

Our Ref: BF/DAF/Councils/Renf/2008
Your Ref: 06/0602/PP

Director of Planning & Transport
Renfrewshire Council
South Building
Cotton Street
PAISLEY
PA1 1LL

If telephoning ask for:
Brian Fotheringham

7 November 2008

Dear Sir

**CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION ACCOMPANIED BY AN
ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT
REDEVELOPMENT OF ROYAL ORDNANCE FACTORY, BISHOPTON
OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE REGENERATION OF THE SITE TO FORM A MIXED
USE COMMUNITY GROWTH AREA APPLICATION REFERENCE: 06/0602/PP
AMENDED AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Thank you for your consultation letter received on 30 September in respect of the above proposal.

SEPA would offer the following comments on the additional correspondence received regarding the above proposals;

Overview

SEPA would reiterate its previous comments that it remains supportive of the redevelopment of the site which results in the remediation of contaminated land provided the process to achieve this goal safeguards the environment at every step. Given both the scale and the complexity of this proposal it was accepted that the level of information provided would be dictated by the specific stage reached in the planning and regulatory processes. It was accepted that at the outline masterplan application stage, which sought approval for the development in principle, there were areas of information regarding the detailed design which had yet to be established. This is not unusual for a development of this kind. However, SEPA considered that there are areas within the Environmental Statement which required to be expanded to provide greater detail and certainty. This included sections on the water environment; including engineering and flood risk, and sections on the impact of the remediation processes.

On the basis that the Environmental Statement did not provide sufficient detail on the implementation of the development in relation to the water environment, SEPA **objected** to this application. SEPA was however satisfied that these points could be addressed at the detailed planning application stage. SEPA's objection could therefore be addressed by the inclusion of conditions in any outline planning consent granted which required these issues to be addressed to the satisfaction of the Council, in consultation with SEPA.

Cont'd / ...



Chairman
David Sigsworth

Chief Executive
Dr Campbell Gemell

East Kilbride Office
Redwood Crescent, Peel Park, East Kilbride G74 5PP
tel 01355 574200 fax 01355 574688
www.sepa.org.uk

The applicant has now submitted additional information regarding a number of issues pertinent to SEPA's interests and we would offer the following revised comments which must be read in conjunction with our previous correspondence;

1. The applicant (via Upton McGougan) has submitted a supplementary note to the Flood Risk Assessment which primarily contains details of the alterations made to the surface water drainage strategy for the site.
2. The indicative SUDS strategy for the site for the site takes account of the constraints associated with the site
3. The concerns raised by BAA and the recommendations of AOA Advice Note 6 have been noted and accordingly the design of the SUDS ponds have been altered to reduce the risk of bird strike, by reducing the areas of open water, appropriate planting of vegetation, etc.
4. SEPA would reiterate that all surface water drainage arising at the site requires to be treated, inclusive of roof drainage.
5. SEPA would continue to emphasise the importance of the management train scenario which encourages source, site and regional control measures whilst recognising that the constraints within particular land allocations will ultimately determine the likelihood of constructing sustainable source control systems.
6. The design of the ponds is clearly aimed at satisfying the requirements of BAA, however the consequence of these actions will significantly limit the opportunity to maximise biodiversity within the ponds. SEPA acknowledges the principle which defines this approach.
7. The ponds have been designed to deliver the required treatment (Vt) and to comply with the requirements of The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2005 (as amended). Issues relating to discharge rates and the provision of attenuation are the responsibility of Renfrewshire Council.
8. SEPA would also highlight that pervious road surfaces are now being adopted by local authorities and that further consideration should be given to this methodology.
9. In 2009, a new document detailing SUDS for Roads is to be published and SEPA would state that this best practice document will assist in further shaping the SUDS strategy for the site.

Remediation Strategy

SEPA's previous response clearly outlines our views on the remediation and reclamation strategy for the site and what additional works are required to satisfy our concerns and requirements.

The applicant has reiterated that the strategy for the enablement of the site for development is investigation, decontamination, demolition and construction. SEPA accepts this approach which will be applied to each stage of the land zoned for development.

The applicant has indicated the phasing of the regeneration of the site and that initial works will focus on the western area of the site and the early need to create new habitat for displaced wildlife.

Cont'd /...

Decontamination of Buildings by Burning

While recognising that the detailed remediation of the site is a matter for the detailed planning application, SEPA would provide the following comments on the information submitted:

SEPA would still disagree with BAE's assessment that the ADMS model is the considered to be the most suitable model for assessing impact from open burn scenarios. It is only "industry standard" for point source emissions from controlled and not variable combustion conditions. SEPA considers that there are more suitable models available for open fires.

