From: Martschenko, David
Sent:2 Apr 2026 11:39:38 +0100
To: Godson, Rebecca
Cc: Development;Strutt, Philip
Subject:RE: Planning Consultation - AVA/2025/0691
Attachments: Annotated site plan.png, Plant .png, 1938.png, 1975.png

Rebecca

Planning application AVA/2025/0691 Demolition of existing cultural outbuildings, erection of 5 dwellings Bargate Farm, The Croft, Bargate

I acknowledge receipt of your consultation requests dated 21 November 2025 and 18 February 2026. I have reviewed the planning application and supporting documentation. On behalf of Environmental Health as consultee to the Local Planning Authority, I make the following comments and observations.

The Applicant is proposing to demolish agricultural buildings associated with Bargate Farm. The farmhouse bungalow is to be retained. The development site is situated within the urban envelope of Bargate village. Existing residential development is to the north, south and east beyond Belper Road. Open agricultural fields to the west.

I have reviewed our GIS contaminated land database a spatial database of contaminative features derived from various sources compiled in response to our Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA) Part IIA obligations. No significant contaminative features were identified.

The following geo-environmental reports have been submitted in support of the application:

- GeoDyne Combined Phase I Desk Study and Phase II Exploratory Investigation D45026, August 2025

Phase 1

A Phase 1 Contaminated Land Assessment should comprise: (a) a review of desktop information sources, (b) a site walkover, appraisal and photographs, (c) discussions with the current owner, occupier, operator and staff.

The submitted Phase 1 CLA includes a review of desktop resources.

- Historic mapping shows the site undeveloped until the 1910s and an orchid until the 1930s before the development of Bargate Farm. Successive development has since occurred with the farm layout remaining largely the same from the 1990s. The appended historic maps (and other mapping) are blacked-out and unavailable for review.
- The site geology is mostly Pennine Lower Coal Measures Formation. A fault is present on-site. No superficial deposits are anticipated. The bedrock is a Secondary A Aquifer.
- No landfills or hazardous industry is located nearby.
- The development site isn□t located in a □High Risk Area□ and no historical mining activity has been identified.

A site walkover was undertaken in July 2025. At the time of the site visit, the site is occupied by existing agricultural buildings. The buildings are currently being used to store wood and private vehicles. No evidence of fuel storage or the maintenance of agricultural plant and / or machinery was observed. No cattle or horses are present.

An annotated site plan is available in Appendix III. General photographic views of the site are available in Appendix IV.

However, the building marked □A□ on the attached plan is described as an □agricultural storage building□. No further appraisal of this building is available and no photographs are appended. An appended photograph shows a silver/metal piece of machinery or plant which has also not been identified.

Historically, the farm is understood to have been in equestrian and livestock (cattle) rearing use. The Consultant states:

□*It is understood from the current landowner that the site was purchased around 25 years ago and the buildings have not been used to house cattle within this period.*□

This begs the question how has the current landowner used the property in the last 25 years? Insufficient local enquiries have been made to identify the use of potentially contaminative materials and activities within this time period.

The Consultant concludes the Phase I CLA in stating:

Based on the information obtained from our desk study works, no significant on or off-site sources of potentially hazardous ground gases (i.e. carbon dioxide and methane) have been identified.

Nonetheless, localised sources of contaminants could be present in (presumed) on-site made-ground. The Preliminary Conceptual Site Model has determined a Low/Moderate risk to end users and the Consultant recommends a Phase II CLA. At this stage, the conclusions appear reasonable subject to the following actions.

1. Presentation of the blacked-out historical maps
2. A detailed account of building A on the attached plan, including photographic evidence of observations
3. Identification of machinery/plant in the attached photograph
4. Liaison with the current landowner to populate the below screening questions:

a. Knowledge of infilled ponds?
b. Knowledge of made ground / imported soils?
c. Location of fuel tanks, past and present?
d. Significant losses of fuels, oils, lubricants or solvents?
e. Disposal by burning of materials, particularly where this has occurred in the same location?
f. Disposal by burial including animal carcasses?
g. Long term (greater than 1 year) manure heaps and slurry lagoons?
h. Use of sheep dip pits?
i. Use of pesticides?
j. Any other activities which might have caused ground contamination?

Phase 2

An intrusive, exploratory investigation was undertaken on the 17 July 2025. Eight window sample boreholes (WS1 WS8) were advanced to a maximum depth of 3.0mblg. No boreholes were retained for ground gas or ground water sampling/monitoring. The location of the boreholes are presented in Appendix XI. The borehole logs are presented in Appendix XII.

