

# **Pump and Bloors Farm, Rainham**

# Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contamination and Geotechnical)

On behalf of AC Goatham & Son

Project Ref: 44538/3501 | Rev: 01 | Date: October 2018





# **Document Control Sheet**

Project Name: Pump and Bloors Farm, RainhamProject Ref:44538/3501Report Title:Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contamination and Geotechnical)Doc Ref:Rev01Date:October 2018

	Name	Position	Signature	Date	
Prepared by:	W Woolf	Graduate Engineer	- martinet	3.10.18	
Reviewed and Approved by:	P Jeffery	Director	₽Jbj	3.10.18	
For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP					

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
00	3.10.18	Draft for client review	WW	PJ	PJ
01	04.12.18	Final for Issue	WW	PJ	PJ

This report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP ('PBA') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which PBA was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). PBA accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

© Peter Brett Associates LLP 2018



# Contents

Sum	mary		1
1	Introdu	ction	3
	1.1	Preamble	3
	1.2	Objectives	3
	1.3	Scope of Work	3
	1.4	Methodology and Report Format	4
	1.5	Sources of Information	5
2	Land U	se Information	7
	2.1	Introduction	7
	2.2	Site Location and Description	7
	2.3	Topography	7
	2.4	Historical Land Use	7
	2.5	Current Land Use – On site	9
	2.6	Surrounding land	10
	2.7	Visually Identified Utilities	11
	2.8	Proposed Development	11
3	Enviror	mental Setting	12
	3.1	Introduction	12
	3.2	Geology	12
	3.3	Radon	13
	3.4	Environmental and Industrial Setting	13
	3.5	Landfill Sites	14
	3.6	Discharge Consents	15
	3.7	Pollution Prevention and Control	16
	3.8	Pollution Incidents to Controlled Waters	16
	3.9	Hydrogeology	17
	3.10	Groundwater Abstractions	17
	3.11	Hydrology	17
	3.12	Ecological Systems	18
	3.13	Ancient Monuments and Historical Buildings	18
4	Ground	Stability Assessment	19
	4.1	Introduction	19
	4.2	Geological Hazards	19
	4.3	Natural and Artificial Cavities	20
	4.4	Surface Quarrying	23
	4.5	Slope Instability	23
	4.6	Unexploded Ordinance	24
	4.7	Foundation Conditions	24



	4.8	Soakaway Strategy in Chalk	. 24
	4.9	Confidence and Uncertainty	. 25
5	Tier 1 Pr	eliminary Risk Assessment	. 26
	5.1	Introduction	. 26
	5.2	Conceptual Site Model	. 26
	5.3	Geoenvironmental Hazard Identification	. 26
	5.4	Risk Assessment	. 28
	5.5	Risk Estimation	. 30
	5.6	Confidence and Uncertainty	. 31
6	Conclus	ions & Recommendations	. 33
	6.1	Conclusions	. 33
	6.2	Recommendations	. 33
7	Essentia	al Guidance for Report Readers	. 35
8	Referen	Ces	. 36

# **Figures**

Figure 1: Site Location	1
Figure 2: Site Layout	1

# **Tables**

Table A Summary of the preliminary geoenvironmental assessment	1
Table 3.1 Summary of ground conditions from BGS historical exploratory hole logs.	. 12
Table 3.2 Summary of environmental and industrial setting	. 13
Table 4.1 Summary of Geological Hazards from third party report	. 19
Table 4.2 Details of the natural cavities records within 2000m from the site centre.	. 20
Table 4.3 Details of the artificial non-coal mining cavities records within 2000m of the site centre	. 21
Table 5.1 Potential sources of contamination (PSC) and contaminants of concern (COC)	. 28
Table 5.2 Potential Receptors and Receptor Sensitivity	. 29
Table 5.3 Contamination Risk Estimation	. 30

# Appendices

- Appendix A: PBA Methodology for Assessing Land Contamination in England.
- Appendix B1: Historical Maps South-West (Area 1)
- Appendix B2: Historical Maps South-East (Area 2)
- Appendix B3: Historical Maps North-West (Area 3)
- Appendix B4: Historical Maps North-West (Area 4)
- Appendix C1: EnviroCheck Report South-West (Area 1)



- Appendix C2: EnviroCheck Report South-East (Area 2)
- Appendix C3: EnviroCheck Report North-West (Area 3)
- Appendix C4: EnviroCheck Report North-East (Area 4)
- Appendix D: Walkover Photographic Plates
- Appendix E: BGS Records
- Appendix F: Extracts from Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Landfill Reports
- Appendix G: Proposed Development Masterplan
- Appendix H: Table of Estimated Risk



this page is intertionally bland



# Summary

This report presents a Phase 1 Ground Condition Assessment (Contamination and Geotechnical) for the proposed residential redevelopment of a parcel of land around Pump Farm and Bloors Farm, Rainham, Medway, Kent.

**Site Location** The site is located within the village of Lower Rainham, Kent. The site is approximately 51.8 hectares in area and mostly comprises agricultural land and associated farm outbuildings.

**Ground Conditions** The available geological data indicates that the Site is underlain by Superficial Head deposits in part with a thinning sequence of Thanet Formation overlying the Seaford Chalk Formation forming the bedrock strata below. Groundwater is anticipated to be at an elevation of between around 4m and 2mAOD, i.e. between 18-20m bgl within the Seaford Chalk Formation which has been identified as being a Principal Aquifer

The Lower Twydall Chalk Pit landfill, a closed inert filled landfill is located to the immediate west of the site. The presence of other areas of made ground at the site are limited in nature and restricted to areas of previous development principally associated with farm outbuildings, access roads or structures that exist on the site.

**Preliminary Geo-Environmental Assessment** Based on the proposed end use of the site as residential with a primary school, retirement village, and recreational areas, the findings of a qualitative risk assessment carried out to assess hazards and constraints posed by the existing site conditions to the proposed development are summarised in the following table.

Table /	A Summary	/ of the	preliminary	geoenvironment	al assessment
---------	-----------	----------	-------------	----------------	---------------

Potential Receptor	Risk Assessment	Description
Construction Workers	Low	The risk to site workers is expected to be Low provided appropriate protective clothing and equipment are worn, and good standards of hygiene are adopted to prevent prolonged skin contact, inhalation and ingestion of soils.
Future Users	Low	The risk to future site users is estimated as Low with very localised areas of possible contamination/landgas associated with historic or current land use.
Buildings	Very Low	The risk to buildings is estimated to be Very Low. This is a result of the buildings being classified as being replaceable and because it is assessed that there is a low possibility that harm could impact this receptor.
Groundwater	Low	The site is underlain by a Principal Aquifer (Seaford Chalk Formation), but it's not located within any Source Protection Zone area. The risk to groundwater is considered to be Low.

Ground investigation is advised at a later stage to inform both the geotechnical design of foundations / infrastructure and also to confirm the absence of contamination. It is recommended therefore that any future ground investigation at the site will incorporate some basic contamination testing, and land gas monitoring in proximity to the Lower Twydall Landfill site to support the conclusions of this study.

It is considered very unlikely that the local planning authority will designate the site as Contaminated Land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.



Preliminary Ground Stability Risk Assessment A review of potential geological hazards has identified the risk of land instability or potentially adverse foundation conditions to be present, in general, to be **High**. This is due to the **High** risk of solution features associated with the dissolution of the Seaford Chalk Formation underlying the site.

The summary contains an overview of the key findings and conclusions. However, no reliance should be placed on any part of the summary until the whole of the report has been read.



# **1** Introduction

# 1.1 Preamble

Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) has been instructed by AC Goatham & Son (the Client) to undertake a Phase 1 Ground Condition Assessment for a parcel of agricultural land associated with Pump Farm and Bloors Farm in Rainham, Medway, Kent.

This report presents a Phase 1 ground conditions assessment comprising a desk study, site walkover, Tier 1 preliminary qualitative contamination risk assessment, and preliminary ground stability assessment. The report has been prepared to support a planning application for the development of the Site suitable for predominantly residential development.

The assessments review readily available information in order to assess the existing ground conditions on the site and the potential for contamination to be present associated with previous and present uses of the site and the surrounding areas. This enables a qualitative assessment to be made of the geoenvironmental constraints such that informed decisions on the proposed development can be made and the risk and hazards associated with existing or potential future contamination and instability of the ground be identified.

It should be noted that the Phase 1 is a land condition assessment and does not purport to be an ecological, flood risk or archaeological survey.

# 1.2 Objectives

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DCLG, 2018) stipulates that planning policies and decisions should ensure that "a site is suitable for it proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risk arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising form that remediation)"; and that "after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments".

The objective of this report is to identify the likely ground conditions at the site and to assess whether there are significant geoenvironmental, and stability hazards associated with the existing ground conditions that require management (remediation or mitigation) to enable development or as part of the subsequent use of the site. In addition, the report includes advice on likely requirements for foundations, and infrastructure, to assess with the conceptual design of the proposed development.

# 1.3 Scope of Work

The scope of work undertaken by PBA comprises:

- A review and collation of readily available geological, hydrogeological and aquifer vulnerability maps; geological information and historical Ordnance Survey maps.
- A walkover survey to examine the existing condition of the Site and surrounding area.
- A qualitative Tier 1 risk assessment utilising a Conceptual Site Model to identify 'source pathway receptor' linkages to assess the potential risk and hazards, if any, associated with existing or potential future contamination in the ground.



• A ground stability assessment of the risk of subsidence arising from artificial cavities; natural cavities; and potential adverse foundation conditions.

This report presents a review of the acquired information, together with the development of a Preliminary Conceptual Site Model (CSM) and the associated Tier 1 contaminated land and ground stability risk assessment.

# 1.4 Methodology and Report Format

# **Assessment of Ground Conditions - Contamination**

UK legislation on contaminated land from historical activities is principally contained in Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act, 1990 (which was inserted into the 1990 Act by section 57 of the Environment Act 1995).

The Regulations and Statutory Guidance that accompanied the Act, including the Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2006, have been revised with the issue of the Contaminated Land (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012/263) and the Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance for England 2012.

Under the NPPF, the broad approach, concepts and principles behind land contamination management advocated by the Part 2A regime are applied to the determination of planning applications. Guidance on ground condition assessment is given in CLR 11 Model Procedures for the Management of Contaminated Land (EA, 2004), that sets out a process based on a tiered risk assessment with increasing level of detail required to progress through the tiers.:

- Stage 1 = risk assessment
- Stage 2 = options appraisal and
- Stage 3 = implementation of remedial strategy

Risk assessment is undertaken in a phased manner with the three tiers being:

- Tier 1 "preliminary risk assessment" a qualitative assessment forming part of a Phase 1 report,
- Tier 2 "generic risk assessment" a quantitative assessment using published criteria to screen Site specific ground condition data forming part of a Phase 2 report and
- Tier 3 "detailed risk assessment" a quantitative assessment involving the generation of Site specific assessment criteria (SSAC).

The underlying principle is the evaluation of *pollutant linkages* in order to assess whether the presence of a source of contamination could potentially lead to harmful consequences. A pollutant linkage consists of the following three elements:

- A source of contamination or hazard that has the potential to cause harm or pollution;
- A pathway for the hazard to move along / generate exposure; and
- A receptor which is affected by the hazard.

For each potential pollutant linkage identified the risk is estimated through consideration of the magnitude of the potential consequences and the likelihood or probability of an event occurring.



This report is divided into chapters identifying potential sources (hazard identification), potential pathway and receptor identification, and risk estimation and assessment.

The PBA methodology for ground condition assessment (contamination) is presented in **Appendix A**.

# **Ground Instability**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Clause 178 requires that 'a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability'. The preliminary stability assessment includes for example, where relevant, a review of geological hazards for the Site such as natural and man-made (mining) cavities, landslide, cambering and block movement, collapsible and compressible soils, running sand, and subsidence and heave due to volumetric change in the ground.

The preliminary ground stability assessment methodology adopted by PBA follows the guidance on preliminary land stability assessment given in the Planning Practice Guidance for Land Stability published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG 2014). The guidance requires, at least, a desk based study and a site inspection visit by an appropriately qualified person. Available published geological information has been obtained and reviewed, together with data acquired from public databases. A site walkover with direct inspection of the site and surrounding land was also carried out in conjunction with the desk study.

The desk-based study comprises a review of existing readily available published sources of geological, geomorphological, hydrogeological and /or mining information on the Site and its surroundings and a historical review including mapping and aerial imagery, if appropriate.

The site inspection is undertaken to assess the presence of potential instability features on site. The objective of a ground stability assessment is to identify the likely ground conditions of a defined site and assess the information to identify potential issues that may have associated geotechnical liabilities or other ground engineering constraints that could affect the site development. This includes potential subsidence arising from artificial cavities, natural cavities - coal and non-coal (underground) mining / extraction activities, adverse foundation conditions (ranging from soft weak sediments to hard strong rocks), and landslides and slope instability.

#### **1.5** Sources of Information

The following sources of information were used in the preparation of this report:

- Landmark was commissioned to provide historical maps and an EnviroCheck computerised data search. The historical maps are presented in **Appendix B** and the EnviroCheck report is presented in **Appendix C**. Note: This report is divided into four areas which cover the site; 1, 2, 3, and 4 representing the south-west, south-east, north-west, and north-east quadrants respectively. Therefore, the appendices are numerically labelled according the area they cover.
- PBA walkover inspection Selected key photographs are presented in Appendix D;
- Information published by the British Geological Survey (BGS) from 1:50,000 scale geological maps and 1: 126,720 scale hydrogeological maps;
- Historical borehole records held by the BGS as accessed via their website, <u>www.bgs.ac.uk/data/boreholescans/home.html</u>; the historical borehole logs are presented in **Appendix E**;



- Environment Agency website "What's in Your Back Yard?", <u>http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk;</u>
- The National Artificial and Natural Cavities Database managed and enhanced by PBA.
- MAGIC website http://www.magic.gov.uk which provides authoritative geographic information about the natural environment from across government. The information covers rural, urban, coastal, and marine environments across Great Britain. It is presented in an interactive map which can be explored using various mapping tools.
- Third-party reports on the environmental monitoring of the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit landfill site, obtained from the Environment Agency. Key extracts from the third-party monitoring reports are included in Appendix F.
- Unexploded Bomb risk map from Zetica UXO (<u>https://zeticauxo.com/downloads-and-resources/risk-maps/</u>).

Attention is drawn to the Essential Guidance for Report Readers included in **Section 7** of this report.



# 2 Land Use Information

# 2.1 Introduction

This section presents a summary of historical and current land uses on and immediately adjacent to the site. Land use is used to inform the hazard identification element of the risk assessment.

# 2.2 Site Location and Description

The site is situated in the village of Lower Rainham, approximately 3.0km to the east of the town of Gillingham, Kent. The subject site is centred at National Grid Reference TQ 809 674 with the nearest postcode being ME8 7AT.

The site is located between Lower Rainham Road to the north, with associated agricultural land and residential development, and the South Eastern (Chatham to Sittingbourne) Railway line to the south. The River Medway estuary lies approximately 600m to the north of the site.

Within this report the site has been divided principally as two main parcels of land, divided by Pump Lane which traverses north south through the subject site. The first area, termed "Pump Farm", is bounded by Pump Lane to the east and Lower Twydall Lane to the west. The second area, termed "Bloors Farm", is bounded by Lower Bloors Lane to the west and Pump Lane to the east.

A site location is presented in Figure 1, with the division of land parcels shown on Figure 2.

# 2.3 Topography

The general topography falls from a highest elevation of approximately 30m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) adjacent to the railway line on the southern edge of the site falling to circa 13m AOD on the northern boundary. Pump Lane, which runs roughly through the middle of the site, lies in a narrow shallow valley. The former Lower Twydall Chalk Quarry and associated access road leading to Lower Rainham Road also lie within a shallow valley feature.

## 2.4 Historical Land Use

The history of the development of the site and the surrounding area has been obtained from a number of readily available historical Ordnance Survey (OS) maps. Copies of the extracts from both the historical and current OS maps are presented in **Appendix B** (LM, 2018).

## Pump Farm

The earliest available historical OS maps is dated 1869. The site is located a rural setting near the Medway Estuary. The site is shown comprising agricultural land with a number of orchards present on site. A hedge and ditch boundary is also shown running north to south through the centre of the site. The land surrounding the site is occupied by agricultural land with several farms scattered throughout the area. For example, Twydall and York Farms are located on the western side of the area. The site is bordered to the east and south by Pump Lane and by the South Eastern and Chatham Railway respectively.

A number of chalk pits are also present to the south of the site alongside Pump Lane and Twydall Lane.

By 1909 the excavation works at the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit, closest to the site have commenced, while the smaller chalk pits further to the south of the site appear to be disused.



By 1932 the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit has been expanded further to its current layout and extent. OS mapping suggests that the pit was excavated to a level of circa 5m AOD i.e. approximately 15m at its greatest depth on the southern edge. A number additional quarries are now present alongside the railway about 750 m to the west of the site. While the area immediately surrounding the site remains generally unchanged, significant residential development has occurred in Rainham, about 1000m to the south of the site.

Between the late 1930s and the early 1960s further large scale residential development is shown immediately south of the site in Twydall and to the east in East Rainham.

The historical aerial photograph of the area taken from Google Earth and dated December 1940, shows the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit to be disused and covered with overgrown vegetation.

By 1967 a small building labelled as 'Nursery' exists on the north-eastern part of the site, while a residential structure labelled as Winston is present adjacent to the northern site boundary. Small scale residential development has also occurred along Pump Lane. Additionally, the discovery of flint implements is made in the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit.

