

Intended for  
**Ball Beverage Packaging UK Limited**



Date  
**July 2022**

Project Number  
**1620011745-001**

# **BALL PACKAGING KETTERING SITE SITE CONDITION REPORT**

# BALL PACKAGING KETTERING SITE SITE CONDITION REPORT

Project No. **1620011745-001**  
Issue No. **1**  
Date **01/07/2022**  
Made by **Lucy Baker**  
Checked by  
Approved by **Richard Wood**

Made by:	
Checked/Approved by:	

*This report is produced by Ramboll at the request of the client for the purposes detailed herein. This report and accompanying documents are intended solely for the use and benefit of the client for this purpose only and may not be used by or disclosed to, in whole or in part, any other person without the express written consent of Ramboll. Ramboll neither owes nor accepts any duty to any third party and shall not be liable for any loss, damage or expense of whatsoever nature which is caused by their reliance on the information contained in this report.*

## Version Control Log

Revision	Date	Made by	Checked by	Approved by	Description
1	01/07/2022	LB	RAW	RAW	Issue to Client

Ramboll UK Limited  
1 Broad Gate  
The Headrow  
Leeds  
LS1 8EQ  
United Kingdom

T +44 113 245 7552  
www.ramboll.com

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. SITE DETAILS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. CONDITION OF THE LAND AT PERMIT ISSUE</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. PERMITTED ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4. CHANGES TO THE ACTIVITY</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5. MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT LAND</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>6. POLLUTION INCIDENTS THAT MAY HAVE HAD AN IMPACT ON LAND, AND THEIR REMEDIATION</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>7. SOIL GAS AND WATER QUALITY MONITORING (WHERE UNDERTAKEN)</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>8. DECOMMISSIONING AND REMOVAL OF POLLUTION RISK</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>9. REFERENCE DATA AND REMEDIATION (WHERE RELEVANT)</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>10. STATEMENT OF SITE CONDITION</b>	<b>23</b>

## INTRODUCTION

Ramboll UK Limited ("Ramboll") was commissioned by Ball Beverage Packaging UK Limited (the "Client") to provide environmental permitting support in relation to the operation of a beverage can manufacturing facility located at Plot 4b, Segro Park, Kettering Gateway (the "site"). The site will be operated by Ball Beverage Packaging UK Limited.

This site condition report is intended to satisfy the EA's request for such a report as part of the application for an Environmental Permit and has been developed following the guidance and template provided in the EA's Guidance for Applicants (H5) – Site Condition Report document.

### **Reliance and General Limitations**

The conclusions presented in this report represent Ramboll UK Limited's best professional judgment based upon the information available and conditions existing as of the date of the review. In performing its assignment, Ramboll UK Limited must rely upon publicly available information, information provided by the client and information provided by third-parties. Accordingly, the conclusions in this report are valid only to the extent that the information provided to Ramboll Limited was accurate and complete. This review is not intended as legal advice, nor is it an exhaustive review of site conditions or facility compliance. Ramboll UK Limited makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, about the condition of the site.

Ramboll UK Limited's scope of work for this assignment did not include collecting samples of any environmental media. As such, this review cannot rule out the existence of latent conditions.

## 1. SITE DETAILS

<b>1.0 Site Details</b>	
Name of the applicant	Ball Beverage Packaging UK Limited
Activity Address	Plot 4b, Segro Park, Kettering Gateway
National Grid Reference	490539, 276119
Document reference and dates for Site Condition Report at permit application and surrender	Site Condition Report at Permit Application: 1620011745-001_Ball Kettering Site Condition Report, prepared by Ramboll UK Limited, May 2022
Document references for site plans (including location and boundaries)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appendix 1 - Site Location – 1620011745-001 Issue 1, Figure 1</li><li>• Appendix 1 - Site Layout – Drawing ref. P2108-UMC-ZZ-00-DR-A-D0603</li><li>• Appendix 1 – Overall Drainage Layout – P21028-FRH-EW-XX-DR-C-2000, Revision C02</li></ul>

## 2. CONDITION OF THE LAND AT PERMIT ISSUE

The table below provides a description of the site’s environmental setting from a review of publicly available information and previous third-party site investigation reports.

