

**LIABILITY SCREENING REPORT**

# Data Review



Property Reviewed

**Unit 1 Factory Lane  
Hepford  
Derbyshire  
DE7 4RX**

Review Prepared For

**Greenborough Pension Management LLP**

Your Reference

**MMWI.12**

Date

**1 November 2010**

Renaissance Regeneration Reference

**CI01101 - Unit 1 Factory Lane**

**Renaissance Regeneration Ltd**

**T 01284 765563  
F 01284 765581  
E [info@renreg.co.uk](mailto:info@renreg.co.uk)**

## Introduction

Renaissance Regeneration was asked by Greenborough Pension Management on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2010 to review the following data:

- Derbyshire County Council Site Investigation, Hepford by Environmental Advisors and Associates and dated February 2010.

This was required to assess the environmental liability associated with the above named property and provide appropriate recommendations for further action. This report is based purely on the information provided and Renaissance Regeneration has not advised as to the applicability of the information prior to commencing this report. Renaissance Regeneration was not requested to identify or source alternative and additional forms of information for the production of this report.

## Review

The report presents the findings of an intrusive Phase II investigation covering Units 1, 4 and 8. The report suggested that Unit 1 was used for plastic coating objects, which involved dipping them in a solvent bath and drying them. There was therefore the potential for contamination of the site by chlorinated solvents.

The investigation involved analysing the vapours within the ground at five locations beneath Unit 1, as well as two locations immediately southeast of Unit 1 and many more further to the south around Unit 8. There was also one borehole advanced through the floor of Unit 1 to take soil samples for laboratory analysis, with a second borehole advanced immediately southeast of Unit 1.

The soil vapour analysis suggested that there may be some volatile contamination beneath the north eastern corner of Unit 1, although results from soil vapour surveys are notoriously unreliable.

The ground beneath the site was found to be a thin layer of rubble over solid clay. The soil samples taken from beneath the site and the neighbouring unit to the southeast (Unit 4) were found to contain minor quantities of heavy metals and solvents, but nothing that poses a significant concern for the continued use of the site. The concentrations found beneath the site were generally acceptable for a residential use, let alone a commercial use with complete concrete-surfacing.

The report showed that there was some modest contamination of Unit 8 about 80m to the south, but the clay soils in this area make it unlikely that such contamination will migrate beneath Unit 1 to an appreciable degree.

The report of 2010 recommended that the concrete flooring of Unit 1 was repaired or replaced if the unit was to continue in plating use.

The report of 2010 assessed the degree of contamination by using target values that are now redundant. This report has re-assessed the concentrations in line with current guidance values and Generic Acceptance Criteria generated by deterministic modelling software.

## Conclusions

The site was not found to be contaminated in early 2010 and the clay soils beneath the site are likely to protect it from pollution emanating from the surrounding properties.

However, the concrete floor of Unit I was noted to be corroded. This could have allowed some recent contamination of the site if it has been used over the past ten years for an activity that uses significant quantities of chemicals. However, the clay soils beneath the site are likely to have restricted this from travelling off the site and adversely affecting neighbouring properties.

The site is unlikely to be determined as Contaminated Land under Part IIA of the EPA 1990. It is also our opinion that the site should not be financially impaired due to environmental matters.

The site is not likely to pollute local water resources.

The site presents a low overall environmental risk for a continued industrial use without redevelopment. However, there may be some future costs associated with contamination if the site is redeveloped in the future.

## Recommendations

The site poses a low environmental liability risk and no further environmental investigation is recommended prior to accepting this property into a pension.

However, it would be wise to ensure that the flooring at the site is competent, especially if the site has been used for potentially polluting activities over the last ten years or will be in the future. A competent floor would protect site users from contamination that may have entered the ground over the last ten years, as well as prevent future releases of chemicals from entering the ground.

## **Appendix**

**Phase II report as provided for review**

[Third Party report removed for reasons of confidentiality]

**Renaissance Regeneration Ltd**

**T 01284 765563**  
**F 01284 765581**  
**E [info@renreg.co.uk](mailto:info@renreg.co.uk)**