By 1974 small scale residential development has also occurred along Lower Rainham Road, immediately to the north of the site.

The historical aerial photograph of the area taken from Google Earth and dated December 1990, shows Pump Farm to exist on the eastern part of the site.

The historical aerial photographs of the area taken from Google Earth and dated between May 2007 and July 2013, show the backfilling and associated earthworks at the former Twydall Chalk Pit. The site's Closure Report (GES 2014a) obtained from the Environment Agency, indicates that the restoration of the site was completed in March 2013, with the site restored currently to a rough open ground (intended to be "restored to agriculture") with a slightly raised domed profile above the surround ground level (maximum level of 25.97mAOD as of January 2015,) (GES 2015).

#### **Bloors Farm**

The earliest historical OS map is dated 1869. The site is composed of orchards extending from the northern border, along the Lower Rainham Road, to a public bridleway that cuts the site approximately in half along the east-west axis. To the south of this path the site appears to be open agricultural land. The land surrounding the Bloors Farm area of the site is occupied by further agricultural land, several farms, and a few small chalk pits to the south (**Section 2.4.1**). Pump Farm appears on the western border of the site on Pump Lane. A small linear settlement is present along Lower Rainham Road to the north. Additionally, Motleyhill Docks appears approximately 2km to the north-east of the site on the River Medway.

By 1880 the building of Queen Court appears around 200m to the east of the site. From 1894 the small chalk pit around 100m to the south of the site appears to be disused. Additionally, an area labelled as 'Brick Field' appears approximately 150m north of the area along with a Wharf. The Brick Field returns to an orchard by 1896. However, from 1966 there is the gradual expansion of the Wharf with the development of a spoil heap, which then becomes a scrap metal yard by 1989. Furthermore, by 1896 a Quay is present approximately 200m to the north-east of the site.

The OS maps from 1897 show that the orchard has expanded south beyond the public bridleway to fill the majority of the site. A disused quarry is also situated around 400m to the south of the area.



The OS map from 1909 shows an area labelled as 'Nursery' present along the southern boundary along with allotment gardens at the south-east corner of the site. Two other nurseries are also present along the eastern boundary of the site.

By 1931 a chalk pit is now present in East Rainham about 400m south-east of the site, which is disused by 1961. A large Chalk Pit is also present approximately 400m east of the site, along Berengrave Lane, which is disused by 1974 and then becomes a nature reserve by 1985. By 1931 there is an apparent large expansion of the settlements at Rainham, Berengrave Lane, and Lower Rainham to the south, east, and north respectively. In 1932 the Motelyhill docks area reveals the development of the Rochester and Chatham Joint Sewerage Board sewage works, which continues to expand up to 1985. Additionally, by 1931 a series of nurseries are established along Berengrave Lane which become the Berengrave Nursery by 1969, and finally expand to form the Bloors Land Community Woodland along the eastern border of the site by 2018.

The OS Map from 1961 labels the discovery of Dark Age coins east of Plumb lane towards the north of the site. By 1989 most of the orchard north of the site has been removed, Bloors Farm is also first labelled on the northern border of the site.

Historical aerial photography from Google Earth shows the marked expansion of the area of orchard and potential intensification of agricultural activity over the site between December 1960 and December 1990. Additionally, by July 2013 a water tank is marked as being present on the eastern boundary of the site.

Google Earth images from April 2015 show the demolition of two agricultural outbuildings towards the north of the site, near Lower Rainham Road. This area is subsequently redeveloped by May 2018 into a series of three buildings with a paved area and garden around each building. At the time of the site walkover, whilst the principal structures had been created, the area of land to the immediate south of the new buildings remains as a general builders' yard, and a large stockpile of wooden crates/pallets (associated with fruit picking) are shown to the east of the buildings.

## 2.5 Current Land Use – On site

The current land use information is based on a walkover inspection undertaken by an Engineer from PBA on the 7<sup>th</sup> September 2018. Key pertinent photographs taken during the site walkover are presented in **Appendix D**. The layout of the site, locations of photographs, and salient notes from the walkover are presented as **Figure 2**.

## Pump Farm

This area of the site can be accessed off Pump Lane via a tarmac surfaced track. The area comprises agricultural land currently occupied by a series of orchards, divided by hedgerows forming wind-breaks about 2m to 3m high separating each field. Surface laid small diameter water irrigation pipes were observed in most of the rows of trees in the orchards, with associated pipe control chambers generally in the corners of each discrete field.

Principal access tracks within the orchard appear to be constructed from a mixture of gravel, scalpings, and crushed brick/concrete materials.

The Pump Farm area also contains a number of associated agricultural buildings, and temporary caravans utilised by itinerant labour on the north-eastern part of the site.

Two discrete farm buildings located at the farm are both used to store farming equipment/materials (large portal framed structure with steel corrugated sides and roof), and a smaller but longer wooden fruit processing shed. The temporary caravans are located to the north and west of the main storage shed, with a free-standing LPG gas tank at the eastern end



serving this accommodation. A skip containing general waste is also located in the forecourt of Pump Farm.

Two chemical storage sheds, a large water tank and a number of metal barrels labelled as farm oils, herbicide, and fuel, were noted alongside the main storage building. Whilst access to the main store was not possible during the site walkover, the client has advised that a fuel tank is also located within the main farm building; and that the tank is fully bunded and is placed on hardstanding.

## **Bloors Farm**

The Bloors Farm area of the Site can currently be accessed through two gates which exit onto Pump Lane, and another gate in the north-east corner of the site that opens onto Lower Bloors Lane. The use and layout of this area of the Site is very similar to the Pump Farm area (outlined above), consisting of an orchard divided by hedgerows. Across the Bloors Farm area there are also several locations where crates/pallets are stored, for harvesting the crops.

The Bloors Farm area is bisected by a public bridleway (GB6A) along the east west axis. A series of three residential buildings are present towards the north of the area, built after 2013. The south-west corner of this site remains a storage area for tiles and construction waste.

The access track to these buildings appears to be constructed from demolition rubble, possibly derived from the previous buildings on site, or imported to the site to form a hard-surfaced track. Within the crushed brick and concrete material there were very localised minor inclusions of what could possibly asbestos containing materials (ACMs) in the form of small fragments of cement sheeting/board.

A large segmental steel circular water storage tank, sited upon a concrete plinth, is present along the eastern boundary of the Bloors Farm area. This location also contains a borehole used for water abstraction for irrigation purposes and a large steel shipping container. Pipework was observed connecting the water storage tank, borehole and container. The client has advised that the container houses pumping equipment is used for the irrigation pumping system, and that no chemicals are stored within.

## 2.6 Surrounding land

#### **Pump Farm**

The land surrounding the Pump Farm area of the site is generally agricultural and residential in use. An orchard and corn field borders the site to the north and west respectively. A concrete slab (approximately 30m long and 15m wide) is present immediately south-east of Pump Farm and appears to be used for the storage of treated wooden poles and scrap metal. Residential buildings are located around York Farm to the west of the site and along lower Rainham road to the north-west.

The Pump Farm residential complex, comprising a number of two-storey reconverted barns, is located immediately to the east of the site along Pump Lane. The Chatham Railway line borders the site to the south with the town of Rainham located immediately beyond.

The Lower Twydall Chalk Pit (landfill) was observed immediately to the west-northwest of the Site. During the walkover, the section of the landfill bordering the Site was observed covered in overgrown vegetation, with no evidence of vegetation dieback.

## **Bloors Farm**

The surrounding land consists of residential and greenfield areas. Allotment gardens border the south-east corner of the Site. Residential properties are located along Lower Rainham Road to



the north, Pump Lane to the north-west, and Lower Bloors Lane to the east. Ongoing construction is occurring to the north of the site along Lower Rainham Road, believed to be associated with residential development, which has also recently occurred to the immediate north of Lower Rainham Road, adjacent to the Three Mariners Public House.

The Chatham Railway line borders the Site to the south with the town of Rainham located immediately beyond.

# 2.7 Visually Identified Utilities

A below ground foul sewer cuts across the northern portion of the site. A manhole associated with this sewer is set in a concrete plinth near Pump Farm. This sewer appears to continue across the Bloors farm site area, with a similarly constructed concrete plinth and covers observed towards the north-western corner of the site.

Another manhole is present in the south-east corner of the site. Additionally, a set of two manholes occurs along the eastern boundary of the area. During a site walkover flowing water could be heard through the manholes, accompanied by a slight foul odour, suggesting that this is a foul water sewer.

Off site, along Pump Lane, there are multiple manholes and gas mains covers. Additionally, a manhole is located in the corner of a concrete slab located south-east of Pump Farm, near the boundary with Pump Lane. A substation is also located along the eastern boundary near Pump Farm.

# 2.8 **Proposed Development**

It is understood that the Client is seeking to establish circa 1250 dwellings with a primary school and retirement village. The development is divided between five 'areas' which also incorporates a central 'village green', various 'green corridors' and equipped playgrounds, and a community orchard. A copy of the proposed development Masterplan is displayed in **Appendix G**.



# **3** Environmental Setting

## 3.1 Introduction

Information on the environmental setting is presented in this Section and the data is used to inform the stability assessment in **Section 4** and the Contamination Risk Assessment presented in **Section 5**.

## 3.2 Geology

The publicly available geological data from the British Geological Survey (BGS) for the general site area was reviewed for the purpose of this report.

# **Geological Map**

The 1:50,000 scale geological map of the area, Sheet 272 Chatham (BGS, 1977), indicates that the site is underlain Thanet Beds comprising pale yellow-brown, fine grained sand. These strata are in turn underlain by the Cretaceous age Seaford Chalk Formation comprising firm white chalk with flint seams. The Thanet Sand is mapped locally as an outlier and thins to the northern, western and eastern boundaries of the site, but it's shown extending beneath the railway line to the south. Superficial Head Deposits comprising clay, silt and gravel are mapped as being present locally to the north of the site, principally in areas not overlain by Thanet Sand. In particular Head Deposits are found within the narrow shallow valley feature occupied by Pump Lane.

## **Historical Records**

A number of publicly available borehole and trial pit logs in the general vicinity of the site have been viewed to ascertain the likely thicknesses of deposits.

In addition, borehole records obtained as part of the review of information on the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Landfill (GES, 2014a), provided borehole records of monitoring boreholes installed to the perimeter of the site. Copies of such are included for reference in **Appendix F1**.

Table 3.1 below presents a summary of such:

Strata	Base level (m bgl)	Typical Description
Topsoil	0.3 - 0.5	n/a
Head Deposits	0.5 - 3.0	Loam. Locally thinning at northern boundary and probably absent to south of site.
Thanet Beds	2.0 - 6.0	Stiff or very stiff, brown sandy CLAY with gravel and occasional roots. Locally thinning to north of site.
Seaford Chalk Formation	>16.70	Firm chalk with fragments of hard chalk and flint.

Table 3.1 Summary of ground conditions from BGS historical exploratory hole logs.

Groundwater levels recorded in close proximity to the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit landfill, taken from the 2015 annual monitoring report (GES, 2015), are presented graphically in **Appendix F1**. Results from the continuation of the groundwater monitoring program, taken from the 2016 annual interpretive report (GES, 2016) and the 2017 annual interpretive report (GES, 2017), are presented graphically in **Appendix F2**.



During 2015 Groundwater levels ranged between 3.33mAOD and 3.99mAOD in the up-gradient borehole BH1 (to the south of the landfill site) and between 1.99mAOD and 2.14mAOD in the furthest down-gradient borehole BH3a, to the north of the landfill site closest to Lower Rainham Road. Up-gradient levels were on average approximately 1.5m greater than down-gradient.

Groundwater level in the immediately down-gradient boreholes of the landfill, BH2B and BH6 ranged between 2.49mAOD and 2.80mAOD, and 2.14mAOD and 2.46mAOD respectively.

During 2016 and 2017 Groundwater levels ranged between 2.85 mAOD and 3.71mAOD in the up-gradient borehole BH1 (to the south of the landfill site) and between 1.53mAOD and 2.08mAOD in the furthest down-gradient borehole BH3a, to the north of the landfill site closest to Lower Rainham Road. Up-gradient levels were on average 1.0m and 1.5m greater than down-gradient levels in 2016 and 2017 respectively.

Groundwater levels in the immediately down-gradient boreholes of the landfill, BH2B and BH6, ranged between 1.87mAOD and 2.25mAOD and 1.73mAOD and 2.28mAOD during 2016 and 2017 respectively.

# 3.3 Radon

Radon is a naturally occurring radioactive gas and emanated from certain geological formations to varying degrees, depending on the type, porosity and permeability. The EnviroCheck report indicates the site is located in an area where between 1% and 3% of the properties are above the Action Level. According to BRE BR211 (BRE, 2007), dwellings at this location do not require radon protection measures.

## 3.4 Environmental and Industrial Setting

Information on the industrial setting of the site is presented in the EnviroCheck report (LM, 2018) and reproduced in **Appendix C**. The results of the database search are summarised on the following table and discussed in the following sections.

Data Type	Number on Site <sup>(1)</sup>	Number within 250m of Site <sup>(1)</sup>
Waste Regulation		
Landfill Sites	0 (0)	1 (0)
Licensed Waste Management Facilities	0 (0)	2 (0)
Statutory Permits/Authorisations		
Pollution Prevention and Control <sup>(2)</sup>	0 (0)	1 (1)
Radioactive Substance Authorisations	0 (0)	0 (0)
Planning Hazardous Substances	0 (0)	0 (0)
COMAH Sites (3) and NIHHS Sites (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Potential Contaminative Uses		
Fuel Stations	0 (0)	0
Trade Directory	0	5 (15)
Discharge Consents	0 (1)	4 (4)
Pollution Records		
Pollution Incidents to Controlled Waters	0	6

Table 3.2 Summary of environmental and industrial setting

Data Type		Number on Site <sup>(1)</sup>	Number within 250m of Site <sup>(1)</sup>
	Sites Determined as Contaminated Land		0
Note:			
1)	Numbers in brackets denotes number of authorisations, licences or permits that are lapsed, revoked, cancelled, superseded, defunct, surrendered, not applicable, withdrawn or not yet started.		
2)	Includes Integrated Pollution Controls, Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control, Local Authority Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control and Local Authority Pollution Prevention and Control permits.		
3)	COMAH denotes Control of Major Accident Hazards		
	NIHHS denotes Notification of Installations Handling Hazardous Substances		

# 3.5 Landfill Sites

The EnviroCheck Report contains a record of two landfill sites within 250m of the site:

- Licence Number: 210049. Name: 'Lower Twydall Chalk Pit'. Category: Inert landfill. Licence Holder: Kent Land Reclamation Ltd.
- Licence Number: Unknown. Name: 'Pump Lane'. Category: Inert Waste. Licence Holder: Unknown.

# Lower Twydall Chalk Pit

Lower Twydall Chalk Pit is an historical landfill adjacent to the site. This comprises a former chalk pit approximately 200m long and 100m wide, excavated during the first half of the 1900s to a maximum depth of around 15 m bgl. After completion of chalk extraction, the site operator, Kent Land Reclamation Limited (KLR) in-filled the resultant void, using inert waste soils generated by the local construction industry. Activities were undertaken under the auspices of Environmental Permit No FP3630LC. (GES, 2014a).

The monitoring infrastructure on the site comprises four in-waste monitoring points and four external perimeter wells, located in the natural chalk geology surrounding the site. The site layout is included in **Appendix F**. Infilling has now been completed and the site has been restored with a rough open grassland with sporadic small bushes. The site entered the Closure Phase in 2014 and is now covered under permit EPR/3309GK/V003. The landfill was subsequently restored and entered closure under permit EPR/BB3309GK/V003.

A number of third-party monitoring reports on the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit landfill site were reviewed as part of this desk study (GES; 2013, 2014b, 2015, 2016, and 2017). The latest available monitoring data indicate that ground gases concentrations on the perimeter are relatively low (all below the trigger levels), with methane concentrations recorded as 0%, and carbon dioxide levels ranging from 0.8% to 3.2%. Graphical representations of the landfill gas concentrations are presented in **Appendix F2**. These results are broadly consistent with the previous monitoring results from 2015 (see **Appendix F1**).

Additionally, for both in-waste and perimeter gas measurements, no changes in differential pressure or flow were observed between the 2016 and 2017 reports. Furthermore, no substantial changes occurred in the down-gradient water chemistry between 2016 and 2017 with the elevated total organic carbon recorded in 2017 attributed to an offside incident.



Comments concerning groundwater monitoring from GES (2015) and GES (2017) are very similar. The GES (2017) report concludes that:

"Water quality remained in line with previous monitoring periods, with all parameters below the trigger levels throughout the monitoring period. No significant upward trends are noticed in any parameters measured.

Elevated TOC concentration identified in all monitoring points in August 2017 decreased throughout the remaining review period. As such it is considered that this is attributable to an incident that occurred off site.

Groundwater composition down-gradient is generally the same as up-gradient, with variations throughout the monitoring period reflected in all boreholes. As such it is not considered that the site currently poses a risk to groundwater."

Graphical representations of the groundwater quality concentrations recorded in GES (2015) are presented in **Appendix F1**. Groundwater quality concentration graphs from GES (2017) and GES (2016) are presented in **Appendix F2**.

#### **Pump Lane**

This landfill is located approximately 150m to the south of the site, at the end of Pump Lane and adjacent to Beechings Way. The area currently comprises a small mounded grassed area with a number of mature trees, providing public open space to the adjoining residential development.

The landfill is believed to have been a historical chalk pit infilled with inert waste prior to the construction of the residential area. Given the scale of the landfill, its age and likely composition and proximity to existing development, it is not considered as representing a significant risk to the proposed development, and is not taken forward as a potential offsite source of contamination.