**Table 2-1: Environmental Setting**

Conditions	Source / Supporting Information	Description
<b>Geology</b>	British Geological Society (BGS) website, accessed April 2022 <a href="http://www.bgs.ac.uk">www.bgs.ac.uk</a> Hydrock, 2021, Environmental Risk Assessment Report (ref. 14441-HYD-XX-XX-RP-GE-1001-S2-P02)	<p>Information on the geology underlying the site and the area surrounding the site was obtained from electronic mapping and publicly available borehole records the British Geological Society (BGS) website.</p> <p>The mapping indicates that the site is site is directly underlain by bedrock of the Northampton Sand Formation (ironstone, ooidal). This is further underlain by the Whitby Mudstone Formation.</p> <p>The most recent 2021 site investigation took place following enabling works including a development plateau. Ground conditions were reported to comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engineered fill in the north and north-west to depths of between 0.5-3.1m below ground level (bgl) (average thickness of 1.7m) comprising sandy gravelly clay. The remainder of the site had been subject to ‘cut’ operations and fill was absent.</li> <li>• Northampton Sand Formation was encountered in all locations, comprising sandy gravelly clay or gravelly sandy clay to depth of between 0.4m and proven to 4m bgl.</li> <li>• Where encountered, the underlying Whitby Mudstone Formation was present at the surface at one location in the south-west or underlying the Northampton Sand Formation and comprising firm to stiff clay becoming a mudstone with limestone bands.</li> </ul>
<b>Hydrogeology</b>	Aquifer designation mapping available at <a href="http://www.magic.gov.uk">www.magic.gov.uk</a> , accessed April 2022 Groundsure database	<p>The Aquifer Designation mapping indicates the site is underlain by a Secondary A Aquifer; defined as permeable formations with potential to support localised abstractions.</p> <p>The underlying Groundwater body is the Nene Mid Jurassic Unit, designated as being of ‘good’ chemical and ‘good’ quantitative status under the Water Framework Directive classification scheme.</p> <p>The site is not situated within an EA designated Source Protection Zone.</p> <p>There are two groundwater abstractions within a 2km radius of the site. These are located 950m south and 1.01km north-west for general farming and domestic purposes.</p> <p>The 2021 Hydrock ground investigation recorded groundwater strikes locally both within the engineered fill (between 1.2 to 2.6m depth) and the Northampton Sand Formation (between 0.5 and 3m depth). During subsequent monitoring rounds, groundwater levels were typically recorded in the Northampton Sand Formation between 0.94 and 2.53m bgl.</p>

Conditions	Source / Supporting Information	Description
		Similar natural ground conditions and groundwater levels were recorded during the 2012 and 2015 investigations. The reports concluded that groundwater was perched and did not represent a continuous groundwater body.
<b>Hydrology</b>	Ordnance Survey mapping Groundsure database Environmental Agency Flood map for planning	The nearest identified surface watercourse is an unnamed stream approximately 400m north of the site. The nearest larger watercourse is the River Is approximately 1.94km south-west. The EA currently classifies the River Ise as being of 'poor' ecological quality and 'good' chemical quality under the Water Framework Directive classification scheme.  According to an independent, third party environmental database, there is one licensed surface water abstraction within a 2km radius of the site. This is located approximately 1.83km south-west for "general use relating to secondary category – low loss" from a spring at Burton Latimer.
<b>Ecological Designated Sites</b>	Groundsure database (reproduced in Appendix 4) Environment Agency	Two statutory designated ecologically sensitive sites are located within 2km of the site. The closest is Cranford St John 1.4km east which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

**Table 2-2: Pollution History**

Conditions	Source	Description
<b>Pollution Incidents</b>	Groundsure database	<i>Recorded Pollution Incidents</i> A third-party environmental database (Groundsure) holds no records of pollution incidents on site. Two pollution incidents occurred within 250m: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>170m north, 25/09/2011, pollutant – smoke, Category 2 (Significant Incident) to air and water.</li> <li>180m north, 11/10/2011, pollutant – smoke and firefighting runoff, Category 3 (Minor Incident) to water.</li> </ul> Both incidents occurred at Blackbridge Farm to the north of the site.  These incidents pre-date the development of the site for use as a manufacturing facility and are located off-site. They are considered unlikely to have resulted in long-term impacts within the installation boundary.  <i>Contaminated Land Register Entries</i> None recorded within 2km of the site.
<b>Historical Land Uses</b>	Historical ordnance survey mapping provided by Groundsure (reproduced in Appendix 2)	<i>On Site</i> The map edition of 1884 shows that the site was undeveloped land, likely used for agriculture. By the early 1920s the site was occupied by an ironstone quarry with part of an old tramway labelled in the south of the site. The quarry was labelled as disused by 1950 and the tramway was dismantled by the mid-1970s.  Aerial photography from Google Earth™ dated 1945 showed the site was occupied by undeveloped land used for farming. Imagery from 2016 and 2017 showed the site was no longer

