

SITE CONDITION REPORT

For full details, see H5 *SCR guide for applicants* v2.0 4 August 2008

COMPLETE SECTIONS 1-3 AND SUBMIT WITH APPLICATION

DURING THE LIFE OF THE PERMIT: MAINTAIN SECTIONS 4-7

AT SURRENDER: ADD NEW DOC REFERENCE IN 1.0; COMPLETE SECTIONS 8-10; & SUBMIT WITH YOUR SURRENDER APPLICATION.

1.0 SITE DETAILS	
Name of the applicant	Crown Chicken Limited
Activity address	Falcons Hall Farm Poultry Unit, Falcons Hall Farm, Finningham Road, Rickinghall, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 1LP
National grid reference	Site centred on TM 04668 73654 ⁽¹²⁾
Document reference and dates for Site Condition Report at permit application and surrender	1. Created SCR for Falcons Hall Farm Poultry Unit in June 2022 using desk top study to identify and examine in broad terms readily available information without any intrusive investigation. SCR relates to extending the installation boundary to enclose approx. 2.9ha agricultural land to erect 4no additional poultry houses B1,B2,B3&B4 approx. 280m to northeast of 5no existing poultry houses operated under an environmental permit since 2012. SCR is a stand-alone record in addition to the original SCR for the permit application.
Document references for site plans (including location and boundaries)	2. Groundsure Insights ⁽⁹⁾ 21/06/2022; Centre of pond...33m from Falcon Hall, Finningham Road 159m from unnamed road, Finningham Road, Rickinghall Superior, IP22 1LP created at the 1:2500 scale showing existing and extended installation boundary marked in green and enclosure of approx. 2.9ha additional agricultural land for 4no additional poultry houses. Combined site layout and drainage plans for existing and additional houses with sources of releases, emission points and drainage routes.

Note:

In Part A of the application form, you must give us details of the site's location and provide us with a site plan. We need a detailed site plan (or plans) showing:

- Site location, the area covered by the site condition report, and the location and nature of the activities and/or waste facilities on the site.
- Locations of receptors, sources of emissions/releases, and monitoring points.
- Site drainage.
- Site surfacing.

If this information is not shown on the site plan required by Part A of the application form, then you should submit the additional plan or plans with this site condition report.

2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue	
<p>Environmental setting including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • geology • hydrogeology • surface waters 	<p><u>Location</u></p> <p>1. Falcons Hall Farm Poultry Unit is situated approx. 9km southwest of the town of Diss in Norfolk. Existing boundary being extended on to undeveloped agricultural land approx. 200m off the west side of the B1113 Finningham Road in Rickingham to be enclosed to erect 4no poultry houses. Site is accessible via existing private road to Falcons Hall Farm west side of Finningham Road.</p> <p><u>Existing Site Layout & Topography</u></p> <p>2. Site is undeveloped agricultural land. Mid-Suffolk District Council have granted planning permission ⁽¹⁰⁾ for erection of 4no poultry rearing buildings with connecting service corridor and admin block; 4no bulk feed bins, water tank, mains electric shed and external generator.</p> <p>3. Site is located in National Character Area Profile: 83 South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands ⁽¹¹⁾ Characterised by a large plateau area of chalky glacial till that is generally flat or only gently undulating but can be locally concave. The edges of the plateau have been dissected by watercourses that form notable slopes, especially along the tributaries of the meandering River Waveney to the north. Fragmented ancient woodland, game copses, shelterbelts, and carr woodland as well as hedgerow trees provide a treed landscape, despite much boundary loss. Land surrounding site being used for agriculture - fields mostly under arable cultivation dominated by cereals, rapeseed and break-cropping of sugar beet, and pastures, and woodland.</p> <p>4. Plandescil Flood Risk Assessment prepared for the planning application reported ground levels vary across the site from 44.79m above ordnance datum Newlyn (AODN) in the northwest, to 51.11 AODN in the southeast⁽¹³⁾. The surrounding land outside of the site boundary falls away in the northwest towards Falcons Hall Farm and rises up gently in the southeast towards Finningham Road.</p> <p><u>Geology</u></p> <p>5. The majority of the site is underlain by Head (Clay, Silt, Sand, and Gravel) Superficial Deposits ⁽¹⁾, with the southern extent of the main site area and northern extent of the existing access underlain by Lowestoft Formation</p>