## 3.6 Discharge Consents

The EnviroCheck Report records one historic discharge consent located on the site:

- Reference A00468: Active from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1991 until 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary (River Medway).
- Reference Unknown: additional discharge consent for Southern Water Serviced Ltd. This may be a duplicate of the consent outlined above, however insufficient information is provided.

The EnviroCheck Report records four currently active historic discharge consent located within 250m of the site:

- Reference D00098: Active from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1991. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary.
- Reference A00467: Active from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1991. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary (River Medway).
- Reference A00468: Active from 27<sup>th</sup> March 2017. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary (River Medway).
- Reference A00136: Active from 22<sup>nd</sup> June 1998. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary (River Medway).



The EnviroCheck Report records four historic discharge consents located within 250m of the site:

- Reference A00466: Active from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1991 until 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary (River Medway).
- Reference A00465: Active from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1991 until 17<sup>th</sup> July 1998. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary.
- Reference A00463: Active from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1991 until 17<sup>th</sup> July 1998. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary.
- Reference D00097: Active from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1991 until 17<sup>th</sup> July 1998. Operator: Southern Water Services Ltd. Discharge: public sewage/storm sewage overflow into saline estuary.
- Reference Unknown: additional discharge consent for Southern Water Serviced Ltd. This may be a duplicate of the consent outlined above, however insufficient information is provided.

# 3.7 Pollution Prevention and Control

The EnviroCheck Report records two cases of Pollution Prevention and Control within 250m of the site:

- Permit Reference: UP3337UD (originally: FP3630LC). Name: Kent Land Reclamation Ltd. Activity: Waste Landfilling. Location: Lower Twydall Chalk Pit. Status: Revoked.
- Permit Reference: P/B/058. Name: Hidsons Ltd. Activity: Waste oil burners. Location: Manor Farm Barn, Lower Rainham Road. Status: Permitted.

## 3.8 Pollution Incidents to Controlled Waters

The EnviroCheck Report records six pollution incidents within 250m of the site:

- Reference 92T197: Date: 6<sup>th</sup> May 1992. Pollutant: Surcharged Sewage. Severity: Category 3 (Minor Incident). Location: North West of Bloors Wharf.
- Reference 93T126: Date 29th July 1993. Treated Effluent. Severity: Category 3 (Minor Incident). Location: Cowstead Lane Strom Water Outfall, Lower Rainham.
- Reference 92T505: Date: 4<sup>th</sup> February 1993. Pollutant: Surcharged Sewage. Severity: Category 2 (Significant Incident). Location: Cowstead Lane, Lower Rainham.
- Reference 92T443: Date: 24th December 1992. Pollutant: Treated Effluent. Severity: Category 2 (Significant Incident). Location: Cowstead Lane, Lower Rainham.
- Reference 92T528: Date: 6th February 1993. Pollutant: Surcharged Sewage. Severity: Category 2 (Significant Incident). Location: Cowstead Lane, Lower Rainham.
- Reference 92T510: Date: 9th February 1993. Pollutant: Surcharged Sewage. Severity: Category 2 (Significant Incident). Location: Cowstead Lane, Lower Rainham.



# 3.9 Hydrogeology

The site does not lie within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone. The Thanet Beds covering much of the site are classified as a Secondary A aquifer. These are permeable layers capable of supporting water supplies at a local scale, and occasionally forming an important source of base flow to rivers. The Seaford Chalk Formation is classified as a Principal Aquifer. These are layers of rock that have high intergranular and/or fracture permeability, and generally provide high level of water storage. They may support water and/or river flow on a strategic scale.

The Head Deposits to the north of the site are classified as a Secondary (Undifferentiated) aquifer. These are strata displaying a wide range of water permeability and storage that may yield groundwater on local scale and provide base flow to rivers, but has yet to be classified in either Group A or B.

The regional groundwater flow is expected to be directed to the north – northeast towards the Medway Estuary. This is confirmed by the groundwater monitoring data presented in the GES 2015 report. See **Section 3.5** above.

The available groundwater levels recorded immediately north of the site (downgradient) (GES, 2015) indicate that groundwater levels are between about 4m and 2mAOD, which correspond to the inferred groundwater level for the northern part of the site based on the available historical borehole records.

# 3.10 Groundwater Abstractions

The EnviroCheck report lists a single active abstraction licence within 250m of the site (Licence number: 9/40/02/0093/Gr). This is operated by Mr C. J. Lyon for general farming and domestic use.

# Pump Farm

There are no registered abstractions on site. However, the client has advised that a borehole is located at the rear of the main storage building associated with Pump Farm and is used for irrigation purposes. We have been advised that the well has been advanced to circa 50m depth (i.e. within the Seaford Chalk Formation) and that a pump has been installed to circa 40m depth. No rate of abstraction was given, but given that it is unregistered it is assumed that the rate of abstraction is less than 20m<sup>3</sup>/day.

## **Bloors Farm**

There are no registered abstractions on site. However, during the walkover a borehole was observed towards the eastern boundary of the site. This appears to be part of the irrigation system for the orchard.

# 3.11 Hydrology

The EnviroCheck report lists three surface water features within 250m, these appear as a river network or water features. Additionally, the Medway Estuary lies approximately 500m to the north of the site, which is classified as a Ramsar site and Site of Special Scientific Interest. The Medway is tidal in nature at this point.

The online EA Flood Map for Planning (<u>https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</u>) shows the site is located in Flood Zone 1. Furthermore, the site is mostly within an area with limited potential for groundwater flooding to occur according to BGS Flood GFS Data. However, small areas of the site have the potential for groundwater flooding of property situated below ground level and for groundwater flooding to occur at the surface within the site, and more extensively within 250m of the northern boundary of the site.



During the site walkover, it was observed that the elevation of the orchard along the northern boundary, of the Pump Farm site, is below that of the Lower Rainham Road. Therefore, there is the potential for drainage water to pond at this location. Furthermore, there is no evidence of any drainage ditch, either on site or along the Lower Rainham Road.

# 3.12 Ecological Systems

A study of the EnviroCheck report and the interactive ecological maps on the MAGIC website (http://magic.gov.uk/home.htm) indicates that the Medway Estuary and Marshes is classified as a Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI), RAMSAR site, Marine Nature Reserve, and Special Protection Area. This is an area noted for its important intertidal habitat for a number of migratory bird species (JNCC, 2008).

Additionally, the Riverside Country Park and Berengrave Nature Reserve (listed as a local nature reserve) are located roughly 500m north west and east of the site respectively.

It should be noted the statement regarding ecological systems does not purport to be a formal assessment and this aspect may require a separate commission. The presence of a protected species (if applicable) requires a Site-specific survey and is outside the scope of this report.

# 3.13 Ancient Monuments and Historical Buildings

According to the MAGIC website there are no scheduled monuments, registered battlefields, registered parks or gardens, or world heritage sites within 500m of the site. However, a building at Pump Farm is listed as a grade II listed building, along with two buildings near Bloors Place, and three others along Lower Rainham road (along the northern boundary of the site). Additionally, there is also a grade II\* listed building at Bloors Place.

Historical OS Maps from 1961 and 1967 also label the discovery of Dark Age coins east of Plump Lane and flint implements in the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit respectively.

It should be noted the statement regarding historical building and ancient monuments does not purport to be a formal assessment and this aspect may require a separate commission.



# 4 Ground Stability Assessment

## 4.1 Introduction

In accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, 2018), the potential for the proposed development to contribute to or to be adversely affected by land instability has been assessed. Accordingly, consideration is given below to the potential risk of subsidence arising from Artificial Cavities; Natural Cavities; Slope Instability and Potential Adverse Foundation Conditions arising from existing ground conditions across the Site, as identified by the desk study.

# 4.2 Geological Hazards

An assessment of potential geological hazards that may give rise to contamination pathways, instability or adverse foundation or construction conditions as supplied by the British Geological Survey (BGS) from their National Geoscience Information Service (NGIS) are presented in the EnviroCheck Report reproduced in **Appendix C**. The generic assessment is generated automatically based on digital geological maps and the scope and the accuracy is limited by the methods used to create the dataset and is therefore only indicative for the search area.

The information contained in the EnviroCheck report has been reviewed and where considered necessary reassessed considering the specific information available for the site. The modified assessment of the potential for geological hazards to be present on the site is summarised in **Table 4.1** below:

Description	On-Site	PBA Comment
Coal Mining Affected Areas	Not in Coal Mining Area	PBA Agree with this assessment.
Collapsible Ground Stability Hazards	Very Low	PBA Agree with this assessment.
Compressible Ground Stability Hazards	No Hazard	PBA does not agree with this assessment, as there are Head Deposits that may locally include lenses of clay, or other compressible material. However, it is recognised that Head Deposits may be absent from the majority of the site or limited in thickness and as such the hazard is assessed to be <b>Very Low</b> .
Dissolution Hazard	High	PBA Agree with this assessment.
Landslide Ground Stability	Low	PBA Agree with this assessment.
Running Sand	Moderate	PBA does not agree with this assessment. The potential for internal erosion of the granular soil is generally associated with a high groundwater table. The available historical borehole records indicate that the groundwater level is expected to be between about 15m and 20m bgl. As such the hazard is assessed to be <b>Very Low</b> .
Shrinking or Swelling Clay	Low/Very Low	PBA Agree with this assessment.

#### Table 4.1 Summary of Geological Hazards from third party report.



# 4.3 Natural and Artificial Cavities

# **Natural Cavities**

The national Natural and Mining Cavities Database maintained and updated by PBA has been searched for relevant natural and mining cavity records.

A search of the PBA Natural Cavities Database indicated that there are 8 natural cavities recorded within 2000m of the centre of the site. The nearest recorded natural cavity is located around 50m north of the western sector of the site and is comprised of three solution pipes. Details of the recorded natural cavities are given in the table below.

Table 4.2 Details of the natural cavities records within 2000m from the site centre.

Approx. NGR	Approx. distance from site centre (m)	Recorded Location	Geology	Natural Cavity Details	Source
TQ 80420 6770	500 W	South of Manor Court, Lower Rainham, Gillingham, Kent	Superficial Geology: Head Solid: Chalk Group, Thanet Sand Formation	3 x Solution Pipes	British Geological Survey
TQ 811 666	900 SE	Bloors Lane/ Mayfield Close Area, Lower Rainham, Gillingham, Kent	Superficial Geology: Head Solid: Chalk Group	3 x Solution Pipes	Dines, H.G., Holmes, S. C. A. And Robbie, J. A., 1954. Geology of the country around Chatham. British Geological Survey Memoir (Sheet 272). HMSO, London.
TQ 800 665	1300 SW	A2 Watling Street Area, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid</b> : Chalk Group	3 x Solution Pipes	Dines, H.G., Holmes, S. C. A. And Robbie, J. A., 1954. Geology of the country around Chatham. British Geological Survey Memoir (Sheet 272). HMSO, London.
TW 798 681	1300 NW	Lower Twydall area, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid</b> : Chalk Group, Thanet Sand Formation	Solution Pipe	Whitaker, W., 1872. The geology of the London Basin, Volume 4, Part 1., HMSO, London. British Geological Society Memoir (Sheet 220, 221, 240)
TQ 796 675	1300 W	Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid</b> : Chalk Group	6 x Solution Pipes	Whitaker, W., 1872. The geology of the London Basin, Volume 4, Part 1., HMSO, London. British Geological Society Memoir (Sheet 220, 221, 240)
TQ 8145 6607	1500 SE	Holding Street, Rainham, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid</b> : Chalk Group, Thanet Sand Formation	Sinkhole Solution Pipe	Gillingham Borough Council

#### Pump and Bloors Farm, Rainham Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Geotechnical and Contamination)



Approx. NGR	Approx. distance from site centre (m)	Recorded Location	Geology	Natural Cavity Details	Source
TQ 8130 6583	1700 SSE	School, Orchard Street, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid</b> : Chalk Group, Thanet Sand Formation	Sinkhole Solution Pipe	Gillingham Borough Council
TQ 8183 6588	1800 SE	A2 High Street, Rainham, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid</b> : Chalk Group, Thanet Sand Formation	Sinkhole Solution Pipe	Gillingham Borough Council

The risk associated with dissolution features in the chalk has been assessed as **High** for solution pipes and sinkholes. Such features are formed by dissolution of chalk (a carbonate rock) by rain (which is slightly acidic).

Solution pipes are karstic features that develop along sub-vertical joints during down movement of rain water through the rock, whilst sinkholes develop over solution pipes that have widened and caused down movement soils at the surface. Sinkholes are often associated with surface depressions. Solution cavities are associated with sub-horizontal solution widened bedding planes in the Chalk caused by the movement of slightly acidic groundwater through the rock.

These features can be several meters in diameter and depth and are often infilled by very loose or weak superficial soils with voids present. These can present a ground stability hazard, especially if infiltration and drainage patterns are introduced by development, and the downwards movement of infill materials is re-activated. Structures, roads and services within and immediately adjacent to such features may suffer from settlement and structural damage with time, and sudden collapse known as sinkholes can occur. Solution cavities at depth might have an adverse impact on foundations built within or just above such features.

## **Mining Cavities**

A search of the PBA Mining Cavities Database indicated that there are 14 recorded mining cavities within 2000m of the site centre. The nearest recorded mining cavity is located approximately 329m south of the site centre.

Approx. NGR	Approx. distance from site centre (m)	Recorded Location	Geology	Natural Cavity Details	Source
TQ 8068 6683	600 SSW	Rainham Mark Grammar School, Pump Lane, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid</b> : Chalk Group	Denehole Shaft Collapse on 13 February 2014- Suspected Chalk Workings	Peter Brett Associates LLP
TQ 802 671	810 SW	Crundale Road/ Milsted Road, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid:</b> Chalk Group	Possible Shaft/ Crown Hole Collapse	Gillingham Borough Council

Table 4.3 Details of the artificial non-coal mining cavities records within 2000m of the site centre.

# Pump and Bloors Farm, Rainham

Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Geotechnical and Contamination)



Approx. NGR	Approx. distance from site centre (m)	Recorded Location	Geology	Natural Cavity Details	Source
TQ 803 668	900 SW	Woodchurch Cresent/Begoni a Avenue, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	Superficial Geology: Head Solid: Chalk Group	Possible Shaft/ Crown Hole Collapse	Gillingham Borough Council
TQ 816 668	1000 SE	Adjacent to Berengrave Lane, Lower Rainham, Gillingham, Kent	Superficial Geology: Head Solid: Chalk Group	Shaft/ Crown Hole Collapse(s)	Gillingham Borough Council
TQ 806665	1000 SSW	Danson Way/Langdale Close, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid:</b> Chalk Group	Possible Shaft/ Crown Hole Collapse	Gillingham Borough Council
TQ 805 665	1100 SSW	Vicinity of Langdale Close, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid:</b> Chalk Group	Shaft Collapse- Probably Chalkwell	Chelsea Speleological Society Volume 10 (pg. 87) and Volume 15 (pg. 26-27)
TQ 799 668	1200 SW	Romany Road Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	Superficial Geology: Head Solid: Chalk Group	Possible Shaft/ Crown Hole Collapse	Gillingham Borough Council
TQ 795 676	1400 NW	South of Beachings Way, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid:</b> Chalk Group	Possible Shaft/ Crown Hole Collapse	Gillingham Borough Council
TQ 797 666	1500 SW	Vicinity of Twydall Lane/Eastcourt Lane, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	Superficial Geology: Head Solid: Chalk Group	Denehole	Chelsea Speleological Society Volume 23 (pg. 45- 46 and 51)
TQ 797 664	1600 SW	Adjacent to Hoath Way, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	Superficial Geology: Head Solid: Chalk Group	Possible Shaft/Crown Hole Collapse	Gillingham Borough Council
TQ 796 665	1600 SW	Centred at Junction A2 London Road/Hoath Way, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid:</b> Chalk Group	Multiple 'Sappers' Tunnel Complexes	Applied Geology Ltd

# Pump and Bloors Farm, Rainham



Phase 1 Ground Conditions	S Assessment	(Geotechnical	and (	Contamination	)
---------------------------	--------------	---------------	-------	---------------	---

Approx. NGR	Approx. distance from site centre (m)	Recorded Location	Geology	Natural Cavity Details	Source
TQ 797 665	1600 SW	Twydall land/A2 London Road, Twydall, Gillingham, Kent	Superficial Geology: Head Solid: Chalk Group	Multiple Deneholes	Chelsea Speleological Society Volume 10 (pg. 63) & Gillingham Borough Council
TQ 823 666	1600 ESE	Twyford Close, Finwell Road, Rainham, Kent	<b>Solid:</b> Chalk Group	Adit Entry Pillar & Stall Chalk Mine	Chelsea Speleological Society Volume 16 (pg. 8)
TQ 817 659	1800 SE	High Street, Rainham, Gillingham, Kent	<b>Solid</b> : Chalk Group, Thanet Sand Formation	Shaft Collapse- Probable Well	Chelsea Speleological Society Volume 10 (pg. 86))

The potential for mining cavities to be present at the site is assessed to be **High**. The available non-coal mining database indicates that several shafts associated with chalk mining are recorded in the town area to the south of the site. Given the inferred low groundwater level in the chalk, and largely agricultural setting of the site, prior to the establishment of the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit, earlier smaller historic mine shafts associated with chalk extraction might be present on site.

Additionally, the EnviroCheck report records two mining instabilities located on site (NGR: 580319, 167232 and 581779, 167183). The evidence recorded is labelled as conclusive rock mining, with the source being Ove Arup and Partners.