Conditions	Source	Description
		<p>used for agriculture and contained tracks and stockpiles associated with development adjacent to the west. The map dated 2021 shows the site was undeveloped open space.</p> <p><i>Surrounding Area</i></p> <p>The 1884 map showed the majority of the surrounding area was open fields used for agriculture. The Midlands Railway line was 40m north-west, a corn mill was 150m east and a tramway was 380m east. Quarries were labelled from 130m south-east and 240m west by the 1890s until the early 1920s when the site and its immediate surrounds were occupied by ironstone quarrying activities. A tramway present in the south of the site extended off-site to the south.</p> <p>By 1950 residential development had taken place from 100m north and 210m south and the quarries and tramways were labelled as disused. The Midlands Railway line 40m north-west had been dismantled by the mid-1980s and a major road development (the A14) was underway by the early 1990s. Google Earth™ imagery dated 2004 showed Blackbridge Farm had been developed approximately 80m north-east of the site. Imagery dated 2016 and 2017 showed the land adjacent to the west of the site was under development, and by 2020 a light industrial unit had been developed.</p>
<b>Waste Management Facilities</b>	Groundsure Database	<p><i>Landfill Sites</i></p> <p>The Groundsure Datasheet does not record any historical or current landfill sites within a 1km radius of the site.</p> <p><i>Licensed Waste Management Facilities</i></p> <p>There are no current or former Licensed Waste Management Facilities within 1km of the site.</p> <p><i>Waste Treatment Sites</i></p> <p>There is one registered Waste Treatment Site within 1km of the site. This is located 220m north at Blackbridge Farm, and is a biological treatment facility with an annual tonnage of 50,000.</p>
<b>Environmental Permits</b>	Groundsure database	<p><i>Part A(1) Environmental Permits</i></p> <p>There are Part A(1) Environmental Permits within a 1km radius.</p> <p><i>Part A(2) and B Environmental Permits</i></p> <p>There are no Part A(2) Environmental Permits within a 1km radius. There is one Part B Environmental Permit located located approximately 370m east of the site for waste oil burning (0.4 MW) at Midland Fork Lifts Ltd.</p>
<b>Current Site Activities</b>		<p>The site is currently a parcel of undeveloped land covering an area of approximately 11.8 hectares. The site and surrounding area are relatively flat, and the site is accessed via an unnamed access road off the A6.</p>
<b>Environmental Health Enquiry</b>	Kettering Borough Council Environmental Health Officer	<p>An enquiry was made to Slough Borough Council in an attempt to identify if the Council had any specific information about the site, particularly with reference to its status under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Council confirmed that the site is not on their contaminated</p>



