

The Planning Inspectorate
National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Our ref: NE/2020/132089/03-L02
Your ref: TR010029
Date: 27 April 2021

Dear Messrs. Allen and McArthur

Procedural Deadline 6.

Application by Highways England for an Order granting Development Consent for the proposed M25 Junction 28 Improvement Scheme

Please find enclosed our comments for procedural deadline 6 relating to the M25 Junction 28 improvement scheme Development Consent Order examination. Since we provided our comments for Procedural Deadline 5 on 13 April 2021, we have reviewed the Ground Investigation Report (GIR) submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-023, REP1-024 and REP1-025].

This was the subject of the Examiners Written Question GS 2.1 as part of WQ2, as follows:

Question **GS 2.1** – *Ground Investigation Report*

Comment on the adequacy of the Ground Investigation Report (GIR) submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-023, REP1-024 and REP1-025] and the Applicant's response as set out at ISH1, confirmed in its oral submissions at Deadline 4 [REP4-016] that an outline Materials Management Plan does not need to be submitted into the Examination.

The Environment Agency reviews land contamination assessments from a groundwater and controlled waters quality perspective. We are satisfied with the adequacy of the GIR in terms of the level of investigation and assessment of the environmental conditions at the site.

The GIR has provided the following information:

- Further discussion of the risk to deeper groundwater aquifers that has been assessed is confirmed as being very low risk.
- The risk of soil-derived leachate and perched groundwater within historic deposits impacting on the Weald Brook and River Ingrebourne is probably the highest controlled waters risk associated with the scheme. The GIR investigates this further and concludes "*it is recommended that: the risk to surface water receptors from soil-derived leachate and perched water within the landfill is considered during detailed design, such that the risks are managed to an appropriate level.*" Further details of potential mitigations are provided in the environmental risk register in the appendices including site attendance by a geo-technical

Cont/d..

engineer, to identify suitable materials from preventing pathways from manifesting, or including ground improvement or liners in the detailed design for specific elements of the scheme to mitigate against these potential pathways.

- A piling risk assessment will be prepared as part of the final design.

We believe the potential mitigation measures identified above are acceptable in principle and we understand that further submissions will be provided in relation to Requirement 6 (Contaminated Land and Groundwater) of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the Development Consent Order, and the Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC). We look forward to reviewing those submissions in due course.

We have no objections to the submission of a Materials Management Plan for those areas of the scheme that are not controlled wastes prior to development as set out within Requirement 4 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) and the REAC.

The only outstanding issue is the decision from our National Permitting Service (NPS) on the assessment of the draft Waste Recovery Plan. This provides the applicant's approach to utilising the controlled wastes on site and underpins some of the recent changes made to the scheme. A positive outcome will enable the applicant to apply for the appropriate Environmental Permit. We hope to issue our decision shortly at which point we will update the Examiners.

We look forward to continuing to work with the applicant on the detailed design stages of the project to ensure the best environmental outcome for this project. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely

Keira Murphy
Planning Specialist

Direct dial [REDACTED]

E-mail HNLsustainablePlaces@environment-agency.gov.uk