



**H Fraser
Consulting**

Contaminated Land
and Hydrogeology

SUMMARY

Proof of Evidence from Hannah Fraser

Employment Land to the north of Maple Cross Lodge, Maple Cross, Rickmansworth

GROUNDWATER

Prepared for: Barwood Capital Ltd
Including evidence on Piling Methods from Phil Barlow of Tier UK
Ltd

Date: 28/03/2022

Status: FINAL

Reference: 30422PoE1Summary

© H Fraser Consulting Ltd 2022

Prepared by: H Fraser Consulting Ltd





H Fraser Consulting

Contaminated Land
and Hydrogeology

Copyright of this Report is vested in H Fraser Consulting Ltd and no part of it may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from H Fraser Consulting Ltd. If you have received this Report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession and control and notify H Fraser Consulting Ltd.

This report has been prepared by H Fraser Consulting Ltd, with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the agreed scope and terms of contract and taking account of the manpower and resources devoted to it by agreement with its client, and is provided by H Fraser Consulting Ltd solely for the use of its client.

The advice and opinions in this report should be read and relied on only in the context of the report as a whole, taking account of the terms of reference agreed with the client. The findings are based on the information made available to H Fraser Consulting at the date of the report (and will have been assumed to be correct) and on current UK standards, codes, technology and practices as at that time. They do not purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion. New information or changes in conditions and regulatory requirements may occur in future, which will change the conclusions presented here.

Where this report relies on field data these will have been interpreted with reasonable skill care and diligence, but these data may not fully represent true conditions. Ground conditions may vary from those assumed on the basis of data relied on in this report.

This report is confidential to the client. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by H Fraser Consulting Ltd, no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of the report. No liability is accepted by H Fraser Consulting Ltd for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

CONTENTS

1	SUMMARY	1
---	---------------	---



1 SUMMARY

- 1.1.1 A planning permission for 'Comprehensive redevelopment to provide 2 no. warehouse Class B1c/B2/B8 units comprising a total of 16,140 sqm including 1,986 sqm ancillary B1a office space, access, landscaping and associated works' was refused in November 2019. An appeal was dismissed due to a lack of information relating to nearby Public Water Supply (PWS) boreholes, operated by Affinity Water (AW). AW had objected to the application, citing concerns that piling at the site would affect groundwater flow and quality.
- 1.1.2 Further to the appeal dismissal, the Applicant has engaged in intensive consultations with AW, and has undertaken an extensive programme of site investigation and monitoring. There is now a robust understanding of the groundwater regime at the site, and of the potential for the proposed development to affect groundwater flow and quality. These are detailed in the Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) report (CD7.1.23).
- 1.1.3 A programme of mitigation and monitoring has been developed, as detailed in the Piling Method Statement and Risk Assessment (PMSRA) report (CD1.2.26). AW has acknowledged the engagement and cooperation from the developer, and the changes, amendments and adjustments made to the application, to address the concerns with the previous application. AW recognise that risks to the PWS boreholes can be managed, and does not object to the current application.
- 1.1.4 The Environment Agency (EA) did not object to the refused permission, but requested standard conditions for the investigation of land contamination and associated monitoring. EA did object to the current application, citing a lack of information regarding the nearby Maple Lodge nature reserve (MLNR) (a privately owned conservation area 160 m south of the site). The EA withdrew its objection on the provision of further assessment by the applicant, documented in a Hydrogeological Impact Assessment report (CD1.3.6) and an updated assessment report (CD1.3.7). These reports, which benefit from a long period of baseline monitoring data, demonstrate negligible risk to the nature reserve.

- 1.1.5 The Local Planning Authority (LPA) deferred the planning decision, the subject of this appeal, citing a lack of information on potential impacts on groundwater and thereby the habitats supported by the groundwater dependent lakes at the Maple Lodge nature reserve. The LPA instructed McCloy consulting to undertake a review of the relevant information. McCloy found that the proposed development's effects on groundwater and the Maple Lodge nature reserve can be managed and appropriately mitigated via a Construction Environmental Management Plan, and Operational Environmental Management Plan, a Dewatering Method Statement, surface water monitoring, and the monitoring and mitigation measures set out in the DQRA and PMSRA.
- 1.1.6 It is concluded that the potential impacts to the water environment have been thoroughly investigated and are now well understood. I consider that risks to the identified receptors are negligible. Mitigation measures have been identified to ensure that receptors, including PWS boreholes and the MLNR, will not be adversely impacted by the development. The assessments are supported by a robust data set, and further monitoring before, during and after construction, will provide all stakeholders with assurance that impacts are negligible.
- 1.1.7 It is noted that, in its statement of case, the Rule 6 party identifies the Maple Lodge Marsh, a local wildlife site, as potentially at risk due to the development. From my detailed knowledge of the setting, I consider the risks to this site to be negligible, and in any case the mitigation measures identified will afford this site similar protection to the other identified receptors.
- 1.1.8 The scheme is compliant with relevant environmental legislation and guidance, and national and local planning policy. There is not any objection which is underpinned by any technical assessment. Rather, there is a powerful consensus of professional evidence, after a very thorough audit and assessment process, to which significant weight should attach. There is no evidential basis for the refusal of this scheme and the LPA agree.