Conditions	Source	Description
		land register and the Council are not currently considering any further action against the site or surrounding area.
<b>Evidence of Historical Contamination</b>	Historical ordnance survey mapping provided by Groundsure  Groundsure database	Potentially contaminative activities identified on site included an ironstone quarry from the early 1920s with part of an old tramway in the south of the site. The quarry was disused by 1950 and the tramway was dismantled by the mid-1970s.  The surrounding area had been used for the quarrying of ironstone from the late 1890s until 1950, and associated landfilling appears to have been undertaken at two sites within 500 metres of the site.  Several intrusive investigations have been undertaken at the site which have targeted the identified historical on-site and off-site uses. The findings are summarised below.
<b>Previous Reporting</b>	Reports reproduced in Appendix 11	<p><i>It should be noted that the 2012 intrusive reports covered a wider area including the development site boundary.</i></p> <p><i>Phase I Desk Study Report, 2011 – Waterman (Ref. 11964-4430-100 Rev 0)</i></p> <p>The report was commissioned by Roxhill Development Ltd as part of outline planning application KET/2013/0661, encompassing the wider area including Ramboll’s subject site. The purpose of the report was to provide a record of the history of the site, to advise on the potential for land contamination at the site and to form the basis for the design of a site investigation. At the time of reporting the wider site was an area of arable farmland.</p> <p>A review of historical mapping for the wider site was used for quarrying activities in the west from the early 1900s until the late 1960s, and an associated mineral railway operated from the north of the site until the late 1980s. The surrounding area was also historically occupied by quarrying activities, an ironstone works with associated tanks and a tramway. Two historical landfill sites were identified within 500m of the site.</p> <p>Potential sources of contamination identified at or close to the site included waste processing operations, agricultural practices, and fly tipping. A second potential issue was identified as an ongoing fire taking place at Blackbridge Farm, adjacent to the east of the site. The backfill materials for the quarried areas of the site were not known by Waterman. The initial findings of the report suggested that there is expected to be a low likelihood of encountering contamination at the site.</p> <p>The report concluded that an intrusive ground investigation should be undertaken in order to further assess the potential for contamination in soil and groundwater, ground gas migration from Made Ground and to establish if there has been any contamination impact on site from the adjacent waste processing operation.</p> <p><i>Factual Report on Ground Investigation, 2012, ESG Soil Mechanics (Ref. E1100-11); and Phase 2 Ground Investigation Interpretative Report, Waterman (Ref. Ref. 119644430-200 Rev 0)</i></p> <p>The ground investigation was undertaken by ESG Soil Mechanics Limited under the direction of Waterman. Ramboll’s review encompasses data from both the factual</p>

Conditions	Source	Description
		<p>record and interpretive report. The investigation involved the drilling of six cable percussion boreholes to a depth of up to 8.35m bgl and the excavation of 18 trial pits to depths of up to 4.10m bgl. Monitoring standpipes were installed in all six boreholes, and four subsequent monitoring rounds took place. Three boreholes (BH3, BH4 and BH5) fall within the subject site boundary.</p> <p>Made Ground was reportedly only encountered in two locations (TP1 and TP2) in the west of the site. The Made Ground comprised very stiff, friable, slightly gravelly, sandy clay containing brick fragments to depths between 0.09m and 1.0m bgl. <i>Note: the made ground was not encountered during the most recent 2021 investigation which has subsequently been subject to cut and fill.</i></p> <p>Soil samples were tested by a laboratory for the following determinands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metals suite;</li> <li>• Phenols, cyanide, sulphide and pH;</li> <li>• Fuel oils (CWG Banding);</li> <li>• Benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes and MTBE; and</li> <li>• Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH).</li> </ul> <p>Results of chemical analyses were compared to the relevant Soil Guideline Values (SGVs). Soil results were compared to the relevant Land Quality Management (LQM) Generic Assessment Criteria (GAC) or Environment Agency published SGVs for a commercial end use. The results from soil analysis confirmed no significantly elevated concentrations of contaminants above the relevant SGV which would cause harm to human health within the Made Ground and natural strata at the site. Soil samples were not analysed for the presence of asbestos; however, no visual evidence of asbestos was observed during the site work.</p> <p>Groundwater samples were not collected as part of the site investigation.</p> <p>During four rounds of ground gas monitoring, methane was not identified above the instrument detection limit in any of the six boreholes. A positive flow rate was also not identified during any of the monitoring rounds for any borehole location. The Waterman Interpretive Report discusses that a maximum recorded concentration of carbon dioxide of 3.47% v/v was detected; however, the appended gas monitoring results and Factual Ground Investigation Report show a maximum concentration of 1.7% v/v. The minimum oxygen concentration is also reported as being 16.7% v/v however it was referenced as 10.2% v/v in the supporting data. The site was calculated to be in line with Characteristic Situation 1 (very low risk) as defined by CIRIA publication C665:2007. Waterman concluded that basic gas prevention measures should be incorporated into the development as well as full radon protection measures.</p> <p>The report concluded that no significant concentrations of contaminants that are harmful to human health or the environment were evident on site. Continued vigilance for unexpected contamination during the development works was recommended.</p>