	<p>(Diamicton) Superficial Deposits. Crag Group (Sand) Bedrock is located at depth along the southern and eastern extents of the main site area with White Chalk Subgroup Bedrock comprising Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, Seaford Chalk Formation, Newhaven Chalk Formation and Culver Chalk Formation (Undifferentiated) located at depth along the existing access and northern and western extent of the main site area. This is consistent with the findings of the Groundsure Insight report ⁽⁷⁾.</p> <p>6. Two BGS borehole records are located within 700m of the site boundary⁽¹⁾. To establish the ground conditions surrounding the site the logs of the borehole records have been reviewed below.</p> <p>7. Borehole TM07SW43 is located 510m west of the site at an approximate ground level of 55.8m AOD. The log comprises approximately 0.3m of topsoil, below which was stiff grey and brown Clay to approximately 10.1m below ground level (bgl). Below 10.1m bgl comprised 0.7m of silt, followed by a 0.6m layer of silty clay. Chalk Bedrock was encountered from 23.3m bgl.</p> <p>8. Borehole TM07SE15 is located 700m south-east of the site at an approximate ground level of 61.5m AOD. The log comprises approximately 0.2m of topsoil, below which was stiff grey and orange Clay to approximately 0.7m bgl, followed by a 0.2m layer of very clayey sand. Below this comprised a 11.1m thick layer of stiff grey and brown Clay. Chalk Bedrock was encountered from 26.5m bgl</p> <p>9. Superficial deposits are also known as 'drift'. These are the youngest geological deposits, formed during the Quaternary Period. Head (Clay, Silt, Sand, and Gravel) Superficial Deposits formed up to 3 million years ago. Local environment previously dominated by subaerial slopes. Lowestoft Formation (Diamicton) Superficial Drift Deposits were formed up to 2 million years ago in the Quaternary when the local environment was dominated by ice age conditions. These sedimentary deposits are glacial in origin – detrital, created by the action of ice and melt water, they can form a wide range of deposits and geomorphologies associated with glacial and inter-glacial periods during the Quaternary – chalky till, with outwash sands and gravels, silts, and clays with low to moderate permeability ⁽¹⁾.</p> <p>10. The White Chalk Subgroup is sedimentary Bedrock formed approx. 72 to 94 million years ago in the Cretaceous Period when local environment was dominated by warm chalk seas. These sedimentary rocks are shallow-marine in origin. They are biogenic and detrital, generally comprising</p>
--	--

carbonate forming distinctive beds of chalk and have fractured flow type with very, high permeability ⁽¹⁾.

11. The Head Superficial Deposits have a mixed flow type with very low to high permeability. The Lowestoft Formation Superficial Deposits have a mixed flow type with low to moderate very low to high permeability. The Crag Group Bedrock has a intergranular flow type with high permeability⁽³⁹⁾. The White Chalk Subgroup Bedrock has a fractured flow type with very high permeability ⁽¹⁾.

12. No records for any artificial and made ground onsite ⁽⁷⁾. Artificial and made ground can be associated with potentially contaminated material, unpredictable engineering conditions and instability.

Soil Vulnerability Classification - Leaching Potential

13. The clay soils underlying the site are a very poor infiltration material. The Groundsure Insight ⁽⁷⁾ details the permeability to be low to medium and the Cranfield Soil and Agrifood Institution ⁽²⁾ characterises the soils of the area to be slowly permeable seasonally wet slightly acid but base rich loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage that drain to the stream network.

14. Groundwater onsite has medium vulnerability to pollutants discharged at ground level ⁽³⁾. Where assessment is based on the hydrological, geological, hydrogeological and soil properties. Vulnerability is described as high, medium-high, medium, medium-low, or low.

Hydrogeology

15. Groundwater located at approximately 30-35m AOD, suggesting groundwater to be a minimum of approx. 9.79m below ground level (bgl) ⁽¹⁴⁾.

16. The Superficial Drift Deposits underlying the site are classified as a secondary undifferentiated aquifer ⁽⁷⁾, assigned where it is not possible to attribute a classification. Aquifers have a wide range of water permeability and storage capability and can provide modest amounts of water, but the nature of the rock or the aquifers structure limits their use. Support water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale (such as for private supplies) and remain important in supporting surface water flows in rivers, wetlands, and lakes.