#### 4.4 Surface Quarrying

The historical OS maps indicate that an historical surface chalk quarry is present along the western site boundary, associated with Lower Twydall Chalk Pit. This void has subsequently been backfilled as a landfill. Further details are given in Section 3.5. above. In addition, there are a number of other smaller historical chalk pits recorded in the general vicinity of the site, each of which has been subsequently backfilled in whole or part, and incorporated with built development.

The database and published records reviewed during the desk study have identified no other records of quarrying within the site itself. The risk to development arising from further but now infilled surface guarrying occurrence at the site is considered to be Low.

#### 4.5 **Slope Instability**

The latest OS map records the ground level to be at about 30mAOD on the southern boundary of the site, falling gently to the northeast to about 10mAOD along Lower Rainham Road. During the site walkover, it was apparent that the Pump Farm Site contains a clear break in slope, with a steepening slope towards the Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Landfill site.

The stability of the existing slopes on site is likely to be controlled by the near surface materials which are likely to comprise principally clay, silt and sand associated with the Head Deposits or clayey sand where the Thanet Beds are at surface. The natural slopes on site are considered to be generally stable.



The former quarry at Lower Twydall Chalk Pit has been backfilled and as such no open steep chalk faces remain.

The risk of slope instability is therefore considered to be **Low**.

# 4.6 Unexploded Ordinance

The unexploded ordnance (UXB) hazard and risk mitigation map prepared by Zetica Ltd indicates that the risk for UXBs to be present on the site is **Moderate**.

Given this risk it would be recommended at a UXO threat Assessment desk study is undertaken to confirm the risk rating for the site, and recommendations given with regard to any special mitigation measures necessary prior to any intrusive ground works or investigation.

# 4.7 Foundation Conditions

The ground stability assessment has identified that there is a high hazard of solution features and high hazard for man-made mining activity to be present within the site. It is considered that a risk based approach be adopted in relation to building foundations. If such features are confirmed to be present, it is unlikely that conventional shallow spread strip and pad foundations will be suitable for the proposed development. In this situation, reinforced strip or trench fill or grillage foundations with minimum widths and cantilever spans are likely to be required, the specific details and design of which would be determined following ground investigation and testing, and with reference to the proposed masterplan.

The type and capacity of foundations adopted for this site will be dependent on the soil structure interaction i.e. load, size and spacing of the footings, the stiffness of the soil and tolerances of the structure to settlement, particularly differential settlement. The differential settlement criteria relative to each structure will be dependent on the structure type. Steel frames tend to be more tolerant to differential settlements than concrete frames. Brickwork is tolerant to differential settlements as long as consideration has been given to the mortar design, to promote overall flexibility or rigidity of the finished brickwork unit/item. The sensitivity of a building to differential settlement will also depend on the proposed use of the finished building.

# 4.8 Soakaway Strategy in Chalk

4.8.1 The CIRIA Guide C574 'Engineering in chalk' (CIRIA, 2002) gives the following guidance in regards to the construction of soakaways in chalk:

"Where the chalk is of medium density (or higher) the closest part of the soakaway should be at least 5 m away from any foundations. Where the chalk is of low density, or its density is not known, soakaways should be sited at least 10 m away from any foundations". In areas where dissolution features are known to be prevalent....soakaways should be sited at least 20 m away from any foundation."

Given the potential for dissolution features any soakaways should be carefully located away from housing, roads and primary infrastructure and located in lower risk soft landscaping areas. If such soakaways are located in areas of intensively used public open space, then the position of such soakaways should be investigated. It would be recommended that rather than the adoption of shallow soakaways discharging into areas where overlying Thanet Sand is present, consideration should be given to the use of deep bored soakaways discharging into competent chalk strata, to reduce the risk of ground collapse due to fines migration into widened fissures or open voids within the underlying chalk.



# 4.9 Confidence and Uncertainty

The ground condition data used in this section is limited in nature and in some cases is not site specific; therefore, as such there is a degree of uncertainty as to the actual ground stability conditions to be found on site.

It is therefore recommended that in due course a ground investigation is carried across the site to better understand the actual conditions as part of the detailed design development of the site.



# 5 Tier 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment

## 5.1 Introduction

The methodology developed and adopted by PBA for contamination risk assessment is presented in **Appendix A**.

The model procedures (also known as 'Contaminated Land Report 11' or 'CLR 11') have been developed to provide the technical framework for applying a risk management process when dealing with land affected by potential contamination (EA, 2004). In accordance with guidance presented in CLR 11, PBA adopt a staged approach to risk assessment and this report presents a Tier 1 preliminary (qualitative) assessment.

## 5.2 Conceptual Site Model

The underlying principle to ground condition assessment is the identification of pollutant linkages in order to evaluate whether the presence of a source of contamination could potentially lead to harmful consequences. For a pollutant linkage to be identified a connection between all three elements (source-pathway-receptor) is required.

The Tier 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment includes the development of a conceptual site model (CSM). The CSM describes the types and locations of potential contamination sources, the identification of potential receptors and the identification of potential transport/migration pathways.

Description of the Risk categories and likely action required (ranging from Very Low to Very High) are outlined in **Appendix A**, **Table 7**.

## 5.3 Geoenvironmental Hazard Identification

#### **On Site**

The site mainly comprises farm land. The geoenvironmental hazards associated with the current and historical land use are mainly agrochemicals and fuels. Based on the known history of the site and the walkover undertaken the most likely hazard is very localised areas of potential contamination linked to the chemical and farm storage areas. The main farm building on Pump Farm potentially has an asbestos roof, although this appears to be in good condition.

Most storage containers are located on concrete plinths, reducing the chance for contaminants to infiltrate into the ground. Additionally, storage containers and tanks have no clear signs of leakages. However, some containers do not appear to be underlain by concrete and the forecourt in front of Pump Farm is unsurfaced, resulting in an increased risk of potential for localized contamination associated with any spills or leaks from farm machinery or agrochemicals.

Open storage areas appear to contain wood (such as various locations of pilled pallets/ fence posts) and agricultural plant and equipment, not representing a substantial contamination hazard.

The area of recent redevelopment to the north-west of the Bloors Farm site represents an additional localised potential contamination hazard as material from the old buildings appear to have been used to construct an access track through the site. Importantly this material may include asbestos fragments. This potential hazard is further highlighted upon inspecting historical Google Earth images from March 2011 to July 2013 which reveals collapsed roofing material on site, associated with the former derelict outbuildings which may contain asbestos.



An area of construction waste and general building materials is still located in the south-west corner of this development.

It is further recognised that a number of the agricultural access roads through the site, have been provided with hardcore surfacing in part to assist in providing vehicular access and to minimise potential rutting of the surface as a result of increased trafficking. The hard-surfacing area where seen appeared to comprise largely inert gravel, construction rubble and occasional road scalpings. Given their use and presence of localised areas of made ground these may present very localised small areas of potential hydrocarbon contamination from localised spills or leaks. Given that some of the material appears to have been derived from demolition of former buildings there is a risk that there may be the potential for asbestos containing material (ACM) fragments to be present in localised areas

Based on the known history of the site and the walkover undertaken during the preparation of this report, the potential for widespread significant contamination associated with the current and historical land use to be present is considered to be **Very Low** and very localised **Low** potential in areas used for the storage of chemicals and fuels, and in areas of localised made ground.

## Off Site

The surrounding land use is predominantly agricultural and residential in use, and whilst this generally presents a **Very Low** risk of widespread contamination it is recognised that agricultural storage areas may represent very localised contamination hazards. For example, a leaking oil drum, with observed staining to the ground, is located off the large concrete slab storage area immediately south-east of Pump Farm. However, the risk of widespread contamination should be minimal.

The historical Lower Twydall Chalk Pit landfill site borders the study site to the northwest and represents a potential geoenvironmental hazard. The available factual data indicate that the landfill was filled with Inert Waste arising from the local construction industry (GES, 2014a). Given the potential presence of timber or other gas generating materials, the landfill was considered as a potential off-site source of ground gases. Gas concentrations at the landfill were monitored between 2010 and 2015 as part of the landfill closure procedure; the monitoring wells located around the perimeter of the landfill recorded very low concentration of ground gases, with methane recorded below 0.3% and carbon dioxide below 3.5% (GES, 2015). Furthermore, groundwater monitoring undertaken at the site has not revealed ay significant groundwater contamination occurring. Additionally, this landfill is located down-gradient of the site. Therefore, it is unlikely any contaminants will be mobilised from the landfill and transported onto the site. This suggests that fugitive emissions from the landfill site onto the study site are likely to be negligible and the landfill does not constitute a significant source of potential contamination. The risk associated with the landfill is considered to be **Low**.

The Chatham Main Railway Line running alongside the southern site boundary is located upgradient in respect to the site. This railway is at grade with the southern edge of the site. There are no historical records suggesting the presence of sidings or maintenance/loading areas. Therefore, it is unlikely this railway poses a substantial contamination risk.

A substation is located along Pump Lane, near Pump Farm, poses a potential contamination hazard in relation to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and hydrocarbons. The potential risk of contamination from the railway line is considered to be **Very Low**.

The potential sources of contamination (PSC) and contaminants of concern are outlined in **Table 5.1** below:



#### Table 5.1 Potential sources of contamination (PSC) and contaminants of concern (COC)

Location	PSC Description	сос
On Site	Farmland and associated storage areas	Agrochemicals, hydrocarbons, metals
On Site	Old Demolished Development	Hydrocarbons, metals, asbestos
On Site	Made Ground Access Tracks	Localised Asbestos, hydrocarbons
Off Site	Agricultural and residential development	Agrochemicals, hydrocarbons, metals
Off Site	Historical Inert landfill	Whilst described as being "inert" there is a residual risk that waste materials could contain fractions of materials which could lead to hazardous ground gases including methane and carbon dioxide. Metals, heavy metals, hydrocarbons (TPH and PAH) including vapours and asbestos.
		Based on monitoring records to date anticipated low potential for migration of gas from the historical landfill site.
Off Site	South Eastern (Chatham to Sittingbourne) Railway line	Hydrocarbons, metals Very Low potential for significant contamination
Off Site	Substation	Hydrocarbons, PCBs

## 5.4 Risk Assessment

In order to determine whether the identified hazards pose a risk, it is necessary to identify the presence of potential receptors and pathways by which they can be exposed to the hazard. The development masterplan is composed of residential properties with gardens, green open space, a school, and retirement village.

#### **Potential Receptors**

Details of the potential receptors considered and whether or not the receptor is plausible are presented in **Table 5.2** below.



Receptor Type	Comment	Potential Receptor (Y/N)	Sensitivity Value
Human Health – On-site current users	Farm workers working in the fields across the site. General Public using footpaths etc.	Y	4
Human Health – On-site future users	Future residents of houses. Children attending proposed school.	Y	5
Human Health - neighbours	Owners of houses in Twydall and Lower Rainham. People visiting the adjacent Bloors Lane Community Woodland and Allotment Gardens.	Y	5
Human Health – construction / maintenance workers	Workers constructing the proposed development.	Y	4
Groundwater – Shallow	Head Superficial Deposits - Secondary Undifferentiated Aquifer.	Y	2
Groundwater - Deep	Seaford Chalk Formation – Principal Aquifer	Y	4
Surface Waters	None	N	N/A
Property - Buildings	Proposed buildings and services	Y	1
Ecological systems	RAMSAR and SSSI	Y	5
Property - Animal or Crop	Proposed Community Orchard	Y	2

#### Table 5.2 Potential Receptors and Receptor Sensitivity

#### **Identification of Potential Pathways**

Table 3 in the PBA methodology (**Appendix A**) describes possible pathways for each receptor type. Each of these possible pathways is then considered when assessing the possible pollutant linkage (see below).

# **Potential Pollutant Linkages**

Potential environmental hazards need a pathway connecting the source (if present) to potential receptors in order to be able to impact upon the receptors. These pathways are capable of conveying the contaminants. Pathways may be anthropogenic (artificial) or natural.

Anthropogenic pathways are artificial routes capable of conveying contaminants and include such routes as surface water drains, high permeability backfill materials, poorly consolidated Made Ground, foundations, and persons disturbing contamination sources in such a way as to liberate contaminants.



In the case of persons working with contaminated ground (e.g. to lay foundations or install services) direct contact with the source becomes possible, and pathways such as dermal contact, inhalation or ingestion require consideration.

The site is expected to be underlain by Head Deposits over Thanet Beds and Seaford Chalk Formation. Potential downward and lateral migration of contaminants is expected to be significant given the likely high hydraulic conductivity of the geological materials underlying the site.

Potential pollutant linkages have been identified using the information on potential sources (contaminant types), receptors and exposure pathways. **Appendix I** identifies which pollutant linkages are considered to potentially exist.

# 5.5 Risk Estimation

When there is a pollutant linkage (and therefore some measure of risk), it is necessary to determine whether the risk matters and therefore whether further action is required. Risk estimation involves predicting the likely consequences (what degree of harm might result) and the probability that the consequences will arise (how likely the outcome is).

For this assessment, the consequences and probability for each potential pollutant linkage has been identified, these are presented in **Appendix I**. Based on the information available, and assuming a worst-case scenario and no mitigation measures, the estimated risks have been designated as follows. It is noted that the below table is informed by the proposed development masterplan in order to identify the end-user of the development (**Appendix H**).

Receptor	Worst-Case Outcome of Contamination Risk Estimation
Human Health: On Site, Current Users	Low
Human Health: On Site, Future User	Low <sup>(1)</sup>
Human Health: Neighbours	Very Low
Human Health: Construction/Maintenance	Low <sup>(1)</sup>
Groundwater (Shallow)	Very Low
Groundwater (Deep)	Very Low
Surface Water	Eliminated
Property: Buildings	Very Low
Ecological Systems	Very Low
Property: Animal/Crop	Very Low

#### Table 5.3 Contamination Risk Estimation

Notes: (1) See additional commentary below

The outcomes presented in the above summary table are the worst-case across all pollutant linkages for an identified receptor without mitigation. Some pathways may have a lower consequence or probability/likelihood and therefore a lower estimated risk. For a full breakdown of the risks assigned to each pathway, for each receptor, refer to the two tables of estimated risk in **Appendix I**.
### Additional Commentary

Under the existing conditions and in the absence of any redevelopment, the worst-case risk to Human Health from potential contamination originating at the Site is assessed as **Low**.

When considering a future redevelopment to a residential with private gardens (allowing the growing and consumption of home-grown produce) the worst-case risk to Human Health from potential contamination originating at the majority of Site is assessed as **Low**. The report has identified that there may be the potential for localised areas of contamination, which would increase the risk to Moderate, however following appropriate ground investigation and adoption of appropriate mitigation should any areas of contamination be encountered to ensure that clean soils are provided then this risk can be reduced to **Low**.

The risk to Human Health (Construction Workers) has been assessed as **Low** on the basis of construction workers encountering potentially contaminated soils and groundwater during construction activities (i.e. the construction of the proposed residential development) and an associated risk of ingestion/inhalation/dermal contact with these soils. It is envisaged that with the adoption of appropriate hygiene, working methods and PPE, that the risk to Human Health (Construction Workers) can be reduced to **Very Low**.

In light of the above, in absence of any mitigation, the worst-case risk identified to any receptor is **Low**. This is a function of:

- The sensitivity of future users (assessed as Very High (5))
- The increased probability of dermal contact or ingestion/inhalation of potential sources of contamination within any newly exposed areas of future soft-landscaping, in absence of any mitigation.

A Low risk is described in Appendix A, Table 7 as:

'It is possible that harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard, but it is likely Low risk that this harm, if realised, would at worst normally be mild.".

### 5.6 Confidence and Uncertainty

The ground condition data used in this report is qualitative in nature and as such there is a degree of uncertainty as to the actual ground conditions present and the associated soil and groundwater chemistry and well as the ground gas regime at the site.

The need to establish the precise nature of the ground conditions, the extent of contamination (if present) and identify potential remediation and/or mitigation measures associated with impacted soil and groundwater will need to be assessed through intrusive ground investigation, monitoring and Tier 2 risk assessments. It is therefore recommended that a ground investigation is carried out on-site to confirm the conceptual site model prior to development.

It is considered however given the low risks identified through this study it is considered that a ground investigation and Tier 2 risk assessment is not required to support the planning application for redevelopment of the Site. Any requirement to carry out a geoenvironmental intrusive investigation can be dealt with by incorporation as a condition in any granted Planning Consent.

Possible pollutant linkages are determined using professional judgement. If a linkage is considered possible, it is considered that this represents a potentially 'unacceptable risk' and therefore requires further consideration. This may be through remediation or mitigation or through further tiers of assessment.



Given redevelopment is being considered, the current identified risk of encountering contamination that requires further assessment as part of the redevelopment should be considered low. This assessment is based on a future residential with private gardens usage. If a proposed use other than this is adopted in any future redevelopment, then the risks would require re-assessment.

On the basis of the current identified low risk of contamination, it is considered unlikely that the local planning authority will designate the Site as Contaminated Land under Part 2a of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.



# 6 Conclusions & Recommendations

#### 6.1 Conclusions

Ground Conditions The available geological data indicates that the Site is underlain by the Head deposits in part with a thinning sequence of Thanet Formation overlying the Seaford Chalk Formation below. Groundwater is anticipated to be at a depth of between around 4m and 2mAOD (GES, 2015).

A landfill, Lower Twydall Chalk Pit, has been determined as being present to the west of the site. The site is currently in closure and environmental monitoring data indicate that ground gases concentrations on the perimeter are relatively low, with methane concentrations recorded being below 0.4% and carbon dioxide generally between about 2% and 3.5%. Similarly, groundwater monitoring has shown that the site poses a low risk of contamination.