Conditions	Source	Description
		<p><i>Supplementary Geotechnical Ground Investigation Interpretative Report, 2015 – RSK (Ref: 313074-02).</i></p> <p>The 2015 geotechnical ground investigation was carried out on behalf of Roxhill Developments Limited as part of the 2018 outline planning application for industrial / commercial development (ref: KET/2018/0744) and encompassed the wider proposed Kettering East Business Park. <i>The report does not include the figures or appendices to confirm which investigation locations fall within the subject site boundary.</i></p> <p>The report identified that there was a requirement to carry out earthwork reprofiling to provide suitable development plateaus, highway realignment and drainage infrastructure for the proposed development. The investigation was for geotechnical purposes and did not include the collection of environmental samples.</p> <p>The ground investigation included 17 trial pits up to 3.6m depth, and three boreholes up to 8m depth, each installed with a ground gas and groundwater monitoring well. Made ground was recorded locally in the west of the site and it was reported that there was no visual evidence of contamination in soil or groundwater observed during the investigation. <i>Note: the made ground was not encountered during the most recent 2021 investigation which has subsequently been subject to cut and fill.</i></p> <p>Ground gas and groundwater level monitoring was carried out on two occasions in September 2015 targeting the bedrock geology. A maximum borehole flow rate of 0.2 l/hr was recorded. No methane was detected and a maximum carbon dioxide concentration of 4.0% v/v. The results were considered by RSK to be consistent with the findings of the 2012 site investigation.</p> <p><i>Environmental Risk Assessment Report, 2021 – Hydrock (ref: 14441-HYD-XX-XX-RP-GE-1001-S2-P02)</i></p> <p>The ground investigation of the subject site was carried out in April 2021 on behalf of Segro Plc. as part of a due diligence exercise to confirm ground conditions. <i>Note: the appended borehole logs are for a different site and therefore the site logs have not been included in the review.</i></p> <p>Hydrock reported that there was a potential for contamination associated with the 2016 enabling works (which included earthworks to form the development plateau), ground gases, naturally occurring metals in soils and radon. Potential receptors were reported to include the proposed development and site users, groundwater and an on-site attenuation pond.</p> <p>The investigation comprised 60 window sample boreholes up to 4m depth on an approximate 50m grid spacing across the site. 10 boreholes were installed with groundwater and ground gas monitoring wells designed to target the shallow bedrock geology. Ground gas and groundwater level monitoring was carried out on four occasions between April and May 2021.</p> <p>Engineered fill was reported to be present in the north and north-west to depths of between 0.5-3.1m (average thickness of 1.7m). The remainder of the site had been</p>

Conditions	Source	Description
		<p>subject to 'cut' operations and was present at surface level across the rest of the site.</p> <p>60 soil samples were collected for analysis including from the engineered fill and underlying natural strata. No groundwater samples were collected as part of the investigation. Analysis included asbestos, pH, sulphate, phenol, PAHs, metals, BTEX and speciated TPH. All of the results were recorded below the Hydrock GAC for a commercial/industrial use.</p> <p>Ground gas monitoring recorded a maximum borehole flow rate of 4.3 l/hr but a positive flow rate was typically absent. No methane was recorded and a maximum carbon dioxide concentration of 1.6% v/v. Hydrock reported that the results were indicative Characteristic Situation 1 (very low risk).</p> <p>Hydrock concluded that there was no 'pervasive chemicals of potential concern' with respect to human health or plant growth and that there was a low risk from ground gases. A waste assessment was carried out which concluded that excavated soils would likely be classified as inert or non-hazardous for waste disposal purposes. It was noted that the site is in an area where full radon precautions are recommended. No assessment of the risk to controlled waters was included in the Hydrock assessment.</p> <p><i>Ramboll Comments</i></p> <p>Ramboll has compared concentrations of soil contaminants from the 2012 and 2021 investigations against the Ramboll GAC for a commercial land use and no exceedances of the relevant GAC have been identified. The ground conditions and findings were consistent and no significant contamination was recorded or elevated ground gases.</p> <p>Groundwater sampling has not been carried out and an assessment of risks to controlled waters was not included in the 2021 investigation. Given that elevated contaminants in soil were not recorded and a continuous groundwater body has not been recorded the risks to controlled waters from the reported ground conditions is considered low.</p> <p>The Planning Department of Kettering Borough Council discharged the conditions relating to site investigation following submission of the reviewed reports.</p>
<p><b>Baseline Soil and Groundwater Reference Data</b></p>	<p>Previous reporting. Soil and chemical data summarised in Appendix 5.</p>	<p>Base line soil and groundwater reference data has been obtained from the previous intrusive geo-environmental investigations.</p> <p>For the purposes of this SCR, organic solvents are considered to be the primary 'relevant hazardous substances' which will be in use at the site. Solvents will be stored within 30,000 litre containers in the south of the facility.</p> <p>Based on this, the SCR presents baseline reference data for contaminants which have the potential to be associated with the site's historical uses, and also with the current / future storage of diesel fuel and glycol; namely hydrocarbons and VOCs including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speciated total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH-CWG) in the carbon range C5 to C44 (aliphatic and aromatic compounds);</li> </ul>

