#### creating a better place



Mr Chay Dempster Hertfordshire County Council Minerals & Waste Planning County Hall Pegs Lane Hertford Hertfordshire SG13 8DN Our ref:NE/2018/128672/01-L01Your ref:PL\0755\16

Date:

6 July 2018

Dear Chay

#### Land at Hatfield Aerodrome, off Hatfield Road

#### Discharge of condition 31 - Groundwater management plan.

Thank you for your patience whilst we reviewed the documents. We have the following comments for you regarding the information submitted for the groundwater management plan and have also provided some comments regarding some of the other draft conditions below.

#### **Comments regarding condition 31**

We have reviewed:

DRAFT Groundwater and Water Management Plan. Prepared for Brett Aggregates Limited by SLR Consulting Limited. SLR Ref: 403.01009.00190. Version No: Draft FINAL. Date: 25 May 2018. Including Appendices 01, 03, 05 and Drawing 01; Excluding Appendices 02 and 04.

The document is submitted as a discharge of condition and the title and introduction of the main report are phrased in terms of the planning having been granted. The document will need to be updated once the decision notice is final, to ensure it reflects the correct planning condition numbers and the wording of the planning conditions.

In a couple of places, a cross reference is marked as "Error! Reference source not found". These need to be corrected in the final version.

This report was produced before the applicant had completed a pumping trial on the site (under a Section 32 of the Water Resources Act 1991). We believe the pumping trial is now complete. The report needs to be updated in light of the findings of that pumping trial. We strongly recommend the applicant meets with relevant people from our organisation and Affinity Water in order to discuss the results of the pumping trial, the updated water management plan and any abstraction licence (made in accordance with the Water Resources Act 1991) because the issues and resolutions are interdependent.

The water management plan should consider potential impacts to any nearby non-Environment Agency regulated groundwater/surface water abstractions (i.e. private



water supplies) as well as potential contingency action, should the quality or quantity of any such abstractions be negatively impacted by the site activities during the lifetime of the development.

Table 2-3 Summary of Predicted Volumes of Water to be Managed indicates in the row 'Total estimated discharge to LMH Lagoon' that the Discharge Location is the UMH Lagoon. We suspect this is a typo but it needs to be corrected in the final version of this report because under **no circumstances** must groundwater from the lower mineral horizon enter the upper mineral horizon.

We welcome the proposals for performance review and meetings to include ourselves, Herts County Council and Affinity Water as suggested in section 2.3.4 Lagoon Discharge Management. It is important that both bromate and bromide concentrations should be considered in these reviews and meetings. It is also important that the reviews, meetings and implementation of any contingency action deemed necessary is guaranteed throughout the lifetime of the development – hence the suggested additions to planning condition 30 below.

In section 2.4 Restoration Phase Water Management and 2.4.2 UMA Infiltration Lagoons it is described that the Lower Mineral Lagoon will be sealed with site won, low permeability backfill. How will this seal be verified as durable in the longer term? We are concerned that integrity of the seal will be compromised in periods of high groundwater in the lower horizon and chalk.

Section 3 on monitoring, taken with Drawing 1, needs some clarification:

- footnotes for Table 3-1
- it is debatable that some of the points are as described on the 3rd column of Table 3-1,
- some points described in the table are not shown on the drawing and vice versa
- monitoring as described on Table 3-1 is limited NE of the site.
- there is not a clear explanation of why the monitoring points have been selected for permit, planning, or additional.
- What is the purpose of the "additional" designation?
- BHA is down as Additional but it is said to be replacing BHJ which is described as a permit monitoring point.
- In Table 3-1, what does BH201L(u) and BH201L(l) mean?
- There is no information on the duration of the monitoring. We would normally expect it to continue 2 years beyond the activities covered by the planning consent unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Section 3.2 should include information on groundwater level monitoring and reporting, as required by planning condition 30.

Section 3.6 refers to data to be provided to Affinity Water. This information should also be passed to us.