17. Both the white chalk subgroup located beneath the northern extent of the site and the Crag Group located beneath the

	<p>centre and south of the site are classified as a principal aquifer ⁽⁷⁾. Rock that provides significant quantities of water and can support water supply and/or baseflow to rivers, lakes, and wetlands on a strategic scale (drinking water supply). They typically have high intergranular and/or fracture permeability, meaning they usually provide a high level of water storage. Principal aquifers were previously designated major aquifers.</p> <p>18. Groundwater for the secondary aquifer is classified as having medium vulnerability to a pollutant discharged at ground level and low vulnerability for the principal aquifer ⁽⁷⁾. Vulnerability of groundwater to a pollutant discharged at ground level is based on the hydrological, geological, hydrogeological and soil properties within a one-kilometre square grid. Groundwater vulnerability is described as High, Medium, or Low as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High – Areas able to easily transmit pollution to groundwater. They are likely to be characterised by high leaching soils and the absence of low permeability superficial deposits. • Medium – Intermediate between high and low vulnerability. • Low – Areas that provide the greatest protection from pollution. They are likely to be characterised by low leaching soils and/or the presence of superficial deposits characterised by a low permeability. <p>19. The site is located in a groundwater outer catchment Source Protection Zone (Zone 2) ⁽⁷⁾. Environment Agency has defined SPZ around large and public potable groundwater abstraction sites to provide additional protection to safeguard drinking water quality. Zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the zone. Zone 1 is an inner protection zone, 2 is an outer protection zone and zone 3 is the total catchment. Closer the activity, the greater the risk.</p> <p>20. Site is not located inside any Drinking Water Protected Area (Surface Water) or Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Surface Water) ⁽²⁾ where raw water is abstracted from rivers and reservoirs. Raw water needs to be protected to ensure that it is not polluted which could lead to additional purification treatment. The Water Framework Directive requires that Drinking Water Protected Areas 'at risk' of contamination are identified by water companies and the Environment Agency where action to address water contamination will be targeted so that extra purification treatment can be avoided. Drinking Water Safeguard Zones (Surface Water) are</p>
--	--

catchment areas that influence the water quality for respective Drinking Water Protected Area.

21. Site is not located in any Drinking Water Safeguard Zone (Groundwater)⁽²⁾. These are established around public water supplies where additional pollution control measures are needed. The Water Framework Directive requires that Drinking Water Protected Areas are identified and that they are given the necessary protection with the aim of avoiding deterioration in the quality to reduce the level of purification treatment required in the production of drinking water.
22. Nearest active groundwater abstraction is 874m to the north of the site⁽⁷⁾. Licensed to Northumbrian Water Ltd for abstracting for potable water supply. There are no groundwater or surface water abstractions onsite.

Hydrology & Catchment

23. Offsite natural watercourse containing water year-round (in normal circumstances) according to Ordnance Survey Map running along the western boundary of the site and a ditch running along the northern boundary and join in the north-west corner of the site next to the access. Watercourse continues on in a north-westerly direction, alongside the access roadway. It is a tributary of the Little Ouse main river approx. 3km to the north via the Little Ouse (US Thelnetham) water body⁽⁴⁾. The watercourse contains drainage runoff from the surrounding agricultural land and uncontaminated roof and surface water runoff from the poultry site. No surface water features or networks onsite.
24. Water Framework Directive (WFD) surface water bodies may be rivers, lakes estuary or coastal. To achieve the purpose of the Directive, environmental objectives have been set and are reported on for each water body. The progress towards delivery of the objectives is then reported on by the Environment Agency at the end of each six-year cycle. For the Little Ouse (US Thelnetham) waterbody the overall achievement was rated Bad, the ecological achievement was rated Bad, and the chemical achievement was rated as Fail as recently as 2019 ⁽⁴⁾. Reasons for not achieving good and reasons for deterioration include poor nutrient management, land drainage and groundwater abstraction in agricultural and rural land management, and continuous sewage discharge, and groundwater abstraction in the water industry.
25. Groundwater bodies are also covered by the WFD, and the same regime of objectives and reporting detailed in the previous section is in place. The underlying WFD groundwater body onsite is the Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk

and both its overall and chemical rating was poor as recently as 2019 ⁽⁷⁾ .