#### **Preliminary Geoenvironmental Assessment**

Based on the proposed end use of the site, being residential with private gardens, the findings of a qualitative risk assessment carried out to assess hazards and constraints posed by the existing site conditions to the proposed development and this generally found to be low.

It is considered very unlikely that the local planning authority will designate the site as Contaminated Land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

### **Preliminary Ground Stability Risk Assessment**

A review of potential geological hazards has identified the risk of land instability or potentially adverse foundation conditions to be present, in general, to be High. This is due to the High risk of solution features associated with the dissolution of the Seaford Chalk Formation underlying the site.

If such features are confirmed to be present, it is unlikely that conventional shallow spread strip and pad foundations will be suitable for the proposed development. In this situation, reinforced strip or trench fill or grillage foundations with minimum widths and cantilever spans are likely to be required, the specific details and design of which would be determined following ground investigation and testing, and with reference to the proposed masterplan.

If soakaways are proposed for the site, and In areas where dissolution features are known to be prevalent they should be located a minimum of 20m away from foundations or primary infrastructure due to risk of triggering the potential for solution feature or mine shaft collapse and precautionary measures should be adopted if located in areas of intensively used public open space.

#### 6.2 Recommendations

The ground condition data used in our desk-based report is qualitative in nature and as such there is a degree of uncertainty as to the actual ground conditions present and the associated soil and groundwater chemistry as well as the ground gas regime at the site.

Therefore, there will ultimately be a need for intrusive geotechnical ground investigations. The aim of these would be to confirm the desk study findings, particularly those related to contamination, to identify the design parameters for the foundation and other ground based works required for the development.



Whilst the ground conditions may enable infiltration systems to be incorporated in the design, consideration must be given to the risk of solution features and man-made cavities in the appropriate design and siting of any infiltration system. Identification of such below ground features and the associate risk will be a further requirement of the intrusive ground investigation.



## 7 Essential Guidance for Report Readers

This report has been prepared within an agreed timeframe and to an agreed budget that will necessarily apply some constraints on its content and usage. The remarks below are presented to assist the reader in understanding the context of this report and any general limitations or constraints. If there are any specific limitations and constraints they are described in the report text.

The opinions and recommendations expressed in this report are based on statute, guidance, and best practice current at the time of its publication. Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) does not accept any liability whatsoever for the consequences of any future legislative changes or the release of subsequent guidance documentation, etc. Such changes may render some of the opinions and advice in this report inappropriate or incorrect and the report should be returned to us and reassessed if required for re-use after one year from date of publication. Following delivery of the report PBA has no obligation to advise the Client or any other party of such changes or their repercussions.

Some of the conclusions in this report may be based on third party data. No guarantee can be given for the accuracy or completeness of any of the third party data used. Historical maps and aerial photographs provide a "snap shot" in time about conditions or activities at the site and cannot be relied upon as indicators of any events or activities that may have taken place at other times.

The conclusions and recommendations made in this report and the opinions expressed are based on the information reviewed and/or the ground conditions encountered in exploratory holes and the results of any field or laboratory testing undertaken. There may be ground conditions at the site that have not been disclosed by the information reviewed or by the investigative work undertaken. Such undisclosed conditions cannot be taken into account in any analysis and reporting.

This report has been written for the sole use of the Client stated at the front of the report in relation to a specific development or scheme. The conclusions and recommendations presented herein are only relevant to the scheme or the phase of project under consideration. This report shall not be relied upon or transferred to any other party without the express written authorisation of PBA. Any such party relies upon the report at its own risk.

The interpretation carried out in this report is based on scientific and engineering appraisal carried out by suitably experienced and qualified technical consultants based on the scope of our engagement. We have not taken into account the perceptions of, for example, banks, insurers, other funders, lay people, etc, unless the report has been prepared specifically for that purpose. Advice from other specialists may be required such as the legal, planning and architecture professions, whether specifically recommended in our report or not.

Public or legal consultations or enquiries, or consultation with any Regulatory Bodies (such as the Environment Agency, Natural England or Local Authority) have taken place only as part of this work where specifically stated.



## 8 References

- BGS (1977) Chatham, England and Wales Geological Map Sheet 272, Solid & Drift, 1: 50,000 scale. British Geological Survey.
- BRE (2007) Radon: Guidance on protective measures for new buildings, 2007. Report BR211, Building Research Establishment, Garston, Hertfordshire.
- DCLG (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Department of Communities and Local Government, London.
- DCLG (2014) National Planning Policy Framework. Department of Communities and Local Government, London.
- EA (2004). The Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CRL 11 published by the Environment Agency (EA).
- GES (2013) EPR-FP3630LC Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Annual interpretive report January to December 2013. Ground and Environmental Services Limited, Ashford. January 2014.
- GES (2014a) EAWML 210049 Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Closure Report January 2014. Ground and Environmental Services Limited, Ashford. January 2014.
- GES (2014b) EPR-FP3630LC Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Annual interpretive report January to December 2014. Ground and Environmental Services Limited, Ashford. February 2015.
- GES (2015) EPR-FP3630LC Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Annual interpretive report January to December 2013. Ground and Environmental Services Limited, Ashford. February 2016.
- GES (2016) EPR/BB3309GK/V003 Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Annual interpretive report January December 2016. Ground and Environmental Services Limited, Ashford. January 2017.
- GES (2017) EPR/BB3309GK/V003 Lower Twydall Chalk Pit Annual interpretive report January December 2017. Ground and Environmental Services Limited, Ashford. January 2018.
- JNCC (2003) 'Information Sheet on Ramsar Wetlands (RIS)' [online]. Joint Nature Conservation Committee. Available from: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/RIS/UK11040.pdf [Accessed:10/09/2018].
- LM (2018). EnviroCheck report: 1 Russett Farm, Rainham, Gillingham, ME8 7AT. Landmark Information Group. Order Number: 178768733\_1\_1
- MAGIC (2018) http://www.magic.gov.uk/website/magic/ [Accessed: 10/09/2018].
- NHBC (2018) Land Quality Managing Ground Conditions: Chapter 4.1. In: *NHBC Standards 2018*. Pg. 8.



# Figures

Figure 1: Site Location

Figure 2: Site Layout







# Appendix A: PBA Methodology for Assessing Land Contamination in England.

#### PBA Methodology for Assessing Land Contamination in England

#### 1 Introduction

This document defines the approach adopted by PBA in relation to the assessment of land contamination in England. The aim is for the approach to (i) be systematic and objective, (ii) provide for the assessment of uncertainty and (iii) provide a rational, consistent, transparent framework.

When preparing our methodology, we have made reference to various technical guidance documents and legislation referenced in Section 7 of which the principal documents are (i) Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance (Defra 2012), (ii) the Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination (CLR 11) (EA 2004), (iii) Contaminated land risk assessment: A guide to good practice (C552) (CIRIA 2001) (iv) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012 and 2018) and (v) BS 10175 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice (BSI 2017).

#### 2 Dealing with Land Contamination

Government policy on land contamination aims to prevent new contaminated land from being created and promotes a risk based approach to addressing historical contamination. With regard to historical contamination, regulatory intervention is held in reserve for land that meets the legal definition and cannot be dealt with through any other means, including through planning. Land is only considered to be "contaminated land" in the legal sense if it poses an unacceptable risk.

UK legislation on contaminated land is principally contained in Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act, 1990 (which was inserted into the 1990 Act by section 57 of the Environment Act 1995). Part 2A was introduced in England on 1 April 2000 and provides a risk-based approach to the identification and remediation of land where contamination poses an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment. In 2004 the Model Procedures for the Management of Contamination (CLR 11) were published providing guidance on how the statutory requirements were to be delivered. The approach, concepts and principles for land contamination management promoted by CLR 11 are applied to the determination of planning applications.

Other legislative regimes may also provide a means of dealing with land contamination issues, such as the regimes for waste, water, environmental permitting, and environmental damage. Further, the law of statutory nuisance may result in contaminants being unacceptable to third parties whilst not attracting action under Part 2A or other environmental legislation.

#### 2.1 Part 2A

The Regulations and Statutory Guidance that accompanied the Act, including the Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2006, has been revised with the issue of The Contaminated Land (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (SI 2012/263) and the Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance for England 2012.

Part 2A defines contaminated land as "land which appears to the Local Authority in whose area it is situated to be in such a condition that, by reason of substances in, on or under the land that significant harm is being caused, or there is a significant possibility that such significant harm (SPOSH) could be caused, or significant pollution of controlled waters is being caused, or there is a significant possibility of such pollution (SPOSP) being caused".

Harm is defined as "harm to the health of living organisms or other interference with the ecological systems of which they form part, and in the case of man, includes harm to his property".

Part 2A provides a means of dealing with unacceptable risks posed by land contamination to human health and the environment, and under the guidance enforcing authorities should seek to find and deal with such land. It states that "under Part 2A the starting point should be that land is not contaminated land unless there is reason to consider otherwise. Only land where unacceptable risks are clearly identified, after a risk assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the Guidance, should be considered as meeting the Part 2A definition of contaminated land". Further, the guidance makes it clear that "regulatory decisions should be based on what is reasonably likely, not what is hypothetically possible".

The overarching objectives of the Government's policy on contaminated land and the Part 2A regime are:

- "(a) To identify and remove unacceptable risks to human health and the environment.
- (a) To seek to ensure that contaminated land is made suitable for its current use.
- (b) To ensure that the burdens faced by individuals, companies and society as a whole are proportionate, manageable and compatible with the principles of sustainable development".

The enforcing authority may need to decide whether and how to act in situations where decisions are not straight forward, and where there is uncertainty. "In so doing, the authority should use its judgement to strike a reasonable balance between: (a) dealing with risks raised by contaminants in land and the benefits of remediating land to remove or reduce those risks; and (b) the potential impacts of regulatory intervention including financial costs to whoever will pay for remediation, health and environmental impacts of taking action, property blight, and burdens on affected people". The authority is required to "take a precautionary approach to the risks raised by contamination, whilst avoiding a disproportionate approach given the circumstances of each case". The aim is "that the regime produces net benefits, taking account of local circumstances".

The guidance recognises that "normal levels of contaminants in soils should not be considered to cause land to qualify as contaminated land, unless there is a particular reason to consider otherwise".

Normal levels are quoted as:

- "a) natural presence of contaminants' such as from underlying geology 'that have not been shown to pose an unacceptable risk to health and the environment
- b) ...low level diffuse pollution, and common human activity..."

Similarly the guidance states that significant pollution or significant possibility of significant pollution of controlled waters is required for land to be considered contaminated and the "fact that substances are merely entering water" or "where discharge from land is not discernible at a location immediately downstream" does not constitute contaminated land.

To help achieve a more targeted approach to identifying and managing contaminated land in relation to the risk (or possibility) of harm to human health, the revised Statutory Guidance presented a new four category system for considering land under Part 2A, ranging from Category 4, where there is no risk that land poses a significant possibility of significant harm (SPOSH), or the level of risk is low, to Category 1, where the risk that land poses a significant possibility of significant possibility of significant harm (SPOSH) is unacceptably high.

For land that cannot be readily placed into Categories 1 or 4 further assessment is required. If there is a sufficiently strong case that the risks are of sufficient concern to cause significant harm or have the significant possibility of significant harm the land is to be placed into Category 2. If the concern is not met land is considered Category 3.

The technical guidance clearly states that the currently published SGV and GAC's represent *"cautious estimates of level of contaminants in soils"* which should be considered *"no risk to health or, at most, a minimal risk"*. These values do not represent the boundary between categories 3 and 4 and *"should be considered to be comfortably within Category 4"*.

At the end of 2013 technical guidance in support of Defra's revised Statutory Guidance (SG) was published and then revised in 2014 (CL:AIRE 2014) which provided:

• A methodology for deriving C4SLs for four generic land-uses comprising residential, commercial, allotments and public open space; and

• A demonstration of the methodology, via the derivation of C4SLs for six substances – arsenic, benzene, benzo(a)pyrene, cadmium, chromium (VI) and lead.

With regards controlled waters the revised Statutory Guidance states that the following types of pollution should be considered to constitute significant pollution of controlled waters:

"(a) Pollution equivalent to "environmental damage" to surface water or groundwater as defined by The Environmental Damage (Prevention and Remediation) Regulations 2009, but which cannot be dealt with under those Regulations.

(b) Inputs resulting in deterioration of the quality of water abstracted, or intended to be used in the future, for human consumption such that additional treatment would be required to enable that use.

(c) A breach of a statutory surface water Environment Quality Standard, either directly or via a groundwater pathway.

(d) Input of a substance into groundwater resulting in a significant and sustained upward trend in concentration of contaminants (as defined in Article 2(3) of the Groundwater Daughter Directive (2006/118/EC)".

The guidance also states that, in some circumstances, significant concentrations at a compliance point (in

groundwater or surface water) may constitute pollution of controlled waters.

As with SPOSH for human health the revised Statutory Guidance presents a four category system for SPOSP for controlled waters. Category 1 covers land where there is a strong and compelling case for SPOSH, for example where significant pollution would almost certainly occur if no action was taken to avoid it. Category 4 covers land where there is no risk or the risk is low, for example, where the land contamination is having no discernible impact on groundwater or surface water quality. Category 2 is for land where the risks posed to controlled waters are not high enough to consider the land as Category 1 but nonetheless are of sufficient concern to constitute SPOSP, Category 3 is for land where the risks posed to controlled waters are higher than low but not of sufficient concern to constitute SPOSP.

#### 2.2 Planning

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) is responsible for the control of development, and in doing so it has a duty to take account of all material considerations, including contamination.

The principal planning objective is to ensure that any unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment from the contaminated condition of the land are identified so that appropriate action can be considered and taken to address those risks.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012) has been revised in July 2018 (NPPF, 2018).

Paragraph 118 states that planning policies and decisions should "(*c*) give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land."

Paragraph 179 states "Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner".

Paragraph 170 states "planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

> e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and

> f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate."

Paragraph 178 describes the policy considerations the Government expects LPA's to have in regard to land

affected by contamination when preparing policies for development plans and in taking decisions on applications. have been replaced by paragraphs 178 and 180 respectively.

Paragraph 178 states "planning policies and decisions should ensure that:

a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation);

b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and

c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments."

Paragraph 183 states "The focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes). Planning decisions should assume that these regimes will operate effectively. Equally, where a planning decision has been made on a particular development, the planning issues should not be revisited through the permitting regimes operated by pollution control authorities."

The Glossary in Annex 2 provides the following:

**Brownfield land registers**: Registers of previously developed land that local planning authorities consider to be appropriate for residential development, having regard to criteria in the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Registers) Regulations 2017. Local planning authorities will be able to trigger a grant of permission in principle for residential development on suitable sites in their registers where they follow the required procedures.

**Competent person (to prepare site investigation information**): A person with a recognised relevant qualification, sufficient experience in dealing with the type(s) of pollution or land instability, and membership of a relevant professional organisation.

**Previously developed land**: Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape.

**Site investigation information**: Includes a risk assessment of land potentially affected by contamination, or ground stability and slope stability reports, as appropriate. All investigations of land potentially affected by contamination should be carried out in accordance with established procedures (such as BS10175 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice). This in turn links to procedures in CLR11 which PBA adopt.

PBA adopt the principle that a Phase 1 desk study is the minimum assessment requirement for planning applications.

The level at which contamination is deemed to be unacceptable, or, gives rise to adverse effects under a planning context has not been identified but is envisaged to be more precautionary than the level required to detrmine land as contaminated under Part 2A.

#### 2.3 Building Control

The building control department of the local authority or private sector approved inspectors are responsible for the operation and enforcement of the Building Regulations (DCLG 2010) to protect the health, safety and welfare of people in and around buildings. Approved Document C requires the protection of buildings and associated land from the effects of contamination, to be applied (non-exclusively) in all changes of use from commercial or industrial premises, to residential property.

#### 3 Approach

CLR 11 recommends a phased or tiered approach to risk assessment with the three tiers being:-

- Tier 1 preliminary a qualitative assessment forming part of a Phase 1 report,
- Tier 2 generic a quantitative assessment using published criteria to screen site specific ground condition data forming part of a Phase 2 report
- Tier 3 detailed a quantitative assessment involving the generation of site specific assessment criteria

Each tier of risk assessment comprises the following four stages:-

- 1. Hazard Identification identifying potential contaminant sources on and off site;
- Hazard Assessment assessing the potential for unacceptable risks by identifying what pathways and receptors could be present, and what pollutant linkages could result (forming the Conceptual Site Model (CSM));
- Risk Estimation estimating the magnitude and probability of the possible consequences (what degree of harm might result to a defined receptor and how likely); and
- 4. Risk Evaluation evaluating whether the risk needs to be, and can be, managed.

A PBA Phase 1 report normally comprises a desk study, walkover and Tier 1 risk assessment (the project specific proposal defines the actual scope of work). At Tier 1 the PBA approach to risk estimation involves identifying the magnitude of the potential consequence

(taking into account both the potential severity of the hazard and the sensitivity of the receptor) and the magnitude of the likelihood i.e. the probability (taking into account the presence of the hazard and the receptor and the integrity of the pathway). This approach is promoted in current guidance such as R&D 66 (NHBC 2008).

The PBA approach is that if a pollution linkage is identified then it represents a potential risk which requires further consideration and either (1) remediation / direct risk management or (2) further tiers of assessment.

