



Expansion of Anfield Stadium for  
Liverpool Football Club

## Contaminated Land Checklist

## Contaminated Land Report Screening Checklist



<b>Site (full address):</b>	Anfield Stadium, Anfield Rd, Liverpool L4 0TH		<b>Development end-use:</b>	Stadium
<b>Appointed Consultant:</b>	Mott MacDonald (EIA)	<b>Developer:</b>	Planning App / Ref No:	
	SKM (Designers / Con Land)		Planning Case Officer:	Feargal McAvoy
			Document preparation date #:	May 2014
<b>Submitted report/s or correspondence #:</b>		Expansion of Anfield Stadium for LFC - Environmental Statement (MM May 2014), Phase 1 Geoenvironmental Report (SKM, Dec 2013)		

This factual, non-interpretative "Screening Checklist" is used by Liverpool City Council (LCC) Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) to initially verify every Local Planning Authority (LPA) submission for its adequacy and suitability during the assessment of proposed developments on potentially-contaminated land (or for sensitive end-uses). Appointed advisory Consultants (who should demonstrate possession of the necessary skills, competence and experience in the assessment / remediation of Contaminated Land) must familiarise with these requirements 'prior to, or during' the preparation of any phased investigation for submission to the LPA (within jurisdiction of LCC).

This "Screening Checklist" must be completed by an appointed Consultant and accompany any relevant submission to LCC (LPA or EPU) in electronic format, otherwise information will not be reviewed. This exercise does not constitute a detailed review by LCC EPU, further amendments or issues may be highlighted or required at any later time. Additionally, it intends to supplement, not preclude, any requirements of published statutory or non-statutory technical guidance (where relevant and applicable).

Submitted reports and / or any subsequent correspondence which, following an initial review by LCC EPU, do not comply with any aspect of this "Screening Checklist" will be referred back to the Developer for amendment 'prior to' detailed review of the submitted information.

Where it is considered that particular requirements of this "Screening Checklist" may not be appropriate (on a development-specific basis) a thorough written justification must be presented 'prior to' submission of relevant document/s. LCC EPU's prior acceptance of these justifications will be explicitly necessary to negate any "Screening Checklist" requirement.

1. Planning Application / Permission reference details:		✓ / ✗	Notes (see below). Include each section where they are relevant to the submission	✓ / ✗
Planning Application / Permission boundary	✓		The site boundary under consideration matches that of the proposed development (details are available at <a href="#">Planning &amp; Building Control - Search and track current applications</a> )	
Proposed development end-use	✓		The proposed end-use under assessment matches that of the proposed development	
Development Layout Plans	✓		Development Layout Plans are enclosed and assessed in detail as part of the preparation of all reports	
'Sub-phased' developments	✓		For any sub-phase of a development / scheme, the information submitted (including relevant desk study, S.I., remediation, validation details, phasing plans etc...) relates specifically to the area of land in question	
<b>2. Report Status:</b>				✓ / ✗
Draft reports	✓		Draft reports are not appropriate for submission. All reports submitted are 'final'	
Revised / amended reports	✓		Revised / amended reports are clearly-identifiable on QA / QC log sheets	
Factual reports	✓		Stand-alone, exclusively 'factual' reports of any form (e.g. Environmental Information datasets or Ground Investigation reports) are not sufficient. These are supplemented with appropriate full interpretations / assessments	