Flooding

26. Site is not located in an area of flood risk from rivers and the sea⁽⁵⁾. The development is located in Flood Risk Zone 1 with very low risk of flooding onsite, less than 0.1% (1 in 1,000) chance of flooding in any given year.

27. Risk of surface water (flash) flooding onsite is low between 0.1% (1 in 1,000) and 1% (1 in 100) chance in any given year⁽⁶⁾. Predicted highest risk onsite is 1 in 30-year, and depth between 0.3m-1.0m ⁽⁷⁾. As identified above there is an offsite natural watercourse containing water year-round (in normal circumstances) running along the western boundary and a ditch running along the northern boundary and join in the north-west corner of the site next to the access. The surface water flooding is shown to occur in and around the watercourse and the ditch and surrounding areas including around the access and roadway both on and offsite and might possibly make vehicular access difficult. The poultry houses have been located away from the extent of the flooding. Surface water flooding, sometimes known as flash flooding:

- happens when heavy rain cannot drain away
- is difficult to predict as it depends on rainfall volume and location
- can happen up hills and away from rivers and other bodies of water
- is more widespread in area with harder surfaces like concrete.

28. There is no risk of groundwater flooding⁽⁶⁾ which can be caused by unusually high groundwater levels when the water table rises above the ground surface or within underground structures such as basements or cellars. The risk assessment is based on a 1 in 100-year return period. There is no risk of reservoir flooding⁽⁶⁾.

Environmental designations

29. Westhall Wood and Meadow Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Burgate Wood SSSI are designated sites for nature conservation within 5km⁽³⁾. No designated sites for nature conservation onsite.

30. The surrounding land is undeveloped, predominantly used for arable agriculture, with some agricultural and commercial premises, and residential dwelling houses to the

	<p>southeast, close to the existing poultry houses, and north of the site.</p> <p>31. The site is located in the Ely Ouse and Cut-off channel Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ)⁽⁷⁾. Areas where surface and groundwater are at risk from agricultural nitrate pollution. These are areas of land that drain into waters polluted by nitrates. Farmers operating within these areas have to follow mandatory rules to tackle nitrate loss from agriculture including from housing for rearing poultry intensively.</p>
<p>Pollution history including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pollution incidents that may have affected land • historical land-uses and associated contaminants • any visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination • evidence of damage to pollution prevention measures 	<p><u>Pollution incidents that may have affected land</u></p> <p>32. Not identified any records as evidence for pollution that may have affected land onsite. Conducted a site walkover on Sunday 30th January 2022 in the morning. Weather conditions were sunny, cold, and dry. Groundworks for the development had commenced start of January and ongoing. Most of the site had been excavated providing good exposure for visually checking for evidence of any previous activities or contamination. Building contractor already stripped back the topsoil and excavated down several metres in place into the underlying superficial drift geology to create a level area for the development. The excavated drift material has been used to create engineered earth banks within the boundary to the north, east and south sides and the topsoil spread over evenly. The attenuation basin appeared to be complete to manage surface water run-off from site to minimise risk of surface water flooding in and around the watercourse. Crushed concrete aggregates had been delivered and levelled in readiness for the concrete apron and floors of two of the poultry houses. Besides the excavations and landscaping there was no visible indications for the presence of any artificial and made ground, worked, infilled, disturbed, or landscaped ground. Artificial ground can be associated with potentially contaminated material.</p> <p><u>Historical land-uses and associated contaminants</u></p> <p>33. Established historical land-uses using Ordnance Survey maps 1885-2022 at the 1:10,560 and 1:1250 scale and aerial imagery 1999-2021 obtained from Groundsure⁽⁸⁾. The earliest map of 1885 shows land entirely undeveloped, and a field boundary with trees across the site between the southwest corner and east side. The boundary is not marked in 1903 and the site continues to appear unchanged in all the maps and aerial imagery. Land most probably continually used for arable agriculture or grazing livestock. Concluded no historical land-uses likely to be associated with contamination of soil or groundwater.</p>

34. No evidence for any permissions or exemptions onsite⁽⁷⁾. An environmental permit has been issued for the existing 5no poultry houses approx. 280m southwest of the site. Most recent pollution inventory reporting on annual emissions of particulate matter and ammonia to air and waste transfers of used poultry litter and waste oil. There are historical and current waste exemptions at Falcon Hall within 260m of the site boundary⁽⁷⁾ for treatment of waste wood, use of waste in construction, spreading waste on agricultural land to confer benefit, burning of waste as a fuel in a small appliance, use of waste for a specified purpose.

Visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination

35. Not identified any evidence for any existing contamination.

Evidence of damage to pollution control measures

36. Poultry houses designed and operated in accordance with the SGN EPR 6.09 and Best Available Techniques (BAT) Conclusions Document. Modern clear span portal construction over concrete floors poured over a continuous damp proof membrane and insulated walls and roofs. Forced ventilation via side inlets, extraction fans and uncapped outlets on the roof - medium velocity (Vents greater than 3.5m high, fan efflux velocity greater than 2m/s), actually efflux velocity greater than 7m/s but outlets only 5.2m high. Ventilation is computer controlled to remove moisture under all weather and seasonal conditions and minimise ammonia, odour and dust while meeting the physiological needs of the chickens.

37. Uncontaminated roof-water runoff intercepted in stone-filled French drains under the eaves with perforated pipes, but infiltration drainage is limited owing to low permeability of the ground, so most flows through solid pipes into the attenuation basin. Uncontaminated surface water runoff the concrete apron (excluding during periods for litter removal and washing-out) also conveyed in solid pipes into the basin. The surface water discharges off site at a controlled rate into an unnamed, natural watercourse via a flow control device so as not to increase the risk of flooding onsite. The watercourse is a tributary of the Little Ouse, a main river approx. 3km to the north. When the poultry houses and apron are cleaned, a diverter valve will direct the washdown water into a package, below ground dirty water tank for offsite disposal. The pollution control measures are intended to minimise emission of ammonia, odour, and dust to air and prevent liquid washings from escaping to minimise risk of pollution in the watercourse and downstream environment, and the underlying geology, and groundwater.

Evidence of historic contamination, for example, historical site investigation, assessment, remediation, and verification reports (where available)	<p>38. No records found in the desk top study for any previous historical site investigation, assessment, or remediation and verification.</p> <p>39. Concluded land being enclosed to extend the installation boundary has never been used for any historical industrial activities and no evidence for any specific incidents that might have resulted in significant release of any substance into soil or groundwater causing pollution in the desk top study and the site walkover.</p>
Baseline soil and groundwater reference data	40. Concluded intrusive investigation to establish baseline soil and groundwater reference data was not warranted.
Supporting information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. British Geological Survey website (2022) Geology of Britain Viewer 2. Cranfield Soil and Agrifood Institution website (2022) Soilscales Viewer 3. DEFRA website (2022) MAGIC Maps 4. Environment Agency website (2022) Catchment Data Explorer 5. Environment Agency website (2022) Flood Map for Planning 6. Environment Agency website (2022) Long Term Flood Risk Information 7. Groundsure website (2022) Groundsure Enviro + Geo Insight 8. Groundsure website (2022) Groundsure Historical Maps Insight 9. Groundsure website (2022) Insights; 21/04/2022; Centre of pond... 159m from unnamed road, Finningham Road, Rickinghall Superior, IP22 1LP site plan at the 1:2500 scale 10. Mid-Suffolk District Council website (2022) Planning Permission DC/21/01659 dated 01/07/2021 11. Natural England website (2022) National Character Area profiles 12. UK Grid Reference Finder website (2022) UK Grid Reference Finder Maps 13. Plandescil (2021) Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy; Job No. 27408; Proposed Agricultural Development Land North-east of Falcons Hall Farm Finningham Road (B1113) Rickinghall IP22 1LP

3.0 Permitted activities	
Permitted activities	41. In accordance with The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016; Regulation 2(1); Schedule 1; Part 2; Section 6.9; Part A(1)(a)(i) Rearing poultry or pigs intensively in an installation with more than 40,000 places for poultry.
Non-permitted activities undertaken	See section 4.0 below.

Document references for:	See section 4.0 below.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan showing activity layout; and • environmental risk assessment. 	

Note:

In Part B of the application form, you must tell us about the activities that you will undertake at the site. You must also give us an environmental risk assessment. This risk assessment must be based on our guidance (*Environmental Risk Assessment - EPR H1*) or use an equivalent approach.