Conditions	Source	Description
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sixteen commonly occurring speciated polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (speciated PAHs);</li> <li>• Volatile aromatic hydrocarbons (VOCs) including benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes (BTEX).</li> </ul> <p>Glycols were not analysed as part of the previous investigations, as they had not been identified as a contaminant of concern based on former site uses. Glycols are readily biodegradable in soil and groundwater, and would not be anticipated to be a persistent contaminant.</p> <p><i>Groundwater Flow</i></p> <p>The 2021 Hydrock ground investigation recorded groundwater strikes locally both within the engineered fill (between 1.2 to 2.6m depth) and the Northampton Sand Formation (between 0.5 and 3m depth). During subsequent monitoring rounds, groundwater levels were typically recorded in the Northampton Sand Formation between 0.94 and 2.53m bgl.</p> <p>Similar natural ground conditions and groundwater levels were recorded during the 2012 and 2015 investigations. The reports concluded that groundwater was perched and did not represent a continuous groundwater body.</p> <p><i>Soil Baseline Reference Data</i></p> <p>Laboratory certificates are presented with the previous reports in Appendix 11.</p> <p>In summary, across the site as a whole:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concentrations of TPH were below laboratory limits in all samples analysed.</li> <li>• BTEX was below laboratory reporting limits in all samples analysed.</li> <li>• Total PAH (sum of sixteen) was below laboratory reporting limits in all samples analysed.</li> </ul> <p>No significantly elevated concentrations above the SSV levels which would cause harm to human health were identified.</p> <p><i>Groundwater Baseline Reference Data</i></p> <p>Groundwater sampling was not carried out during any of the site investigations, and an assessment of controlled waters was not included in the 2021 investigation. Given that elevated contaminants in soils were not recorded and a continuous groundwater body has not been recorded the risks to controlled waters from the reported ground conditions is considered low.</p> <p>With reference to the EA published Data Centre FAQ Headline Approach, which, with respect to soil and groundwater, states:</p> <p>Paragraph 17, page 4:</p> <p><i>"The groundwater monitoring of fuel storage tanks and distribution pipework using GW [groundwater] boreholes is risk based for the site condition report (SCR) and IED 5-yearly monitoring. Should GW monitoring be required for underground tanks and/or the SCR, the boreholes should be positioned for whole site surveillance (for the SCR) rather than as a very local control immediately around the buried</i></p>