## Contaminated Land Report Screening Checklist



		✓ / ✗	Notes (see below). Include each section where they are relevant to the submission
Copyright / assignment permissions		✓	Assignment permissions have been sought and granted where reliance is placed on information with third party copyright
Appendices		✓	All report Appendices (or any additional referenced information) are fully-enclosed as part of submission
<b>3. Desk study aspects:</b>			✓ / ✗
Site inspection / walkover survey *		✓	A site walkover has been undertaken to ascertain existing ground conditions / topography / ground investigation constraints / potential contamination issues (as a non-exhaustive list). Findings are documented within the desk study report (including relevant photographs with accompanying descriptions)
LCC EPU existing site records / information		✓	Desk study consultations with LCC EPU are strongly encouraged ( <b>Submit a request</b> ). When not undertaken, and LCC EPU hold site records / information that is not referenced in report/s, these may be referred back to the Developer
Reports and / or previous remediation based upon former investigations / work by other Consultants *		✓	Consideration given to adequacy of former reports / site works against current guidance / assessment standards (or findings are disregarded, reviewed or re-assessed accordingly)
Sampling suite justification *			Where relevant to a site or adjacent former land uses, DoE Industry Profiles are clearly-detailed and fully referenced to justify the rationale for proposed chemical analysis suites
<b>4. Site Investigation (general) aspects:</b>			✓ / ✗
S.I. based on desk study*			A desk study report has been submitted previously (and accepted); or a combined desk study / S.I. report is enclosed which forms the basis of S.I. requirements (any reliance on desk studies includes associated copyright permissions)
Submission of S.I. proposals			It is for appointed Consultants to competently-present and clearly justify 'all' site-specific S.I. requirements in detail
Site Investigation constraints *			All areas of S.I. constraints are clearly-listed and include proposals for further investigation upon their clearance
Site detail / exploratory hole location plans *			All plans are accurate, scaled and with suitable keys / legends. Hand-annotated 'sketch' drawings are not acceptable
Historical site features / exploratory hole location overlay plan/s *			An exploratory hole location plan/s overlaying 'all' historical potential sources / features is presented (justifying the targeting / selection of exploratory locations and analysis suites used). Areas of S.I. constraints are also delineated
<b>5. Site Investigation (Sampling / Contaminants of Concern) aspects:</b>			✓ / ✗
Sampling protocols (particularly for volatile contaminants) *			Sampling protocols are clearly-detailed. Use of appropriate sampling techniques, containers, treatment, storage and prompt 'laboratory submission times' undertaken to prevent potential loss / decay from samples
Sampling strategy justification *			Sampling strategies (both spatial and vertical) accurately-target potential source areas / locations; and also consider exposure pathways (e.g. relevant sampling depths for non-volatile / volatile contaminants)
PCB analysis (targeting attributable sources) *			Consideration given to both 'dioxin' and 'non-dioxin' like Congeners during investigations for PCBs (where required)
Asbestos *			Consideration given to potential asbestos from former demolition / disposal activities (both ACMs and fibres in soil). Request may be made for "Destructive" surveys and associated clearance certificates for 'recent' demolition activities
Laboratory analysis results			Copies of 'all' original laboratory analysis results are presented (summary tables, alone, are not appropriate). Where appropriate laboratory accreditations are not detailed (i.e. MCERTS / UKAS) this supporting evidence is enclosed



## Contaminated Land Report Screening Checklist

✓ / ✕ Notes (see below). Include each section where they are relevant to the submission		✓ / ✕
<b>6. Human Health risk assessment (Quantitative Assessment Criteria) aspects:</b>		
Derived based upon updated HHRA guidance *	The utilised Human Health Assessment Criteria are based upon, or equivalent to, current UK guidance. Withdrawn SGVs, or out-dated (i.e. since revised) Assessment Criteria do not meet such current requirements	✓ / ✕
Assessment Criteria requiring subscription	Evidence of subscription and 'most-recent' Assessment Criteria are submitted (in confidence) in support of report	
'In-house' -derived Assessment Criteria *	'In-house' derived Assessment Criteria are prior-agreed with LCC EPU - full supporting physico-chemical and toxicological data and associated reference materials / documentation submitted (i.e. as a Generic Assessment Criteria submission). Site-specific Assessment Criteria details (model output parameters) are contained within specific reports	
Soil Organic Matter (SOM) / land-use justification *	Assessment Criteria are appropriately-selected for recorded SOM on-site and proposed / current land-uses; otherwise a conservative approach is taken	
Statistical analysis of contaminant data *	Where appropriate, CIEH / CL: AIRE guidance & calculator (or a fully justified, transparent 'in-house' equivalent) are used and submitted in entirety within the report. Statistics are not based upon withdrawn CLR 7 guidance	
<b>7. Ground gas risk assessment aspects:</b>		
Monitoring installations	Monitoring installations appropriately-target strata for their specific and intended purposes (i.e. Made Ground on-site is not excluded from response zones for ground gas monitoring). Installation 'response zones' do not cross both Made Ground and natural strata, which may influence ground gas regimes and / or allow creation of preferential pathways to Controlled Waters. The use of dual monitoring installation response zones is made, where appropriate	✓ / ✕
Monitoring exercises *	Where undertaken, any ground gas monitoring programme (frequency / duration / No. of installations etc...) is fully justified, compliant and undertaken in accordance with appropriate ground gas / vapour assessment guidance	
Incomplete monitoring exercises	'Incomplete' monitoring data (or recommended gas protection measures based thereon) is inconclusive for all parties (both Developers and regulators). Inconclusive datasets are not suitable for submission and LCC EPU will not provide comment on risk assessments until complete, appropriate ground gas monitoring is obtained, assessed and presented	
Consideration of hydrocarbon vapours / VOCs *	Where hydrocarbon vapours / VOCs are potentially encountered - P.I.D, vapour and / or bulk air sampling and analysis are used to aid distinction from methane and allow identification / assessment of vapours during monitoring exercises	
<b>8. Remediation aspects:</b>		
General remediation recommendations within desk study or S.I reports	Basic / outline proposals within desk study or S.I. reports do not constitute a Remediation Strategy	✓ / ✕
Validation proposals for intended Remediation schemes *	Detailed proposals to validate all remedial activities are competently-designed and described within a Remediation Strategy, and have cognisance of LCC's "Requirements for Contaminated Land Validation" and "Gas Protection Validation Proforma" guidance (available from the below web-page)	
Asbestos in soils identified on-site *	Where identified on-site, the Remediation Strategy makes recommendations for measures to mitigate Human Health risks during all site construction activities (e.g. earthworks, foundations etc...) which may disturb such materials; not just considering long term remediation recommendations to implement at the development. Relevant Contractor's method statements account for and reference S.I. report findings and are submitted as part of the Remediation Strategy package	