A PBA preliminary Phase 2 report comprises an intrusive investigation to collect site specific information, a Tier 2 quantitative generic risk assessment and a refinement of the CSM using the site specific data. Depending on the findings further investigation and/or progression to Tier 3 risk assessment and the generation of site specific assessment criteria may be required.

#### 4 Identification of Pollutant Linkages and Conceptual Site Model (CSM)

For all Tiers of Risk Assessment the underlying principle to ground condition assessment is the identification of *pollutant linkages* in order to evaluate whether the presence of a source of contamination could potentially lead to harmful consequences. A pollutant linkage consists of the following three elements:-

- A source/hazard a substance or situation which has the potential to cause harm or pollution;
- A pathway a means by which the hazard moves along / generates exposure; and
- A receptor/target an entity which is vulnerable to the potential adverse effects of the hazard.

The *Conceptual Site Model* identifies the types and locations of potential contaminant sources/hazards and potential receptors and potential migration/transportation pathway(s). The CSM is refined as the assessment progresses through the Tiers.

#### 4.1 Hazard Identification

A hazard is a substance or situation that has the potential to cause harm. Hazards may be chemical, biological or physical.

At Tier 1 the potential for hazards to be present is determined from consideration of the previous or ongoing activities on or near to the site in accordance with the criteria presented in the **Table 1**.

Based on the land use information Contaminants of Potential Concern (COPC) are identified. The COPC direct the scope of the collection of site specific data and the analytical testing selected for subsequent Tiers.

At Tier 2 the site specific data is screened using appropriate published assessment criteria (refer to PBA document entitled Rationale for the Selection of Tier 2 Assessment Criteria). In general, published criteria have been developed using highly conservative assumptions and therefore if the screening criterion is not exceeded (and assuming that sufficient samples from appropriate locations have been analysed) then the COPC is eliminated as a potential Hazard. It should be noted that exceedance does not necessarily indicate that a site is contaminated and/or unsuitable for use only that the COPC is retained as a potential Hazard. Published criteria are generated using models based on numerous and complex assumptions. Whether or not these assumptions are appropriate in a site-specific context requires confirmation on a project by project basis and would normally form part of a Tier 3 assessment.

When reviewing or assessing site specific data PBA utilise published guidance on comparing contamination data with a critical concentration (CL:AIRE/CIEH 2008) which presents a structured process for employing statistical techniques for data assessment purposes. The benefit of the statistical tool is uncertainty in estimating the representative exposure/source concentration) is quantified and decisions are made knowing the strength of the evidence. Correct decision probability is a function of sample size, difference in the mean and the critical concentration, variation in measured values and the significance level.

#### 4.2 Receptor and Pathway Identification

For all Tiers the potential receptors (for both on site and adjoining land) that will be considered are:

- Human Health including current and future occupiers, construction and future maintenance workers, and neighbouring properties/third parties;
- Ecological Systems; \*1
- Controlled Waters \*2 including surface water and groundwater;
- Property Animal or Crop (including timber; produce grown domestically, or on allotments, for consumption; livestock; other owned or domesticated animals; wild animals which are the subject of shooting or fishing rights); and
- Property Buildings (including archaeological sites and ancient monuments).

\*<sup>1</sup> International or nationally designated sites (as defined in the statutory guidance (Defra Circular 04/12)) "in the local area" will be identified as potential ecological receptors. A search radius of 1, 2 or 5km will be utilised depending on the site specific circumstances (see also pathway identification). The Environment Agency has published an ecological risk assessment framework (EA 2008) which promotes (as opposed to statutorily enforces) consideration of additional receptors to include locally protected sites and protected or notable species. These additional potential receptors will only be considered if a Phase 1 habitat survey, undertaken in accordance with guidance (JNCC 1993), is commissioned and the data provided to PBA. It should be noted that without such a survey the Tier 1 risk assessment may conclude that the identification of potential ecological receptors is inconclusive (refer to PBA Specification for Phase 1).

\*<sup>2</sup> the definition of "pollution of controlled water" was amended by the introduction of Section 86 of the Water Act 2003. For the purposes of Part 2A groundwater does not include waters above the saturated zone and our assessment does not therefore address perched water other than where development causes a pathway to develop.

If a receptor is taken forward for further assessment it will be classified in terms of its sensitivity, the criteria for which are presented in **Table 2**. Table 2 has been generated using descriptions of environmental receptor

importance/value given in various guidance documents including R&D 66 (NHBC 2008) and Transport Analysis Guidance (based on DETR 2000). Human health and buildings classifications have been generated by PBA using the attribute description for each class.

The exposure pathway and modes of transport that will be considered are presented in **Table 3**.

#### 4.3 Note regarding Ecological Systems

The Environment Agency (EA) has developed an ecological risk assessment framework which aims to provide a structured approach for assessing the risks to ecology from chemical contaminants in soils (EA 2008). In circumstances where contaminants in water represent a potential risk to aquatic ecosystems then risk assessors will need to consider this separately.

The framework consists of a three tiered process:-

- Tier 1 is a screening step where the site soils chemical data is compared to a soil screening value (SSV)
- Tier 2 uses various tools (including surveys and biological testing) to gather evidence for any harm to the ecological receptors
- Tier 3 seeks to attribute the harm to the chemical contamination

Tier 1 is preceded by a desk study to collate information about the site and the nature of the contamination to assess whether pollutant linkages are feasible. The framework presents ten steps for ecological desk studies and development of a conceptual site model as follows.

- 1 Establish Regulatory Context
- 2 Collate and Assess Documentary Information
- 3 Summarise Documentary Information
- 4 Identify Contaminants of Potential Concern
- 5 Identify Likely Fate Transport of Contaminants
- 6 Identify Potential Receptors of Concern
- 7 Identify Potential Pathways of Concern
- 8 Create a Conceptual Site Model

9 Identify Assessment and Measurement Endpoints 10 Identify Gaps and Uncertainties

The information in a standard PBA Phase 1 report covers Steps 1 to 4 inclusive. Step 5 considers fate and transport of contaminants and it should be noted that our standard report adopts a simplified approach considering only transport mechanisms. A simplified approach has also been adopted in respect of Steps 6 and 7 receptors (a detailed review of the ecological attributes has not been undertaken) and pathways (a food chain assessment has not been undertaken). Step 9 is outside the scope of our standard Phase 1 report.

It should be noted that the Tier 1 assessment for ecological systems (i.e. where designated sites are identified) as part of a Phase 1 report will assess the viability of the mode of transport given the site specific circumstances and not specific pathways.

The Tier 1 risk assessment may conclude that the risk to potential ecological receptors is inconclusive (see PBA Specification for Phase 1).

#### 4.4 Note regarding Controlled Waters

Controlled Waters are rivers, estuaries, coastal waters, lakes and groundwaters, but not perched waters.

The EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) 2000/60/EC provides for the protection of sub-surface, surface, coastal and territorial waters through a framework of river basin management. The EU Updated Water Framework Standards Directive 2014/101/EU amended the EU WFD to update the international standards therein; it entered into force on 20 November 2014 with the requirements for its provisions to be transposed in Member State law by 20 May 2016. Other EU Directives in the European water management framework include:

- the EU Priority Substances Directive 2013/39/EU;
- EU Groundwater Pollutants Threshold Values Directive 2014/80/EU amending the EU Groundwater Directive 2006/118/EC; and
- EU Biological Monitoring Directive 2014/101/EU.

The Ground Water Daughter Directive (GWDD) was enacted by the Groundwater Regulations (2009), which were subsumed by the Environmental Permitting Regulations (2010) which provide essential clarification including on the four objectives specifically for groundwater quality in the WFD: -

• Achieve 'Good' groundwater chemical status by 2015, commonly referred to as 'status objective';

Achieve Drinking Water Protected Area
Objectives;

• Implement measures to reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in groundwater quality, referred to as 'trend objective'; and

• Prevent or limit the inputs of pollutants into groundwater, commonly referred to as 'prevent or limit' objectives

The Water Act 2003 (Commencement No.11) Order 2012 amends the test for 'contaminated land' which relates to water pollution so that pollution of controlled waters must now be "significant" to meet the definition of contaminated land.

River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) have been developed for the 11 River Basin Districts in England and Wales. These were released by Defra in 2009 (Defra 2009) and these were updated in 2015.

These RBMP's establish the current status of waters within the catchments of the respective Districts and the current status of adjoining waters identified. As part of a Tier 2 risk assessment water quality data is screened against the WFD assessment criteria. Comparison with the RBMP's current status of waters for the catchment under consideration would form part of a Tier 3 assessment.

#### 5 Risk Estimation

Risk estimation classifies what degree of harm might result to a receptor (defined as consequence) and how likely it is that such harm might arise (probability).

At Tier 1 the consequence classification is generated by multiplying the hazard classification score and the receptor sensitivity score. This approach follows that presented in the republished R&D 66 (NHBC 2008).

The criteria for classifying probability are set out in **Table 4** and have been taken directly from Table 6.4 CIRIA C552 (CIRIA 2001). Probability considers the integrity of the exposure pathway.

The consequence classifications detailed in **Table 5** have been adapted from Table 6.3 presented in C552 and R&D 66 (Annex 4 Table A4.3).

The Tier 1 risk classification is estimated for each pollutant linkage using the matrix given in **Table 6** which is taken directly from C552 (Table 6.5).

Subsequent Tiers refine the CSM through retention or elimination of potential hazards and pollutant linkages.

#### 6 Risk Evaluation

Risk evaluation is used to determine whether the risk is acceptable or not. It includes consideration of the risk estimation and associated uncertainties.

The PBA Tier 1 methodology provides an estimate of the level of risk, but does not identify a risk level at which the risk is considered "significant" and/or "unacceptable" as this is dependent on the view of the individual / stakeholder. For example; to a risk adverse stakeholder even a risk level of "very low" may be considered unacceptable and as such this stakeholder may require risk management options to be implemented.

In order to put the Tier 1 risk classification into context the likely actions are described in **Table 7** which is taken directly from C552 (Table 6.6). Subsequent Tiers identify potential risk management options through remediation and/or mitigation measures.

#### 7 References

BSI 2007 BS 8485 Code of Practice for characterisation and remediation from ground gas in affected developments.

BSI 2017 BS 10175:2011+A2:2017 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - Code of Practice

CIRIA 2001: Contaminated land risk assessment – a guide to good practice C552.

CIRIA 2008: Assessing risks posed by hazardous ground gases to buildings C655

CL:AIRE/EIH 2008 Guidance on Company Soil Contamination Data with a Critical Concentration. Published by Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE)

CL:AIRE 2013 SP1010 – Development of Category 4 Screening Levels for Assessment of Land Affected by Contamination. Final Project Report published by Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE) 20th December 2013

DCLG 2010 Building Regulations 2010 Approved Document C Site preparation and resistance to contaminants and moisture.

NPPF, 2012 National Planning Policy Framework. (2012). 1st ed. [ebook] London: Department for Communities and Local Government.

NPPF 2018 National Planning Policy Framework (2018). 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Department for Communities and Local Government. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/upl oads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/728643/Revi sed\_NPPF\_2018.pdf

DETR 2000 Methodology for Multi Modal Studies. Volume 2 Section 4. The Environmental Objective.

Defra Circular 01/2006

Defra Circular 04/2012 Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A. Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance.

DEFRA, 2006 The Contaminated Land (England) Regulations 2006.

DEFRA, 2012 The Contaminated Land (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (SI2012/263).

DEFRA, 2012 Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A. Contaminated Land Statuary Guidance. April 2012.

DEFRA, 2013 Environmental Damage (Prevention and Remediation) Regulations 2009: Guidance for England and Wales

Defra '2009 Water for Life and Livelihoods. River Basin Management Plan. (11 Districts: Anglia, Dee, Humber, Northumbria, Northwest, Severn, Solway and Tweed, Southeast, Thames, Western Wales) December 2009

EA 2004: The Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CRL 11 published by the Environment Agency (EA).

EA 2008 Ecological Risk Assessment Science Report Series SC070009 published by the Environment Agency (EA).

JNCC 1993 Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – A Technical for Environmental Audit prepared by the Joint Nature Conservancy Council (JNCC)

NHBC/EA/CIEH 2008: R&D Publication 66 Guidance for the safe development of housing on land affected by contamination.

#### Table 1: Criteria for Classifying Hazards / Potential for Generating Contamination

Classification/Score	Potential for generating contamination/gas based on land use
Very Low	Land Use: Greenfield
-	Contamination: None.
1	Gas generation potential : Inert Made Ground
Low	Land Use: Residential, retail or office use, recent small scale industrial.
	Contamination: None or locally slightly elevated concentrations.
2	Gas generation potential : Shallow thickness of alluvium
Moderate	Land Use: Railway yards, collieries, scrap yards, light industry, engineering works.
	Contamination: Locally elevated concentrations.
3	Gas generation potential : Dock silt and substantial thickness of organic alluvium/peat
High	Land Use: Gas works, chemical works, heavy industry, non-hazardous landfills.
	Contamination: Possible widespread elevated concentrations.
4	Gas generation potential : Shallow mine workings Pre 1960's landfill
Very High	Land Use: Hazardous waste landfills.
	Contamination: Likely widespread elevated concentrations.
5	Gas generation potential: Domestic landfill post 1960

"Greenfield" is land which has not been developed.. This can include land only used for agriculture but it should be recognised there is a potential for localised contamination of buried animal pits and diffuse pollution and this possibility should be considered in the risk assessment.

#### Table 2: Criteria for Classifying Receptor Sensitivity/Value

Classification/Score	Definition
Very Low	Receptor of limited importance
	Groundwater: Non aquifer
1	Surface water: Water body within 25m or eliminate
	Ecology: No local designation
	Buildings: Replaceable
	Human health: Unoccupied/limited access
Low	Receptor of local or county importance with potential for replacement
	Groundwater: Secondary B aquifer or Secondary Undifferentiated
2	Surface water: Tertiary water body immediately adjacent
	Ecology: local habitat resources
	Buildings: Local value
	Human health: Minimum score 4 where human health identified as potential receptor
Moderate	Receptor of local or county importance with potential for replacement
	Groundwater: Secondary A aquifer
3	Surface water: Secondary water body immediately adjacent
	Ecology: County wildlife sites, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
	Buildings: Area of Historic Character
	Human health: Minimum score 4 where human health identified as potential receptor
High	Receptor of county or regional importance with limited potential for replacement
	Groundwater: Principal aquifer
4	Surface water: Primary water body immediately adjacent
	Ecology: SSSI, National or Marine Nature Reserve (NNR or MNR)
	Buildings: Conservation Area
	Human health: Minimum score 4 where human health identified as potential receptor
Very High	Receptor of national or international importance
_	Groundwater: Source Protection Zone
5	Surface water: Primary water body on site
	Ecology: Special Areas of Conservation (SAC and candidates), Special Protection Areas
	(SPA and potentials) or wetlands of international importance (RAMSAR)
	Buildings: World Heritage site
1	Human health: Residential, open spaces and uses where children are present

Receptor	Pathway	Mode of transport	
Human health	Ingestion	Fruit or vegetable leaf or roots	
		Contaminated water	
		Soil/dust indoors	
		Soil/dust outdoors	
	Inhalation	Particles (dust / soil) – outdoor	
		Particles (dust / soil) - indoor	
		Vapours – outdoor - migration via natural or anthropogenic pathways	
		Vapours - indoor - migration via natural or anthropogenic pathways	
	Dermal absorption	Direct contact with soil	
		Direct contact with waters (swimming / showering)	
		Irradiation	
Groundwater	Leaching	Gravity / permeation	
	Migration	Natural – groundwater as pathway	
		Anthropogenic (e.g. boreholes, culverts, pipelines etc.)	
Surface Water	Direct	Runoff or discharges from pipes	
	Indirect	Recharge from groundwater	
	Indirect	Deposition of wind blown dust	
Buildings	Direct contact	Sulphate attack on concrete, hydrocarbon corrosion of plastics	
	Gas ingress	Migration via natural or anthropogenic paths	
Ecological	See Notes	Runoff/discharge to surface water body	
systems	See Notes	Windblown dust	
	See Notes	Groundwater migration	
	See Notes	At point of contaminant source	
Animal and crop	Direct	Wind blown or flood deposited particles / dust / sediments	
	Indirect	Plants via root up take or irrigation. Animals through watering	
	Inhalation	By livestock / fish - gas / vapour / particulates / dust	
	Ingestion	Consumption of vegetation / water / soil by animals	

### Table 3: Exposure Pathway and Modes of Transport

#### Table 4: Classification of Probability

Classification	Definition
High likelihood	There is a pollution linkage and an event either appears very likely in the short-term and almost inevitable over the long-term, or there is already evidence at the receptor of harm / pollution.
Likely	There is a pollution linkage and all the elements are present and in the right place, which means that it is probable that an event will occur. Circumstances are such that an event is not inevitable, but possible in the short-term and likely over the long-term.
Low likelihood	There is a pollution linkage and circumstances are possible under which an event could occur. However, it is by no means certain that even over a longer period such event would take place, and is less likely in the shorter-term.
Unlikely	There is a pollution linkage but circumstances are such that it is improbable that an event would occur even in the very long-term.