Conditions	Source	Description
		<p><i>fuel oil tanks (i.e. not be just an addition to double skinned tanks already protected by leak detection and hence ignoring distribution pipework etc)."</i></p> <p>Paragraph 18, page 4:</p> <p><i>"10-yearly soil sampling under IED is normally not needed but still needs some justification."</i></p> <p>The site meets the requirements of BAT for above ground diesel storage. All infrastructure associated with the transport and use of diesel is located above ground, in areas of hardstanding with secondary containment which meets BAT. Based on this, and the available baseline data, it is recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In line with the IED monitoring requirements for groundwater, groundwater monitoring wells are installed within the superficial deposits (Terrace Gravels) at most five years after issue of the Environmental Permit.</li> <li>• Should a release of a dangerous substance (diesel or glycol) occur during the first five years of the installations life, there may be a requirement to undertake intrusive investigation and install groundwater monitoring wells sooner.</li> <li>• The monitoring wells should be located to provide information on groundwater quality up and down hydraulic groundwater gradient of the generator enclosures, and of the soakaways.</li> <li>• The well locations, drilling and construction should be designed and supervised by a suitably quality environmental professional. Agreement may need to be obtained from the Environment Agency before the wells are installed.</li> <li>• Groundwater monitoring and sampling from the installed wells should be undertaken at a minimum of five yearly intervals and analysed for hydrocarbons; this is envisaged to be speciated TPH-CWG, BTEX compounds and 16 speciated PAHs.</li> <li>• An approach to the data assessment should be developed, which would include comparison against the available baseline groundwater data and against available / relevant water quality standards. There may also be a requirement to undertake statistical assessment and / or trend analysis.</li> <li>• The results of each round of monitoring should be compiled and the site condition report should be updated after each round of monitoring.</li> <li>• A procedure should be developed should the monitoring identify an increase in hydrocarbon concentrations. For example, this may include reviewing diesel storage and handling arrangements and stock records, records of spills / leaks, designing and implementing an enhanced groundwater and (if necessary) soil monitoring programme.</li> <li>• The need for soil sampling would depend on the findings of the groundwater monitoring programme, and also whether there are any releases of a dangerous substance</li> </ul>

Conditions	Source	Description
		<p>at the installation. The need (or otherwise) for soil sampling will require justification by the operator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any soil sampling programme should be designed and supervised by a suitably quality environmental professional. Agreement may need to be obtained from the Environment Agency. The SCR should be updated with the results of any soil sampling.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Supporting information and sources</b></p>	<p>See next column</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publicly available online geological mapping at <a href="http://www.bgs.ac.uk">www.bgs.ac.uk</a></li> <li>• Aquifer designations available at <a href="http://www.magic.gov.uk">www.magic.gov.uk</a></li> <li>• Site location plan and layout plan reproduced in Appendix 1, Figure 1 and 2 respectively</li> <li>• Site drainage plan reproduced in Appendix 1</li> <li>• Kettering Borough Council Environmental Health Officer</li> <li>• Groundsure database records reproduced in Appendix 3</li> <li>• Environmental Risk Assessment in Appendix 5</li> </ul> <p>Previous reports reproduced in Appendix 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waterman, Phase I Desk Study Report, November 2011 (Project No. 11964-4430-100 Rev 0)</li> <li>• ESG, Factual Report on Ground Investigation, February 2012 (Project No. E1100-11)</li> <li>• Waterman, Phase 2 Ground Investigation, May 2012 (Project No. 11964-4430-200 Rev 0)</li> <li>• RSK, Supplementary Geotechnical Ground Investigation Interpretative Report, November 2015 (Project No. 313074-02(00))</li> <li>• Hydrock, Environmental Risk Assessment Report, June 2021 (Project No. 14441-HYD-XX-XX-RP-GE-1001-S2-P02)</li> </ul>

### 3. PERMITTED ACTIVITIES

**Table 3-1: Permitted Activities**

<p><b>Permitted Activities</b></p>	<p>The primary activities proposed to be undertaken at the site are associated with the operation and maintenance of a beverage can manufacturing facility, which is currently under construction, with a scheduled completion date for the building structure of December 2022. This date may be subject to change.</p> <p>The facility will require a Section 6.4 A(2)(a) Environmental Permit relating to the coating and printing of metal cans, which will be regulated by the local authority (solvent consumption &gt;200tpa or &gt;150kg/hr). Solvent emission limits will also apply under Schedule 14 of the Environmental Permitting Regulations.</p>
<p><b>Non-Permitted Activities Undertaken</b></p>	<p>The Installation boundary captures the printing system and the directly associated activities across the facility.</p>
<p><b>Document References For:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>plan showing activity layout; and</b></li> <li>• <b>environmental risk assessment.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 1 - Site Location – 1620011745-001 Issue 1, Figure 1</li> <li>• Appendix 1 - Site Layout – Drawing ref. P2108-UMC-ZZ-00-DR-A-D0603</li> <li>• Appendix 1 – Overall Drainage Layout – P21028-FRH-EW-XX-DR-C-2000, Revision C02</li> </ul>