Analytical suites should include those determinands which could be present as a result of the former use of the site as an airfield and aeroplane construction site, including contaminants associated with unexploded/exploded ordnance if they are suspected to be present.

## Permit advice

## Monitoring

There is a significant degree of overlap between the planning/permitting with regard to groundwater monitoring. It would be very useful to have a full list of all the planning and permitting requirements to include in a monitoring schedule detailing all boreholes locations, monitoring frequency and required analysis and then highlighted either identifying them for **planning** or **permitting** requirement or **both**. This will ensure the monitoring is submitted to the correct body at the correct time.

## Engineered Design and phasing of development

With regard to the pumping trials, we have concerns such additional work may influence the engineered design or phasing for the landfill. If so this may require amendments to the Environmental Permit.

# **Other conditions on Decision Notice**

The Planning Application has not yet been formally decided. We have noticed a few small items in the draft Decision Notice that we would like you to consider revising:

We suggest the following additions to Condition 30 (in red below), which would help to provide more certainty of consultation with ourselves and Water companies regarding the water management plan throughout the lifetime of the development as well as flexibility to adapt the water management plan if the situation on site changes.

30. Prior to the commencement of the works shown on drawing HQ 3/6 Initial Site Preparation Dec 2015, a Groundwater Management Plan shall be submitted and approved by the Mineral Planning Authority. The Groundwater Management Plan shall include:

*i.* details of construction and water management during construction of the two infiltration lagoons.

*ii. clarification of the restored site discharge point for the UML back-drain. iii. a long-term groundwater monitoring plan to continue during and post the operational phase.* 

# iv a mechanism for periodic review.

The plan should include monitoring and reporting programs, location of monitoring points including additional monitoring boreholes particularly in the vicinity of the infiltration lagoons, analytical suites, limits of detection and groundwater level monitoring. Details of contingency actions in the event of impact shall also be included. The two infiltration lagoons and back drain shall be constructed in accordance with the approved

Groundwater Management Plan prior to the commencement of mineral extraction. Groundwater monitoring shall be conducted by the Mineral Operator in accordance with the long-term groundwater monitoring plan for the lifetime of the development.

Prior to mineral extraction in each Phase, the Groundwater Management plan shall be reviewed and an updated plan submitted and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority.

The management of water shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan, or as otherwise agreed by the Mineral Planning Authority under the periodic review process, for the lifetime of the development.

## Reason:

to protect controlled waters throughout the mineral extraction phasing; to ensure there is no deleterious impact to groundwater quality; in accordance with Policy 16 (Soil, Air and Water) of the Hertfordshire Waste Core Strategy 2012 to prevent development that would have an unacceptable risk or adversely affect water pollution; to minimise the risks associated with increased flood risk, impacts on the flow and quantity of surface and groundwater and migration of contamination from the site, in accordance with paragraph 143 of the NPPF.

In addition we have the following observations on these draft conditions:

- Condition 30 iii- This should read "monitoring points", not "monitoring pints" The Reason for Condition 30 ends mid-sentence – is this a typo?
- Condition 40 Only inert waste comprising excavation material shall be deposited /disposed of at the site. Inert waste specifically excludes any material that has been through a screening process, such as at a waste transfer station, including trommel fines, residues or other waste material. The condition does not appear to comply with the Landfill Directive which requires pre-treatment of all waste destined for disposal to landfill. Further, the Environmental Permit allows concrete and brick rubble. The Hydrogeological Risk Assessment that was supplied with the Permit application indicates such wastes can be accepted at the site without posing a risk to the environment. The EA has re-consulted with Herts CC, Welwyn-Hatfield BC and St Albans district council, please respond to the Environmental Permit Consultation with any valid concerns.

Condition 47 No solid matter shall be deposited so that it passes or is likely to pass into any watercourse. Reason: to prevent contamination of groundwater. We believe there might be a Wording discrepancy. This should relate to surface water, not groundwater?

Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

# Mr Kai Mitchell Planning Specialist

Tel: 0203 0259074 E-mail HNLSustainablePlaces@environment-agency.gov.uk