Table 5: Classification of	Γable 5: Classification of Consequence (score = magnitude of hazard Table 1 and sensitivity of receptor Table 2)			
Classification / Score	Examples			
Severe	Human health effect - exposure likely to result in "significant harm" as defined in the Defra (2012) Part			
17-25	2A Statutory Guidance 1.			
(3 out of 25 outcomes)	Controlled water effect - short-term risk of pollution (note: Water Resources Act contains no scope for considering significance of pollution) of sensitive water resource. Equivalent to EA Category 1 incident (persistent and/or extensive effects on water quality leading to closure of potable abstraction point or loss of amenity, agriculture or commercial value. Major fish kill.			
	Ecological effect - short-term exposure likely to result in a substantial adverse effect.			
	Catastrophic damage to crops, buildings or property			
Medium	Human health effect - exposure could result in "significant harm" <sup>1</sup> . Controlled water effect - equivalent			
10-16	to EA Category 2 incident requiring notification of abstractor			
(7 out of 25 outcomes)	Ecological effect - short-term exposure may result in a substantial adverse effect.			
(	Damage to crops, buildings or property			
Mild	Human health effect - exposure may result in "significant harm" <sup>1</sup> .			
5-9 (7 out of 25 outcomes)	Controlled water effect - equivalent to EA Category 3 incident (short lived and/or minimal effects on water quality).			
	Ecological effect - unlikely to result in a substantial adverse effect.			
	Minor damage to crops, buildings or property. Damage to building rendering it unsafe to occupy (for example foundation damage resulting in instability).			
Minor	No measurable effect on humans. Protective equipment is not required during site works.			
1-4	Equivalent to insubstantial pollution incident with no observed effect on water quality or ecosystems.			
(8 out of 25 outcomes)	Repairable effects to crops, buildings or property. The loss of plants in a landscaping scheme. Discolouration of concrete.			

Note: 1. Significant harm includes death, disease, serious injury, genetic mutation, birth defects or impairment of reproductive function. The local authority may also consider other health effects to constitute significant harm such as physical injury; gastrointestinal disturbances; respiratory tract effects; cardio-vascular effects; central nervous system effects; skin ailments; effects on organs such as the liver or kidneys; or a wide range of other health impacts. Whether or not these would constitute significant harm would depend on the seriousness of harm including impact on health, guality of life and scale of impact.

#### Table 6: Classification of Risk (Combination of Consequence Table 5 and Probability Table 4)

	Consequence			
Probability	Severe	Medium	Mild	Minor
High likelihood	Very high	High	Moderate	Low
Likely	High	Moderate	Moderate/	Low
Low likelihood	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Very low
Unlikely	Low	Low	Very low	Very low

#### Table 7: Description of Risks and Likely Action Required

Risk Classification	Description
Very high risk	There is a high probability that severe harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard, OR, there is evidence that severe harm to a designated receptor is currently happening. This risk, if realised, is likely to result in a substantial liability. Urgent investigation (if not undertaken already) and remediation is likely to be required in the short term.
High risk	Harm is likely to arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard. Realisation of the risk is likely to present a substantial liability.
	Urgent investigation (if not undertaken already) is required and remedial works may be necessary in the short-term and are likely over the longer-term.
Moderate risk	It is possible that harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard. However, it is either relatively unlikely that any such harm would be severe, or if any harm were to occur it is more likely that the harm would be relatively mild.
	Investigation (if not already undertaken) is normally required to clarify the risk and to determine the potential liability. Some remedial works may be required in the longer-term.
Low risk	It is possible that harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard, but it is likely that this harm, if realised, would at worst normally be mild.
Very low risk	There is a low possibility that harm could arise to a receptor. In the event of such harm being realised it is not likely to be severe.



# Appendix B1: Historical Maps South-West (Area 1)

# **Historical Mapping Legends**

-	
Ordnance Survey County Series 1:10,560	Ordna
Contract Con	
Cuary 🖓 Shinga 👯 Urchard	3) <sup>0055355</sup> 8:
<sup>248</sup> /2 ກາງໄດ້ Co-iere ເ <sup>ປັດຫຼັງ</sup> Roods ເປັນນີ້ການ Namon ກາງໄດ້ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ກາງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ	entressen R. Nortenten Katelinen Katelinen
	Di Di
Mixed W: Depictuous Brochwood	* * * ŭ
	ှာ <b>ှ</b> ပrch
r i trze Rough Pastora	n≣ ff Brae st:
<sub>eer ve</sub> Antov dendies <u>s</u> ingonometrical towich valer Station	
🤹 Silend Arliqui 🛶 🐢 Berch Mara	<b>678</b> 1 11-1-
Prog. Gride Free	
- <b>285</b> Surface Level	<u>888</u> (Hao
Sitzlehoo instrumentel Compun	Frank Sup
Main Reacts	Calling Sourchite
Reset Read	<u></u>
Ratway over Rativay River	J• den
taikoogi over Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soo	
—————————————————————————————————————	
toex tven ⊘Stream	 
——————————————————————————————————————	
— · — · — · — County & Crvit Parish Boundary	
+++ +++ Administrative County & D.M. Parish Boundary	OP CS Opend Ch Cherr
	CF Clut H
——————————————————————————————————————	FF. FociP to tv.nu
na ody	GP Guical MF Mix Fr
ann an Soil Deien Bonnoeg	ISDAN SM

ance Survey Plan 1:10,000			1:10,000 Raster Mapping			
	- 1620C P	n_	10 mm - 10			4
а амінні, свіў ні є Сца ту Г	తిరిగిని తిరిగిని తిరిగిన	Are Stavel Ft.	62-22	Cosvel Pi	( <u>)</u> ]}_j)	or sia
iane: P1	$\left( \begin{array}{c} - \\ - \end{array} \right)$	°≂ Unsuced Pil _∠ or Quarty		Rut		F⊷sk r-stell
eruse er lag Helap		or Pond		Boukers	· · ·	Bouid (Scall
(m. <del></del>	دن <sup>()</sup> سد م	S Zaudow		Shingle	$\odot$	VIC d
ion renous rees	$\varphi_{Q}$	An-Contercus Trees	<u>R</u> ed	Sand	-9893 -	ten:
			100003	Sloo—e-	1010000	סכנד
hard O.a.—	Sen b	( <sup>1</sup> лу Серже <del>.</del> В м.М.		General celal		tada celei
æn souros.	Heach	Grass and		Coethe-clicelei	<del>• • • • • • • • •</del>	Narto Iraikis
en savVas	Rccd3	Salliys		Multi traek reliway		Birgk ratwa
Di se Sing	tion of Flow : مرجع	-1 #216		Dauniy boundary (England aniv)		Civi, comm bouw
×house >~	J	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		Dietrich Heitery Heinopoliten Houden Bonough Journtery		Cons bourt
ing Masan y	Fylch 	Electricity Transmission Une	66 <sub>1.2</sub> 2	ér⊷a ⊷' wcert vgetetion	00 <sup>Q</sup> 0	Nor-k trees
			۵ ۵	Noneo ariferiors Ireas (acar ered)	÷۵. چي	Cont trees
an banan 1995- 1999-	MI. 		2	Contrerbus Trees (scattered)	Ω	الادP Iree
Hous 7/ Low Own Dress	d V Pos ang Shu	⊣⊢ Santed Ceng- g. Single Trens 9/ Siden Trenssa	5 C 0 A	Onesad	y	Coop or Ca
		→ Nortew Goulge	ал. 	Kough Grassland		-Lail
Secgraphical Co	u-tr		Съ. См	Je u o	etter Aller	Vitural Vitural
Administrative S or County of Oly	surry Court	y Poro .gh	5	WaterRealure	÷.	=
Aughton Dates	gr, breinien Courreil - Courreil		M-W/S)	Meen nigh	M.MAS)	\] <b>⊢</b> ar
5 конятрония 5 конятрония	a kaing kaing Pro <b>ing ka</b> ing ka	erenne soz Er eren herudorne	\$257 PROPERTY	waren (eta milki		* 1 11
.) ell Painh Ceixe de Laega	d	· dhaaka max	• •	Teleptonestine (where shown)	• •	Lieto transi (Atto
dary Point or Slone	Pol Sta Pri	Police 201 on Post of 20	L. LARSAN	Beneh mark (where shown)	140	Trian Islaile
10. st	PC	n ore on on Palais Scriven chev	1 212	Point feature		Palor
ngine Sletion Priday	PI SP	Public Isus+ Signal Ass	1 249	telg, Suice Post priMile Stone)	E	a Ig
Lai Peat	8µ ПП	 Spir y Telegrope Cell D∞		Sile of (artiquity)		Claro
oer Ione	 -ср М	Telephone Call Port Mol		General Building		imper Bulki
			International Activity of the second s		A 10 YO M 10 YO M 10	-

52	Cravel Pi		Refusion p or stag heap
	Rask		5⊶:k r-steller-+: r
	Boukers	·, · · .	Boulders (scallered)
認識	Shingle	$\odot$	Vik d
	Sand	<u> 1</u>	Annel Pi
"lunn"	Stor	10002025 10002025	c <b>iff</b> ددT
	General celai		Underground kelei
	Overheid celei	+++++	мато::: <u>сачре</u> найзах
	Multi trae c raliway		Bingle track ratway
	Sauniy boundary (England anly)		Civil, carishian community boundary
	District Unitery Hemporism Laadse Bonough Jouantery		Constituency boundary
۵ مر	ér∺a ⊷' wasaad k⇔gelelion	دې دو	Non-contretous trees
0	Noneo ariferious bees (ecal arad)	¢۵. \$ \$	Conterous trees
2	Contrendus Trees (spattered)	â	Posilioned Iree
о с 0 с	Onesad	y	Coopio <del>s</del> or Caliere
а <b>л</b> ,	Rough Grasskard	.965 76	-Lail
0 L.	Je up	stije ente	Marsh, Gall Marsh or Reecs
5	Water Idalum	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	Есе носек
M-W/S)	Meen nign water (eorings)	M.WAS)	Mean kw weren (springe)
•	Tel-phone-tine (where shown)	• •	Liestrichy transmission line (with poles)
н MIZMAD	Beneh mark (where shown)		Triangulation Islalian
	Point feature (e.g. Guide Post (of Mile Stone)	K	Pylon, fland stack a flighting tower
•••	Sile of (actionity)		Glecolouse
	General Building		importani Bulking



### Historical Mapping & Photography included:

Mapping Type	Scale	Date	Pg
Kent	1:10,560	1869	2
Kent	1:10,560	1897 - 1898	3
Kent	1:10,560	1909 - 1910	4
Kent	1:10,560	1931 - 1933	5
Kent	1:10,560	1938	6
Kent	1:10,560	1938 - 1950	7
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1961 - 1962	8
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1967 - 1969	9
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1974 - 1975	10
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1981 - 1985	11
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1991	12
10K Raster Mapping	1:10,000	1999	13
Street View	Variable		14

### Historical Map - Slice A



# Order Details Order Number:

 
 Order Number:
 178768733\_1\_1

 Customer Ref:
 44538-3501

 National Grid Reference:
 580320, 167230
 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

A 51.8 1000

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT











## Kent Published 1897 - 1898 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.



1 1		020NW 1898 1:10,560
ļ I	 0195E 1090	+ + ↓ 020SW ↓ 1867 ↓ 10.561
ı ı	1:10,580	

### **Historical Map - Slice A**



#### **Order Details**

Order Number: Customer Ref: National Grid Reference: 580320, 167230 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 Α 51.8 1000

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







## Kent Published 1909 - 1910 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.



	_	-	-	-	т	-	-	-	-	Т
ı		019 190	NE		Ι		020 190	:NW 19		Т
I		1:13	ĭ,580		T		1:1	0,560	)	I
ļ	_	_	_	_	+	_	-		—	Н
I		019 191	SE 0		Т		19	0SW 09		I
I		1:1	0,58	0	١		1.1	0,56	0	I
I	_	_	_	_	٦	_	_	-	-	

### **Historical Map - Slice A**



#### **Order Details**

Order Number: Customer Ref: National Grid Reference: 580320, 167230 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 Α 51.8 1000

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







## Kent Published 1931 - 1933 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.



	_	-	-	-	т	-	-	-	-	I
I		019 193	NE 3		Т		020 193	NW 2		I
I		1:10	,580	,	Т		1:10	0,560		I
ļ	_	_	_	_	+	_	-		_	Н
I		019 193	SE 2		Т		020 193	ISW 1		I
I		1:1	0,58	0	١		1.1	0,56	0	I
I	_	_	_	_	٦	_	-	_	-	

### Historical Map - Slice A



#### **Order Details**

Order Number: Customer Ref: National Grid Reference: 580320, 167230 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 Α 51.8 1000

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







## Kent Published 1938 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is used to update the 1:10,500 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps update in the National Ord is 10270 the first. maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.



·	_	-	-	-	т	-	-		-	-	Т
I		019 192	NE		Ι		02) 193	0NV 38	N		Т
I		1:10	,580		1		1:1	0,5	60		I
ļ	_	_	_	_	+	_	-		-	_	Ч
I		019 193	SE 18		1		02 19	0S) 38	W		I
I		1:1	0,58	0	١		1.	10,5	560	)	I
I	_	_	_	_	٦	_	_		_	-	

### **Historical Map - Slice A**



#### **Order Details**

Order Number: Customer Ref: National Grid Reference: 580320, 167230 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 Α 51.8 1000

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT











## Ordnance Survey Plan Published 1961 - 1962 Source map scale - 1:10,000

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.











## Ordnance Survey Plan Published 1974 - 1975 Source map scale - 1:10,000

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.





![](_page_66_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_68_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_68_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **10k Raster Mapping**

### Published 1999

### Source map scale - 1:10,000

The historical maps shown were produced from the Ordnance Survey's 1:10,000 colour raster mapping. These maps are derived from Landplan which replaced the old 1:10,000 maps originally published in 1970. The data is highly detailed showing buildings, fences and field boundaries as well as all roads, tracks and paths. Road names are also included together with the relevant road number and classification. Boundary information depiction includes county, unitary authority, district, civil parish and constituency.

![](_page_68_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_69_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_69_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **Street View**

### Published 2018

## Source map scale - 1:10,000

Street View is a street-level map for the whole of Great Britain produced by the Ordnance Survey. These maps are provided at a nominal scale of 1:10,000

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)

### Street View Map - Slice A

![](_page_69_Figure_8.jpeg)

#### **Order Details**

 
 Order Number:
 178768733\_1\_1

 Customer Ref:
 44538-3501

 National Grid Reference:
 580320, 167230
 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

А 51.8 1000

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT

![](_page_69_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_69_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_70_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_70_Picture_1.jpeg)

### Historical Mapping & Photography included:

Mapping Type	Scale	Date	Pg
Kent	1:2,500	1894 - 1895	2
Kent	1:2,500	1895	3
Kent	1:2,500	1896	4
Kent	1:2,500	1909	5
Kent	1:2,500	1932 - 1938	6
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:2,500	1955 - 1967	7
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1955	8
Additional SIMs	1:2,500	1955	9
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1960 - 1969	10
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1966 - 1975	11
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:2,500	1970	12
Additional SIMs	1:1,250	1981 - 1990	13
Large-Scale National Grid Data	1:1,250	1994	14

### **Historical Map - Segment A11**

![](_page_70_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### **Order Details**

Order Number: Customer Ref: National Grid Reference: 580320, 167230 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 Α 51.8 100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT

![](_page_70_Picture_11.jpeg)

0844 844 9952 0844 844 9951 www.envirocheck.co.uk

A Landmark Information Group Service v50.0 04-Sep-2018 Page 1 of 14

![](_page_71_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_71_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Published 1894 - 1895 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to mapping urban areas and by rose it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)

![](_page_71_Picture_5.jpeg)

### Historical Map - Segment A11

![](_page_71_Figure_7.jpeg)

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT

![](_page_71_Picture_12.jpeg)




# Published 1895 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Published 1896 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## **Historical Map - Segment A11**



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1909 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



\_

## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1932 - 1938 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Ordnance Survey Plan Published 1955 - 1967 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



# Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# **Ordnance Survey Plan**

# Published 1955

## Source map scale - 1:1,250

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



\_ \_ \_ '

## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

178
445
580
А
51.8
100

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 580320, 167230 A 51.8 100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Additional SIMs

## Published 1955

# Source map scale - 1:2,500

The SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') are further, minor editions of mapping which were produced and published in between the main editions as an area was updated. They date from 1947 to 1994, and contain detailed information on buildings, roads and land-use. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.





- - - -

## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







# Ordnance Survey Plan Published 1960 - 1969 Source map scale - 1:1,250

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



\_ \_ \_ ! \_ \_ \_ ! \_ \_ \_ !

## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

178768733_1_1
44538-3501
580320, 167230
A
51.8
100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Ordnance Survey Plan Published 1966 - 1975 Source map scale - 1:1,250

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)

	1	
70	_ I <sup>_ I</sup>	
1976 1976	۰ I	1999 10:200
1.1,200	1	1.1.200
	1	1

## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# **Ordnance Survey Plan**

## Published 1970

# Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	17876
Customer Ref:	44538
National Grid Reference:	58032
Slice:	А
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 580320, 167230 A 51.8 100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT













# Large-Scale National Grid Data

## Published 1994

## Source map scale - 1:1,250

'Large Scale National Grid Data' superseded SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') in 1992, and continued to be produced until 1999. These maps were the fore-runners of digital mapping and so provide detailed information on houses and roads, but tend to show less topographic features such as vegetation. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)

1076679E 1994 1:1.250	I TG60675W 1994 I 1:1.250 I	TC000675E 1994 1:1.250	1
TQ7sesNE	L TOSOSENW	TOscesNE	1
1:1,250	111,250	1:1,250	I
	1	1	

## Historical Map - Segment A11



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









### Historical Mapping & Photography included:

Mapping Type	Scale	Date	Pg
Kent	1:2,500	1894 - 1895	2
Kent	1:2,500	1895	3
Kent	1:2,500	1896	4
Kent	1:2,500	1909	5
Kent	1:2,500	1932 - 1938	6
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:2,500	1956 - 1967	7
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1958	8
Additional SIMs	1:2,500	1959 - 1989	9
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1966 - 1969	10
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1966	11
Additional SIMs	1:1,250	1990	12
Large-Scale National Grid Data	1:1,250	1994	13
Large-Scale National Grid Data	1:2,500	1994	14

## **Historical Map - Segment A12**



#### **Order Details**

Order Number: Customer Ref: National Grid Reference: 580320, 167230 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 Α 51.8 100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







# Kent Published 1894 - 1895 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



\_

## Historical Map - Segment A12



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Published 1895 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A12



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT





Tel: Fax: Web:





# Published 1896 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A12



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1909 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A12



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1932 - 1938 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A12



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







1787
4453
5803
А
51.8
100









## Published 1959 - 1989

## Source map scale - 1:2,500

The SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's `Survey of Information on Microfilm') are further, minor editions of mapping which were produced and published in between the main editions as an area was updated. They date from 1947 to 1994, and contain detailed information on buildings, roads and land-use. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A12



Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









178
445
580
Α
51.8
100





# Additional SIMs

## Published 1990

# Source map scale - 1:1,250

The SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') are further, minor editions of mapping which were produced and published in between the main editions as an area was updated. They date from 1947 to 1994, and contain detailed information on buildings, roads and land-use. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A12

\_ I



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







TOSC678E	l i
1994 1:1,250	L
	I
TOSOBENE 1994	TQ8188NW
1:1,250	1:1.250
	I

Order Number:	17876873
Customer Ref:	44538-35
National Grid Reference:	580320, 1
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100





# Large-Scale National Grid Data

# Published 1994

## Source map scale - 1:2,500

'Large Scale National Grid Data' superseded SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') in 1992, and continued to be produced until 1999. These maps were the fore-runners of digital mapping and so provide detailed information on houses and roads, but tend to show less topographic features such as vegetation. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A12



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	1
Customer Ref:	4
National Grid Reference:	5
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	5
Search Buffer (m):	1

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 580320, 167230 A 51.8 100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









### Historical Mapping & Photography included:

Mapping Type	Scale	Date	Pg
Kent	1:2,500	1895	2
Kent	1:2,500	1895	3
Kent	1:2,500	1896	4
Kent	1:2,500	1909	5
Kent	1:2,500	1932	6
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:2,500	1955 - 1967	7
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1955	8
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1960 - 1985	9
Additional SIMs	1:1,250	1960	10
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1965 - 1975	11
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:2,500	1970	12
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1975	13
Additional SIMs	1:2,500	1989	14
Additional SIMs	1:1,250	1990	15
Large-Scale National Grid Data	1:1,250	1994	16
Large-Scale National Grid Data	1:2,500	1994	17

### **Historical Map - Segment A15**



#### **Order Details**

Order Number: Customer Ref: National Grid Reference: 580320, 167230 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 Α 51.8 100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Published 1895 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to mapping urban areas and by rose it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A15



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Published 1895 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A15



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1896 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A15



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1909 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A15



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









Kent

# Published 1932 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A15



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Ordnance Survey Plan Published 1955 - 1967 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



\_ \_ \_ ! \_ \_ \_ !

## Historical Map - Segment A15



### **Order Details**

178768733_1_1
44538-3501
580320, 167230
A
51.8
100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# **Ordnance Survey Plan**

# Published 1955

## Source map scale - 1:1,250

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.





## Historical Map - Segment A15



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Ordnance Survey Plan Published 1960 - 1985 Source map scale - 1:1,250

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A15



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# **Additional SIMs**

## Published 1960

## Source map scale - 1:1,250

The SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's `Survey of Information on Microfilm') are further, minor editions of mapping which were produced and published in between the main editions as an area was updated. They date from 1947 to 1994, and contain detailed information on buildings, roads and land-use. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

## Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A15



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT





Tel: Fax: Web:




Order Number:	178768733_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 1672
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100





# Ordnance Survey Plan

## Published 1970

## Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.





## Historical Map - Segment A15

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# **Ordnance Survey Plan**

# Published 1975

### Source map scale - 1:1,250

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



· - - - - -

### Historical Map - Segment A15

••••n(d•••••		No.	ABA	
			Nes.	N
	Å			I. I.
h1		-4	-	

#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









## Additional SIMs

## Published 1989

# Source map scale - 1:2,500

The SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') are further, minor editions of mapping which were produced and published in between the main editions as an area was updated. They date from 1947 to 1994, and contain detailed information on buildings, roads and land-use. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A15



#### **Order Details**

17876
44538
58032
А
51.8
100

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 580320, 167230 A 51.8 100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







# Additional SIMs

## Published 1990

# Source map scale - 1:1,250

The SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') are further, minor editions of mapping which were produced and published in between the main editions as an area was updated. They date from 1947 to 1994, and contain detailed information on buildings, roads and land-use. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



# Historical Map - Segment A15



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Large-Scale National Grid Data

## Published 1994

## Source map scale - 1:1,250

'Large Scale National Grid Data' superseded SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') in 1992, and continued to be produced until 1999. These maps were the fore-runners of digital mapping and so provide detailed information on houses and roads, but tend to show less topographic features such as vegetation. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A15



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	Α
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Large-Scale National Grid Data

# Published 1994

## Source map scale - 1:2,500

'Large Scale National Grid Data' superseded SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') in 1992, and continued to be produced until 1999. These maps were the fore-runners of digital mapping and so provide detailed information on houses and roads, but tend to show less topographic features such as vegetation. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A15



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	1
Customer Ref:	4
National Grid Reference:	5
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	5
Search Buffer (m):	1

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 580320, 167230 A 51.8 100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









### Historical Mapping & Photography included:

Mapping Type	Scale	Date	Pg
Kent	1:2,500	1895	2
Kent	1:2,500	1895	3
Kent	1:2,500	1896	4
Kent	1:2,500	1909	5
Kent	1:2,500	1932	6
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:2,500	1966 - 1967	7
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:1,250	1966	8
Additional SIMs	1:2,500	1989	9
Large-Scale National Grid Data	1:1,250	1994	10
Large-Scale National Grid Data	1:2,500	1994	11

### **Historical Map - Segment A16**



#### **Order Details**

Order Number: Customer Ref: National Grid Reference: 580320, 167230 Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 Α 51.8 100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







# Kent Published 1895 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



## Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1895 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1896 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

178768733_1_1
44538-3501
580320, 167230
A
51.8
100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1909 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

178768733_1_1
44538-3501
580320, 167230
A
51.8
100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Published 1932 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Ordnance Survey Plan Published 1966 - 1967 Source map scale - 1:2,500

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



\_ \_ \_ ! \_ \_ !

### Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

178768733_1_1
44538-3501
580320, 167230
A
51.8
100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







# **Ordnance Survey Plan**

# Published 1966

### Source map scale - 1:1,250

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas and by 1896 it covered the whole of what were considered to be the cultivated parts of Great Britain. The published date given below is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



- - - -

### Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	17
Customer Ref:	44
National Grid Reference:	58
Slice:	А
Site Area (Ha):	51
Search Buffer (m):	10

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 580320, 167230 A 51.8 100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









## **Additional SIMs**

## Published 1989

## Source map scale - 1:2,500

The SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's `Survey of Information on Microfilm') are further, minor editions of mapping which were produced and published in between the main editions as an area was updated. They date from 1947 to 1994, and contain detailed information on buildings, roads and land-use. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A16

\_



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	580320, 167230
Slice:	A
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Large-Scale National Grid Data

## Published 1994

## Source map scale - 1:1,250

'Large Scale National Grid Data' superseded SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') in 1992, and continued to be produced until 1999. These maps were the fore-runners of digital mapping and so provide detailed information on houses and roads, but tend to show less topographic features such as vegetation. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

 
 Order Number:
 178768733\_1\_1

 Customer Ref:
 44538-3501

 National Grid Reference:
 580320, 167230
Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):

А 51.8 100

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Large-Scale National Grid Data

## Published 1994

## Source map scale - 1:2,500

'Large Scale National Grid Data' superseded SIM cards (Ordnance Survey's 'Survey of Information on Microfilm') in 1992, and continued to be produced until 1999. These maps were the fore-runners of digital mapping and so provide detailed information on houses and roads, but tend to show less topographic features such as vegetation. These maps were produced at both 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scales.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)

	TQ8 199- 1:2.3	088 4 500	   	TOS168 1994 12,500	1 1 1
_	_	_			_
			T	TO8167	I
			1	$1994 \\ 12,500$	I
			1	-	I

### Historical Map - Segment A16



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	17876
Customer Ref:	44538
National Grid Reference:	58032
Slice:	А
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	100

178768733\_1\_1 44538-3501 580320, 167230 A 51.8

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







# Appendix B2: Historical Maps South-East (Area 2)

# **Historical Mapping Legends**

-	
Ordnance Survey County Series 1:10,560	Ordna
Contract Con	
Cuary 🖓 Shinga 👯 Urchard	3) <sup>0055355</sup> 8:
<sup>248</sup> /2 ກາງໄດ້ Co-iere ເ <sup>ປັດຫຼັງ</sup> Roods ເປັນນີ້ການ Namon ກາງໄດ້ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ກາງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ ເຊິ່ງກາງ	CONSTRUCT NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION CONSTRUCTION
	Di Di
Mixed W: Depictuous Brochwood	* * * ŭ
	ှာ <b>ှ</b> ပrch
r i trze Rough Pastora	n≣ ff Brae st:
<sub>eer ve</sub> Antov dendies <u>s</u> ingonometrical towich valer Station	
🤹 Silend Arliqui 🛶 🐢 Berch Mara	<b>678</b> 1 11-1-
Prog. Gride Free	
- <b>285</b> Surface Level	<u>888</u> (Hao
Sitzlehoo instrumentel Compun	Frank Sup
Main Reacts	Colling Sourchite
Reset Read	<u></u>
Ratway over Rativay River	J• dkn
taikoogi over Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soocialista Soo	
—————————————————————————————————————	
toex tven ⊘Stream	 
——————————————————————————————————————	
— · — · — · — County & Crvit Parish Boundary	
+++ +++ Administrative County & D.M. Parish Boundary	OP CS Opend Ch Cherr
	CF Clut H
——————————————————————————————————————	FF. FociP to tv.nu
na ody	GP Guical MF Mix Fr
ann an Soil Deien Bonnoeg	ISDAN SM

ance Survey Plan 1:10,000				1:10,000 Ras	ster Mapp	oing
	- 1620C PS	n_	10 mm - 10			4
а амінні, свіў ні є Сца ту Г	తిరిగిని తిరిగిని తిరిగిన	Are Stavel Ft.	62-22	Cosvel Pi	( <u>)</u> ]}});	or sia
iane: P1	$\left( \begin{array}{c} - \\ - \end{array} \right)$	°≂ Unsuced Pil _∠ or Quarty		Rut		F⊷sk r-stell
eruse er lag Helap		or Pond		Boukers	· · ·	Bouid (Scall
(m. <del></del>	دن <sup>()</sup> س ک م	S Zaudow		Shingle	$\odot$	VIC d
ion renous rees	$\varphi_{Q}$	An-Contercus Trees	<u>R</u> ed	Sand	-9893 -	ten:
			100003	Sloo—e-	1010000	סכנד
hard O.a.—	Sen b	( <sup>1</sup> лу Серже <del>.</del> В м.М.		General celal		tada celei
æn souros.	Heach	Grass and		Coethe-clicelei	<del>• • • • • • • • •</del>	Narto Irukis
en savVas	Rccd3	Salliys		Multi traek reliway		Birgk ratwa
Di se Sing	tion of Flow : مرجع	-1 #215		Dauniy boundary (England aniv)		Civi, comm bouw
×house >~	J	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		Dietrich Heitery Heinopoliten Houden Bonough Journtery		Cons bourt
ing Masan y	Fylch 	Electricity Transmission Une	66 <sub>1.2</sub> 2	ér⊷a ⊷' wcert vgetetion	00 <sup>Q</sup> 0	Nor-k trees
			۵ ۵	Noneo ariferiors Ireas (acar ered)	÷۵. چي	Cont trees
an banan 1995- 1999-	MI. 		2	Contrerbus Trees (scattered)	Ω	الادP Iree
Hous 7/ Low Own Dress	d V Pos ang Shu	⊣⊢ Santed Ceng- g. Single Trens 9/ Siden Trenssa	5 C 0 A	Onesad	y	Coop or Ca
		→ Nortew Goulge	ал. 	Kough Grassland		-Lail
Secgraphical Co	u-tr		Съ. См	Je u o	etter Aller	Vitural Vitural
Administrative S or County of Oly	surry Court	y Poro .gh	5	WaterRealure	÷.	=
Aughton Dates	gr, breinien Courreil - Courreil		M-W/S)	Meen nigh	M.MAS)	(J-ar
5 конятрония 5 конятрония	a kaing kaing Pro <b>ing ka</b> ing ka	erenne soz Er eren herudorne	\$257 PROPERTY	waren (eta milki		* 1 11
.) ell Painh Ceixe de Laega	d	· dhaaka max	• •	Teleptonestine (where shown)	• •	Lieto transi (Atto
dary Point or Slone	Pol Sta Pri	Police 201 on Post of 20	L. LARSAN	Beneh mark (where shown)	140	Trian Islaile
10. st	PC	n ore on on Palais Scriven chev	1 212	Point feature		Palor
ngine Sletion Priday	PI SP	Public Isus+ Signal Ass	1 249	telg, Suice Post priMile Stone)	E	a Ig
Lai Peat	8µ ПП	 Spir y Telegrope Cell D∞		Sile of (artiquity)		Claro
oer Ione	 -ср М	Telephone Call Port Mol		General Building		imper Bulki
			International Activity of the second s			-

320	Oravel Pi		Refusion or plag heap
	Rask		5⊶:k r-steller-+: r
	Boukers	· · ·	Boulders (scallered)
認識	Shingle	$\odot$	Vikid
	Sand	32C)	Send Fi
"lunn"	Stor	121123123 1121123123	ct <b>iπ</b> ) ای دو ۲
	General celal		Underground kelei
	Overheid celei	++++	NGTOW (2009 <del>0</del> Rukes
	Mubi trae c relikvey		Bingle track ratway
	County boundary (England only)		Civil, barishian community boundary
	District Unitery Hemopolism Loodse Bonough Tourntery		Constituency boundary
o La	ér⊷a ⊷' wceol v⊷getetion	aa <sup>4</sup> 0	Non-contretous trees
6	Noneo ariferiora Ireea (acar ered)	ي 2. ان د	Conterous trees
2	Contendus Irees (sostiered)	ŝ	Pasilianec Iree
0 0	Onesad	y	Coopio <del>s</del> or Celiere
a.,	Kough Grassland		Hall
с.	Ge up	din din	Viersh, Gall Viersh or Reecs
5	Water Realure	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}$	Есе носек
N-W3)	Meen nign water (eorings)	M.MA5)	Mean kw weret (springe)
•	Teleptones tre (where shown)	•	Liestrichy transmission line (who poles)
н махиял	Bonen mark (where shown)	Δ	Triangulation Islalian
	Point feature (e.g. Guide Post – priMile Stone)	E	Prylon, fland stack a flighting tower
·:•	Sile of (arliqui y)		Glecolouse
	General Building		impertani Bulking



## Historical Mapping & Photography included:

Mapping Type	Scale	Date	Pg
Kent	1:10,560	1869	2
Kent	1:10,560	1897 - 1898	3
Kent	1:10,560	1909	4
Kent	1:10,560	1931 - 1932	5
Kent	1:10,560	1938	6
Kent	1:10,560	1950	7
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1961	8
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1969	9
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1974	10
Ordnance Survey Plan	1:10,000	1985	11
10K Raster Mapping	1:10,000	1999	12
Street View	Variable		13

## Historical Map - Slice B



### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	581780, 167180
Slice:	В
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	1000

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	581780, 167180
Slice:	В
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	1000





## Kent Published 1897 - 1898 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Slice B



#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	581780, 167180
Slice:	В
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	1000
National Grid Reference: Slice: Site Area (Ha): Search Buffer (m):	581780, 16718 B 51.8 1000

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







# Kent Published 1909 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Slice B



#### **Order Details**

30

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1931 - 1932 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Slice B



#### **Order Details**

1
80

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT









# Kent Published 1938 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced using the Transverse Mercator Projection. The revision process continued until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.

### Map Name(s) and Date(s)



### Historical Map - Slice B



#### **Order Details**

_ I
30

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT







# Kent Published 1950 Source map scale - 1:10,560

The historical maps shown were reproduced from maps predominantly held at the scale adopted for England, Wales and Scotland in the 1840's. In 1854 the 1:2,500 scale was adopted for mapping urban areas; these maps were used to update the 1:10,560 maps. The published date given therefore is often some years later than the surveyed date. Before 1938, all OS maps were based on the Cassini Projection, with independent surveys of a single county or group of counties, giving rise to significant inaccuracies in outlying areas. In the late 1940's, a Provisional Edition was produced, which updated the 1:10,560 mapping from a number of sources. The maps appear unfinished - with all military camps and other strategic sites removed. These maps were initially overprinted with the National Grid. In 1970, the first 1:10,000 maps were produced until recently, with new editions appearing every 10 years or so for urban areas.







#### **Order Details**

Order Number:	178768733_1_1
Customer Ref:	44538-3501
National Grid Reference:	581780, 167180
Slice:	В
Site Area (Ha):	51.8
Search Buffer (m):	1000

#### Site Details

1, Russett Farm, Rainham, GILLINGHAM, ME8 7AT