## 4. CHANGES TO THE ACTIVITY

**Table 4-1: Changes to the Activity**

<p>Have there been any changes to the activity boundary?</p>	<p><i>Not applicable at Permit Application. To be completed by the operator should changes to the permitted activity boundary change during the lifetime of the permit.</i></p>
<p>Have there been any changes to the permitted activities?</p>	<p><i>Not applicable at Permit Application. To be completed by the operator should changes to the permitted activities change during the lifetime of the permit.</i></p>
<p>Have any 'dangerous substances' not identified in the Application Site Condition Report been used or produced as a result of the permitted activities?</p>	<p><i>Not applicable at Permit Application. To be completed by the operator should there be changes to the dangerous substances during the lifetime of the permit.</i></p>
<p>Checklist of supporting information</p>	<p><i>Not applicable at Permit Application. Supporting documentation to be provided by the operator should there be changes to any of the above during the lifetime of the permit.</i></p>

## 5. MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT LAND

**Table 5-1: Measures Taken to Protect Land**

<p><i>Operator to complete this section during the permit and at Permit Surrender using records collected during the life of the permit to summarise whether pollution prevention measures have worked.</i></p>	
<p>Checklist of Supporting Information</p>	<p>Checklist of supporting information to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inspection records and summary of findings of inspections for all pollution prevention measures.</li><li>• Records of maintenance, repair and replacement of pollution prevention measures.</li></ul>

## 6. POLLUTION INCIDENTS THAT MAY HAVE HAD AN IMPACT ON LAND, AND THEIR REMEDIATION

**Table 6-1: Pollution incidents that may have had an impact on land, and their remediation**

<p><i>Not required for Permit Application.</i></p> <p><i>Operator to complete this section during the permit and at Permit Surrender to summarise any pollution incidents that may have damaged the land. Operator to describe how each one was investigated and remedied. If this is not possible can't, the operator will need to collect land and /or groundwater reference data to assess whether the land has deteriorated during the permitted period.</i></p>	
Checklist of Supporting Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Records of pollution incidents that may have impacted on land.</li><li>• Records of their investigation and remediation.</li></ul>

## 7. SOIL GAS AND WATER QUALITY MONITORING (WHERE UNDERTAKEN)

**Table 7-1: Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where undertaken)**

<p><i>Not applicable at Permit Application.</i></p> <p><i>Operator to provide details of soil gas and/or water monitoring and a summary of the findings and say whether it shows that the land deteriorated as a result of the permitted activities. If it did, the operator is to outline how it was investigated and remedied.</i></p>	
Checklist of Supporting Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description of soil gas and/or water monitoring undertaken.</li><li>• Monitoring results (including graphs).</li></ul>

## 8. DECOMMISSIONING AND REMOVAL OF POLLUTION RISK

**Table 8-1: Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk**

<p><i>Not applicable at Permit Application.</i></p> <p><i>At Permit Surrender operator is to describe how the site was decommissioned and demonstrate that all sources of pollution risk have been removed. Operator to describe whether the decommissioning had any impact on the land and outline how this was investigated and remedied.</i></p>	
Checklist of Supporting Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Site closure plan.</li><li>• List of potential sources of pollution risk.</li><li>• Investigation and remediation reports (where relevant).</li></ul>

## 9. REFERENCE DATA AND REMEDIATION (WHERE RELEVANT)

**Table 9-1: Reference data and remediation (where relevant)**

<p><i>Not required at Permit Application.</i></p> <p><i>At Permit Surrender, operator is to say whether collection of land and/or groundwater data was required. Or say that it wasn't required from sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Surrender Site Condition Report shows that the land has not deteriorated.</i></p> <p><i>If land and/or groundwater reference data is collected, summarise what this entailed, and what the 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 was done to remedy this. Confirm that the land is now in a "satisfactory state" at surrender.</i></p>	
<p>Checklist of Supporting Information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land and/or groundwater data collected at application (if collected)</li> <li>• Land and/or groundwater data collected at surrender (where needed)</li> <li>• Assessment of satisfactory state</li> <li>• Remediation and verification reports (where undertaken)</li> </ul>

## 10. STATEMENT OF SITE CONDITION

**Table 10-1: Statement of site condition**

*Not required at Permit Application.*

*At Permit Surrender, 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; and*
- the land is in a satisfactory condition.*