

From: [Rachel Carney](#)
To: [Development Management](#)
Subject: FW: Hopwood Hall - Foundation Works (condition 5 pilling)
Date: 18 November 2025 09:09:43
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

From: Jonathon Parr
Sent: 14 November 2025 14:33
To: Sophie McGeough
Cc: Rachel Carney ; Richard Purser
Subject: RE: Hopwood Hall - Foundation Works (condition 5 pilling)

Hi Sophia. Thanks for the response.

Rachel, with the letter from TIER, the PRA is acceptable to me. However, I would stress that the EA are the Statutory Consultee under Development Control and the regulator for Controlled Waters outside of Part 2A, and therefore will detail whether they are happy with what has been produced from their point of view.

Thanks

Jon

Jonathon Parr

Environmental Health Senior Officer (Environment Prot)
Public Health



 01706 924688

 jonathon.parr@rochdale.gov.uk

Rochdale Borough Council
Floor 3, Number One Riverside
Smith Street, Rochdale, OL16 1XU

To access our services go to www.rochdale.gov.uk

For news, events and social media updates go to www.rochdale.gov.uk/newsandevents

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Jonathon Parr
Sent: 13 November 2025 11:39
To: 'Sophie McGeough' <Sophie@planred.co.uk>
Cc: Richard Purser <richard@planred.co.uk>; Rachel Carney <Rachel.Carney@Rochdale.Gov.UK>
Subject: RE: Hopwood Hall - Foundation Works (condition 5 pilling)

Sophie.

Generally I find the approach acceptable. However, I do have a few queries which stem from items I want clarifying before I recommend acceptance; please see below:

Section 4:

You say “It should be noted on the ground model that the Arley Mine coal seam which will be targeted for treatment ... dips below the River Roch thereby reducing risk of connectivity between treatment works and the neighbouring River.”

Although in this instance I am not the regulator for controlled waters, and the comment relates to mine grout, I thought I would add something based on own experience. When the A470 in south Wales was built over Carboniferous strata in the 1980s, grout from grouting works was seen to enter the bed of the River Taff. I believe that both the Consultant and Contractor were prosecuted for this. Bear in mind I read this in a report written by Arup related to a site I was working on; I have never been able to find any reference to it elsewhere, but I had no reason to not believe it. Although I believe the risk is low, I would never discount this issue arising again, especially in shallow workings in fractured rock. I would recommend a watching brief and a plan be derived in case grout does arise. I have not read the grouting specification which probably covers this, which is why I am just putting this comment to you, but given you have commented on this in relation to concrete from the piles, I would assume it is covered.

My own experience suggests that this is not as much of an issue with concrete in piles, I have been on sites where CFA piles were put into river gravels next to the Ness, and where piles were put in 5m from the River Taff, and seen no concrete enter these waters, though I do note you have covered this in Table 5.1.

Section 5

Should the preferred piling technique (CFA) be amended, this piling risk assessment may need updating.

Would vibro-concrete be a better solution than vibro-stone?

Table 5.1

CFA Piling Pollution Scenario 7- does the asbestos risk assessment need updating, or does it cover piling? I can't remember.

In Vibro Stone Columns Pollution Scenario 2, you state:

“... superficial and bedrock units are already hydraulically connected”. Is there no hydraulic connection with superficia/bedrock and Made Ground?

In Vibro Stone Columns Pollution Scenario 1, you state

“VSCs installed to 2m bgl following site turnover. Ground improvement limited to made ground only. No penetration into undisturbed / natural strata”.

In 3.3, you say that

“Made Ground was recorded to depths of between 0.95m and 6.80m bgl”.

You then go onto state that

“Made Ground has been reported to a maximum depth of 6.50m bgl and was found to be thickest towards the southwest and central west of the site within the former infilled watercourse.”

In 4, you say that

“The proposed pile locations are presented as Drawing No. FE0012-ROS-XX-XX-D-C-0500, Rev C01 produced by Roscoe.”

This drawing does not appear to have been included. So, are there going to be no VSCs in the area of shallow Made Ground? Are they just to be in areas where the thickness of MG is over 2m?

Vibro Stone Columns Pollution Scenario 7- does the asbestos risk assessment need updating, or does it cover piling? I can't remember.

Having written several PRAs in my time, I know they can be somewhat difficult to write as the guidance, still, is somewhat lacking, but this is a good report.

Thanks

Jon

Jonathon Parr

Environmental Health Senior Officer (Environment Prot)
Public Health



ROCHDALE
BOROUGH COUNCIL

☎ 01706 924688

✉ jonathon.parr@rochdale.gov.uk

Rochdale Borough Council
Floor 3, Number One Riverside
Smith Street, Rochdale, OL16 1XU

To access our services go to www.rochdale.gov.uk

For news, events and social media updates go to www.rochdale.gov.uk/newsandevents

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

