

To	Armin Buchbinder (Hopkins)	Reference number
		A/UCLH4A M1435
cc	Rob Davies (Skanksa) Barney Jordan (Arup) John Lange (Arup) Chris Barrett (Arup)	File reference
		61
From	Alice Berry x 52743 (3.13)	Date
		12 March 2010
Subject	UCLH - Phase 4A Cancer Centre - condition 8	

Dear Armin,

Thank you for forwarding the Planning Officer's queries regarding planning condition number 8. We believe that the comments are addressed in the attached Geotechnical Interpretative Report (GIR), which we understand was not issued to Camden previously. Chapter 5 of the report provides a ground contamination assessment, based on the ground investigation results and conceptual model. The scope of the investigations undertaken are also discussed in the report which exceeded Camden's suggested minimum requirements.

A ground investigation with contamination sampling and testing was undertaken in December 2008 and January 2010. The investigation and assessment undertaken was generally compliant with the CLR11 Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination. We note that CLR 11 does not provide specific advice on the scope of ground investigations. The procedures followed were compliant with BS10175 which does define the methods of investigation contaminated land. Chapter 4 of the report describes the investigation undertaken.

30 soil samples and six ground water samples were tested for a range of contaminants and six rounds of ground gas monitoring were undertaken. The suite of tests was comprehensive and selected based on the CLEA procedures. Fully speciated TPH and PAH analysis was undertaken for at each sample, and all samples were analysed for asbestos. The results of these tests are summarised in Section 5.5 of the GIR.

Statistical analysis was not performed as almost all of the results were below the generic assessment criteria and soil guidelines values used in the assessment. Where values exceeded the criteria this is highlighted in Section 5.5 of the GIR.

A site specific risk assessment was performed. This is included in Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the GIR. The findings of this risk assessment were included in the Stage D report extract which I believe you were previously sent.

The GOAD fire insurance plan, and other drawings and investigations, have not identified any oil or fuel storage, and it is possible that heating for the building was provided from a central hospital facility via the network of tunnels connecting the original basement to other university buildings (the GOAD plan does identify oil fuel heaters in the sub-basement of the nearby UCLH Rosenheim building). It is understood that underground oil storage tanks have not been found on the site during the demolition process.

Regards,
Alice.