

Map Name: National Grid

Map date: 1972-1973

Scale: 1:1,250

Printed at: 1:2,000



Surveyed 1956
Revised 1972
Edition N/A
Copyright 1973
Levelled 1951

Surveyed 1956
Revised 1971
Edition N/A
Copyright 1972
Levelled 1951



Produced by
Groundsure Insights
www.groundsure.com



Supplied by:
www.emapsite.com
sales@emapsite.com

© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100035207

Production date: 15 April 2016

To view map legend click here [Legend](#)



Site Details:

MRT East Reading

Client Ref: EMS_357251_479571
Report Ref: EMS-357251_479571_1250scale_1_1
Grid Ref: 472267, 173632

Map Name: National Grid

Map date: 1983-1988

Scale: 1:1,250

Printed at: 1:2,000



Surveyed 1973
Revised 1988
Edition N/A
Copyright 1988
Levelled 1973

Surveyed 1972
Revised 1983
Edition N/A
Copyright 1983
Levelled 1972

Surveyed 1956
Revised 1985
Edition N/A
Copyright 1986
Levelled 1972



Produced by
Groundsure Insights
www.groundsure.com




Supplied by:
www.emapsite.com
sales@emapsite.com

© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100035207

Production date: 15 April 2016

To view map legend click here [Legend](#)



Site Details:

MRT East Reading

Client Ref: EMS_357251_479571
Report Ref: EMS-357251_479571_1250scale_1_1
Grid Ref: 472267, 173632

Map Name: National Grid

Map date: 1986-1990

Scale: 1:1,250

Printed at: 1:2,000



Surveyed 1973
 Revised 1990
 Edition N/A
 Copyright 1990
 Levelled 1973

Surveyed N/A
 Revised N/A
 Edition N/A
 Copyright 1989
 Levelled 1970

Surveyed 1972
 Revised 1989
 Edition N/A
 Copyright 1989
 Levelled 1972

Surveyed 1956
 Revised 1985
 Edition N/A
 Copyright 1986
 Levelled 1972



Produced by
 Groundsure Insights
www.groundsure.com




Supplied by:
www.emapsite.com
sales@emapsite.com

© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100035207

Production date: 15 April 2016

To view map legend click here [Legend](#)



Site Details:

MRT East Reading

Client Ref: EMS_357251_479571
Report Ref: EMS-357251_479571_1250scale_1_1
Grid Ref: 472267, 173632

Map Name: National Grid

Map date: 1989-1993

Scale: 1:1,250

Printed at: 1:2,000



Surveyed 1993
 Revised N/A
 Edition N/A
 Copyright 1993
 Levelled N/A

Surveyed 1972
 Revised 1989
 Edition N/A
 Copyright 1989
 Levelled 1972

Surveyed 1990
 Revised 1990
 Edition N/A
 Copyright 1991
 Levelled N/A

Surveyed N/A
 Revised N/A
 Edition N/A
 Copyright N/A
 Levelled N/A



Produced by
 Groundsure Insights
www.groundsure.com



Supplied by:
www.emapsite.com
sales@emapsite.com

© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100035207

Production date: 15 April 2016

To view map legend click here [Legend](#)

