

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL				
No.	W	384	08	

Mr Craig Bulga
JPA (Joynes Pike & Associates)
3900 Parkside
Birmingham Business Park
Birmingham
B37 7YG

Our ref: HA/2008/105495/01-L01
Your ref: LU/175/08

Date: 01 December 2008

Dear Mr Bulga

SEQUENTIAL TEST ADDENDUM - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND REDEVELOPMENT FOR A BUILDERS MERCHANT WITH OUTSIDE STORAGE, A FOOD RETAIL STORE, ALONG WITH ACCESS, SERVICING, PARKING, BOUNDARY TREATMENT AND LANDSCAPING.

TRAVIS PERKINS PIER ROAD/NEW ROAD LITTLEHAMPTON

Thank you for forwarding the site investigation reports and Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment (DQRA) for the above site. We have the following comments to make:

North Area

It is noted that the investigation on the north area of the site was limited in to the extent of the external areas only. The investigation undertaken was satisfactory however only a limited of samples were analysed for key contaminants of concern. It is noted that no soil samples in WS 1, 2 5, 6 & 8 were analysed for TPH fractions. Full characterisation around the tanks has not been undertaken. However the identified levels though show low levels of TPH contamination in the soils and groundwater.

The report has recommended additional investigations. We agree with this conclusion. This would be appropriate when the main building is being demolished.

South Area

It is noted that the investigation on the south area of the site was limited to the extent of the external areas only. The investigation undertaken was satisfactory and the conceptual model identified no significant sources of contamination. Therefore the limited number of window sample locations and samples is acceptable.

Environment Agency
Guildbourne House Chatsworth Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 1LD.
Customer services line: 08708 506 506
Email: enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk
www.environment-agency.gov.uk
Cont/d..

The report has recommended additional investigations to be undertaken. We agree with this conclusion though based on the desk study and conceptual model, it is likely not to encounter or identify anything significant.

DQRA

The content of the report is acceptable. However, with respect to the input parameters we do not agree with the value assigned for effective porosity. The value of 0.49 does not represent a realistic figure for the geology encountered. The report states that 0.49 is 90% of the CLEA model for the total porosity of sandy soil. We are unclear why CLEA model reference is being used and the effective porosity is not the same as porosity and effective porosity is always less than total porosity. The sequence at the centre of the site has been determined as made ground over alluvium over beach deposits (silty sand). The plume thickness has been estimated to be within the clayey sands and silty sands. Therefore a more representative value and more importantly a range of value (sensitivity analysis) should be included in the model. A range of between 10% and 30% (0.1 - 0.3) would be more realistic.

Recommendations

- Additional groundwater monitoring of the existing window samples.
- Additional Investigations around the former tank
- Additional Investigations in the building areas after demolition
- The Controlled Waters DQRA needs to be updated in light of our comments above. In addition to this, if any of the investigation identifies higher levels of TPH fractions or Arsenic than found during the initial investigations, the DQRA needs to be rerun.

I trust that the above comments are satisfactory but if you require any further information please contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Miss Kate Attrill
Senior Area Planning Officer

Direct dial 01903 703918

Direct e-mail: Kate.attrill@environment-agency.gov.uk