It is essential that you identify in your environmental risk assessment all the substances used and produced that could pollute the soil or groundwater if there were an accident, or if measures to protect land fail.

These include substances that would be classified as ‘dangerous’ under the Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) regulations and raw materials, fuels, intermediates, products, wastes, and effluents.

If your submitted environmental risk assessment does not adequately address the risks to soil and groundwater, we may need to request further information from you or even refuse your permit application.

Sections 4.0-10.0 not required for the permit application.

4.0 Changes to the activity	
Have there been any changes to the activity boundary?	<p>42. Application to vary the environmental permit to extend installation boundary to enclose approx. 2.9ha greenfield agricultural land to erect 4no additional poultry houses B1,B2,B3&B4 approx. 280m to northeast of 5no.existing houses.</p> <p>43. Created a plan showing the changes to the activity boundary. Groundsure Insights; 21/04/2022; Centre of pond...159m from unnamed road, Finningham Road, Rickinghall Superior, IP22 1LP site plan at the 1:2500 scale, showing extended installation boundary marked in green enclosing approx. 2.9ha agricultural land. Created a site layout plan identifying the sources of releases, emission points and drainage routes.</p>
Have there been any changes to the permitted activities?	44. Erected 4no. additional poultry houses and directly associated structures for rearing pullets for replacement breeder stock, same as in existing houses.
Have any ‘dangerous substances’ not identified in the Application Site Condition Report been used or produced as a result of the permitted activities?	45. Updated the H1 Environmental Risk Assessment and Management Plan on any substances that could pollute the soil or groundwater in accordance with SGN EPR 6.09 and information on the government website. No substances would be classified as ‘dangerous’

	under the Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) regulations.
Checklist of supporting information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan showing any changes to the boundary (where relevant) • Description of the changes to the permitted activities (where relevant) • List of 'dangerous substances' used/produced by the permitted activities that were not identified in the Application Site Condition Report (where relevant)

5.0 Measures taken to protect land

Use records that you collected during the life of the permit to summarise whether pollution prevention measures worked. If you can't, you need to collect land and/or groundwater data to assess whether the land has deteriorated.

Checklist of supporting information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspection records and summary of findings of inspections for all pollution prevention measures • Records of maintenance, repair, and replacement of pollution prevention measures
--	---

6.0 Pollution incidents that may have had an impact on land, and their remediation

Summarise any pollution incidents that may have damaged the land. Describe how you investigated and remedied each one. If you can't, you need to collect land and /or groundwater reference data to assess whether the land has deteriorated while you've been there.

Checklist of supporting information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records of pollution incidents that may have impacted on land • Records of their investigation and remediation
--	---

7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where undertaken)

Provide details of any soil gas and/or water monitoring you did. Include a summary of the findings. Say whether it shows that the land deteriorated as a result of the permitted activities. If it did, outline how you investigated and remedied this.

Checklist of supporting information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of soil gas and/or water monitoring undertaken • Monitoring results (including graphs)
--	---

8.0 Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk

Describe how the site was decommissioned. Demonstrate that all sources of pollution risk have been removed. Describe whether the decommissioning had any impact on the land. Outline how you investigated and remedied this.

Checklist of supporting information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site closure plan • List of potential sources of pollution risk • Investigation and remediation reports (where relevant)
--	--

9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)

Say whether you had to collect land and/or groundwater data. Or say that you didn't need to because the information from sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Surrender Site Condition Report shows that the land has not deteriorated.

If you did collect land and/or groundwater reference data, summarise what this entailed, and what your data found. Say whether the data shows that the condition of the land has deteriorated, or whether the land at the site is in a "satisfactory state". If it isn't, summarise what you did to remedy this. Confirm that the land is now in a "satisfactory state" at surrender.

Checklist of supporting information

- Land and/or groundwater data collected at application (if collected)
- Land and/or groundwater data collected at surrender (where needed)
- Assessment of satisfactory state
- Remediation and verification reports (where undertaken)

10.0 Statement of site condition

Using the information from sections 3 to 7, give a statement about the condition of the land at the site. This should confirm that:

- the permitted activities have stopped
- decommissioning is complete, and the pollution risk has been removed
- the land is in a satisfactory condition.