## Contaminated Land Report Screening Checklist



✓ / ✗	Notes (see below). Include each section where they are relevant to the submission	✓ / ✗
<b>9. Validation (Contamination) aspects:</b>		
Physical validation and chemical verification *	Validation of all remedial activities is undertaken considering LCC's "Requirements for Contaminated Land Validation" guidance (available to download from our <a href="#">Business</a> web-page)	✓ / ✗
<b>10. Validation (Ground gases) aspects:</b>		
Independent validation of ground gas protection measures *	'In-situ' gas protection measures are independently validated, including completion of LCC's "Gas Protection Validation Proforma" (available to download from our <a href="#">Business</a> web-page)	✓ / ✗
<b>11. General site correspondence:</b>		
Ongoing correspondence with LCC EPU *	Correspondence with LCC EPU responds to, or acknowledges further requirements, for 'all' points / queries raised previously. We accept that incomplete correspondence will be referred back to the Developer / author without review	✓ / ✗

\* - deemed minimum assessment expectations. However these are not prescriptive or detail any 'site-specific' requirements (based upon appropriate technical guidance)

### Declaration Statement for Document/s Preparation

I (NAME) ..... Andrew Lawrance ..... representing (EMPLOYER) ..... Mott MacDonald ..... acting on behalf of ..... Liverpool Football Club ..... (the DEVELOPER) confirm that the above-detailed reports \* have been prepared, or revised, to be in compliance with LCC EPU's Report "Screening Checklist" and accept that any reports which do not meet these basic factual requirements, at initial screening stage, will be referred back to the Developer in their entirety.

Liverpool City Council accepts no liability or responsibility for delays or associated costs resulting from referral of reports for amendment / re-submission. As the appointed Consultant, I have read and understood "Screening Checklist" requirements before preparing or submitting reports. At the time of any re-submission an additional "Screening Checklist" will be required for the revised report/s. If re-submitted reports do not fulfil basic screening requirements they will also be referred back to the Developer.

Passing this initial screening exercise does not constitute a detailed review of the submitted information (of either factual or interpretative sections), nor does it represent LCC EPU's final opinion on the adequacy of the submitted information in relation to a proposed development. LCC EPU will only be obliged to enter into detailed dialogue over any submission once it is satisfied that "Screening Checklist" requirements have been complied with. Ongoing dialogue / correspondence will also be subjected to screening requirements. \*

Signed: .....  ..... Position: Divisional Director ..... Date: 23-May-2014

© Liverpool City Council copyright 2013.

For any enquiries relating to this "Screening Checklist" please log a call-back request with LCC EPU on (0151) 233 3055. Written enquiries, environmental information requests, or Electronic reports & Report Screening Checklists may be submitted to [environmental.health@liverpool.gov.uk](mailto:environmental.health@liverpool.gov.uk) (subject to an 8Mb limit). CD submissions may be sent to Environmental Protection Unit, Public Protection Business Unit, Environment Business Group, Municipal Buildings, Dale Street, Liverpool, L2 2DH. Where any submission is made directly to us, a copy must also be sent to the appropriate Planning Case Officer.

[Business](#) - general guidance for Developers, technical guidelines for Environmental Consultants, to download 'Validation' documents and charges for environmental information.

[Submit a request](#) - for factual LCC environmental information.