The sampling strategy and borehole rationale is presented in Section 7.6. Boreholes have been advanced to target current and historic farm buildings and proposed private rear gardens. In the absence of any discrete potentially contaminative sources, this strategy appears reasonable. Table 11 shows WS1, WS2, WS5 & WS6 targeting historic buildings; however, an examination of Figure 5 □ 1938 Historical Map Data and Figure 6 □ 1975 Historical Map Data would suggest that neither WS5 nor WS6 are on the footprint of historic buildings. Moreover, a number of other historic buildings have not been targeted. Existing building □A□ (as discussed above) has again evaded scrutiny.

Ground conditions are recorded as made ground to a maximum depth of 1.05mblg. The made-ground generally comprises gravels of sandstone, limestone and brick fragments in a sandy matrix. The made-ground is underlain by natural strata comprising silty sand or silty clay. A 0.6m layer of clay was found in WS4 between the MG sandy gravel and natural strata.

The Consultant did not observe any visual or olfactory evidence of significant soil contamination.

The Consultant submitted eight soil samples for laboratory chemical analysis for a standard suite of environmental contaminants. This did not include TPH but no evidence of petroleum storage or spillage has been observed at this time. Five samples were obtained from made-ground and three from natural strata. No samples were submitted from WS3 & WS6. A significant exceedance for arsenic is identified in made-ground in WS02 @ 0.6-0.7mblg as well as asbestos fibres in WS1 & WS5. No statistical analysis has been undertaken.

At this stage, the made-ground is unsuitable for near-surface retention. The refined conceptual site model has determined a moderate risk to end users and remedial action is required. The natural strata can generally be considered uncontaminated.

No investigation of ground gas or ground water has been undertaken.

On balance, Environmental Health is satisfied with the Phase II CLA field work and conclusions □ subject to the above Phase I additional actions. Whilst not every existing or historical building has been targeted, given the findings thus far and the relative heterogeneity of the made-ground, it is unlikely that additional testing will reveal significantly different ground conditions or change the conceptual site model. Ground gas and ground water monitoring does not appear justified at this time.

Initial Remedial Proposal

The Consultant has initially recommended an engineered cover system in areas of soft landscaping to break the identified pollution linkage. In principle, this course of action is acceptable to Environmental Health. The Developer may wish to consider statistical analysis and bioavailability testing.

Summary

Environmental Health is satisfied with the work undertaken so far; however, additional Phase I work is required see above. This includes liaison with the current landowner to establish land use in the past 25 years. Should these actions identify additional potential sources of contamination, additional Phase 2 work maybe required.

There are two options to proceed. I can recommend full contaminated land conditions to enable the additional work to be completed and presented at discharge application, or, the additional work can be completed at full application and if satisfactory, tailor the condition to reflect the work already done.

Please advise.

Regards

David Martschenko | **Scientific Officer**

Amber Valley **Borough Council**
Pollution Control (Operations) | Town Hall, Market Place, Ripley, Derbyshire, DE5 3BT
Email: david.martschenko@ambervalley.gov.uk | Telephone (Direct): 01773 841318; (Office): 01773 841335 | www.ambervalley.gov.uk

Making a Difference for Amber Valley

If you wish to make a freedom of information request, please do not send it to this email address, instead please resend it to foi@ambervalley.gov.uk

Please note that e-mails larger than **25MB** will not be accepted at the above e-mail address.

From: development@ambervalley.gov.uk <development@ambervalley.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 November 2025 18:30
To: Martschenko, David <David.Martschenko@ambervalley.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Consultation - AVA/2025/0691

Dear Sir/Madam

Consultee Type: EH Pollution Control (Contamination/Air Quality)
Our Ref: AVA/2025/0691

Proposal:
Proposed demolition of existing agricultural outbuildings, erection of 5 dwellings with associated infrastructure and new double garage for the existing bungalow.

Development Type:
Dwellings 9 or less

Location:
Bargate Farm The Croft Bargate Belper Derbyshire DE56 1SQ

Applicant:
Chevin Homes (Mickleover) Ltd
44 Friar Gate Derby Derbyshire DE1 1DA United Kingdom

Case Officer Details:
Name: Rebecca Godson
Telephone: 01773 841667
E Mail: rebecca.smith@ambervalley.gov.uk

I enclose details of this application and would be pleased to receive any comments you may have within the next 21 days.

The Application should be available to view on our website within the next 24 hours.

There is a comments button that you can click on to make comments regarding an application (please see the link below that will take you directly to this planning application) or alternatively you can send a direct email to development@ambervalley.gov.uk

https://www.ambervalley.gov.uk/planning/development-management/view-a-planning-application/?appnumber=AVA-2025-0691

Please let the case officer know if you cannot reply by then.

Sarah Brooks
Planning Manager