

Contaminated Land

I have considered the [EIA Scoping Report](#) and in particular sections 2.2-2.12 and appendix 5, 13 and 14. It is noted that the Scoping Report concludes that the *Applicant considers that Land Contamination and Ground Conditions can be scoped out for EIA purposes* and example planning conditions that could be attached to an outline planning permission are proposed. I have the following comments and observations:

- Appendix 5 includes a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) Report dated April 2026 (Brownfield Solutions Limited) this relies on a previous PRA from April 2014 (e3P). It is noted that the 2014 report includes site investigation data (trial pits) which would provide beneficial information. We do not have a copy of this report, please can this be provided.
- The redline boundary of the application site is reported to include an historic landfill in the north which received inert waste. A second landfill, an infilled reservoir is adjacent to the southern boundary. A plan of this is provided within the report and can be seen on the [Illustrative Masterplan](#) submitted for the Screening Opinion Application 73108. The landfill outside the redline boundary is shown on the plan as a proposed public open space (subject to Change of Use application).
- The attached PRA pre dates an environmental search we undertook for the consultant in May 2026. This provided archival planning and enforcement information with regards to the two landfills which are pertinent to this application. In particular:
 - The landfill within the redline boundary, C038, North of Gin Hall was approved by planning in 1987 and 1991 for the extraction of clay for use on the adjacent landfill and backfilling with construction industry waste. The planning file indicates that material was deposited outside of the permitted area and above permitted levels. Waste noted onsite included plastics, glass, fabric, timber, rubber tyres, paper, packaging and metals. Enforcement notices were issued at the time.
 - The landfill adjacent to the redline boundary, C017, Gin Hall had planning permission for tipping granted in 1985 and initially ceased in 1993. The operator was found guilty the following year of tipping after the waste licence was surrendered and it would appear from the historical record that tipping continued without planning permission for a further four years. The site was reported to have been over tipped, including areas outside the permitted boundary. Archive information indicates that the area of tipping may extend out from the original basin to *Walmersley Road to the west and a public footpath to the north*. Following concerns regarding landfill gas migration, monitoring was undertaken in and around nearby residential properties in 1994. Sampling was also undertaken by the NRA (now the Environment Agency) in 1994 to investigate the impact on Walmersley Brook. A landfill gas control system was required by the planning approvals, but it is unclear from the archive records whether any such system was installed.

- It is understood the spreading of biosolids for surface restoration at both sites was carried out in 2005; the records indicate that this was without planning permission.
- The outcome of the enforcement action on both sites is not recorded in the planning archive, but Planning Enforcement colleagues have advised that officer notes from 2007 indicate that the site had been grassed over and all equipment removed. No further action was taken with regards to the notices.
- Given the above, we would recommend that the PRA be revised to include the environmental search information and the conceptual site model and risk assessment be updated accordingly.
- The applicant wishes to have site investigation works agreed via condition at the outline stage. In accordance with Bury Council's [Developers Guide](#), any major planning application on a former landfill site should be supported with a Site Investigation and Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (with adequate gas monitoring). As such, we would recommend refusal of any application without out such information.
- Consultation with the Environment Agency is recommended given the potential Waste Management issues and controlled water risks the site and adjacent land may present.

Given the deficiencies in the submitted information I would advise that we have insufficient information to consider this application and advise whether land affected by contamination can be scoped out. Section 2.3 notes that the *planning and regulatory regime at the time of the landfilling of the former reservoir will have sought to avoid spatial impacts on existing nearby residents, neighbouring land and the local environment generally*. The archival planning records do not indicate this to be the case.

Air Quality

An Air Quality Assessment (Enzygo Limited, March 2026), is contained within Appendix 7 of the scoping report. It is noted that section 2.16 states that the *submitted Air Quality Assessment demonstrates that the development would not give rise to likely significant environmental effects. All potential impacts identified can be managed as part of the application process*. Predicted impacts of NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations during the operational phase were modelled and found to be negligible at all sensitive receptor locations within the vicinity of the site. As such, with good site management of dust, no mitigation is required. The report recommends that a dust management plan is produced and electric vehicle charging infrastructure be provided. We are satisfied with the conclusions of the assessment and recommend that a dust management plan is submitted in support of an application alongside details of the proposed electric vehicle charging infrastructure. As such we confirm that air quality can be scoped out and managed via the normal planning process.