ADMS has a margin of error up to 50% which increases when assessing short-term impacts, which is the case in this scenario. SEPA notes BAE's attempts to provide more confidence in the model by testing outputs against monitoring conducted at a similar burn at Chorley, Lancashire. However, as previously stated at the meeting held in July 2008, this cannot be accepted as validation of the model.

SEPA agrees with BAE's proposal to apply a "safe burn" zone of 400 metres for small buildings from receptors and 1200 metres for large buildings. This should provide a greater level of confidence when assessing the impact on local air quality and subsequently upon human health from the decontamination process. However, as these distances are based on ADMS modelling, it is important that the proposed onsite monitoring systems are scrutinised properly and that onsite management of the burn in relation to weather conditions, removal of smoking materials and so on are effectively implemented.

Foul Drainage

The applicant and Scottish Water have made significant progress in realising a satisfactory solution for the disposal of foul drainage arising at the site. SEPA is pleased to note that the Drainage Impact Assessment undertaken for the redevelopment of ROF Bishopton has concluded that the impact on the existing public sewerage network can be mitigated by the developer through a combination of the provision of new sewerage infrastructure for the site and some upgrading of existing SW infrastructure. Provided the outcome of these works results in no detriment to the water environment then SEPA's interests should not be compromised by these proposals.

SEPA would however confirm that we are generally opposed to the provision of emergency overflow facilities from sewage pumping stations and we would expect the systems to be designed to provide adequate storage in the event of electrical or mechanical breakdown. SEPA would expect Scottish Water to support our stance on this matter.

SEPA would also expect early contact from the applicant regarding the proposed use of the existing private sewage treatment facility at the site, as this issue could have licensing implications in respect of The Water Environment (Controlled Activities)(Scotland) Regulations 2005 (as amended). It should not be assumed that SEPA will approve this scenario.

Flora and Fauna

SEPA would confirm that any construction works envisaged in and around the vicinity of otter holts and other protected species and/or which specifically involve engineering activities adjacent to 'wildlife corridors' will require to be discussed with SEPA and SNH. This include the 'planting' of the proposed ponds, as SNH may seek to ensure that the trees, bushes, etc, that are to be planted are suitable for use

Cont'd/...

Director of Planning & Transport
Renfrewshire Council

7 November 2008

The construction of bridges, culverts, roads and bank modifications may require to be licensed under CAR, and although the CAR licence application process is regulated by SEPA, it is inevitable that dialogue between SNH and SEPA will be necessary to ensure no conflict of interest.

Effects on Watercourses

The previous ES acknowledged the significant pollution problems and the associated impact that could occur to the flora and fauna with a civil engineering project of this magnitude, further exacerbated by the existing contamination which exists at the site and the implications associated with the extent of the remediation works that will also be undertaken.

The ES highlights the need for Method Statements, use of SEPA's PPG notes, monitoring of watercourses, good housekeeping, etc. that are proposed during the works and SEPA accepts that this standard approach is applicable for this project, however the level of detail, micro-siting and education of all contractors is fundamental to the success of these measures.

As previously mentioned, all modifications (even though they may involve long term habitat enhancement) to existing waterbodies, inclusive of the riparian zone, will require to be discussed, justified, agreed and authorised under CAR. The loss of many minor ditches and the Cordite Burn are obvious examples and further details on the extent of these proposed works is required.

It should therefore not be assumed that realignment of watercourses at the site has been approved by SEPA and that although the rationale, in terms of flood risk strategy, necessitates the need for a strategic site solution, SEPA would confirm that until the relevant CAR applications are received, and duly granted by SEPA, then the proposed alterations to the watercourses, etc. within the site should be clearly viewed to be the applicant's preferred options and that SEPA will offer detailed comments on these planned works on receipt of the detailed level of information. However, SEPA recognise that it is imperative that there is no conflict between Planning and Environmental Controls. As previously stated, SEPA requires sufficient information at the detailed stage to ensure that the works proposed at the site are capable of being authorised under CAR.

SEPA does accept that the potential exists to improve the aquatic ecosystem throughout the site for fish migration, etc. and that the ES highlights the need for discussions with SEPA and SNH on the timing of works, design of fish passes, etc., however as the majority of these issues were assessed before the implementation of CAR, SEPA would recommend that the applicant reassesses the implications of this statutory legislation, in relation to the extensive engineering measures proposed at ROF Bishopton.

Yours faithfully



Brian Fotheringham
Senior Planning Officer