

# AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENT AUDIT

**Guildford Crematorium**

Prepared for: Guildford Borough Council

SLR Ref: 416.11419.00001  
Version No: v1.0  
October 2021



## BASIS OF REPORT

This document has been prepared by SLR with reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the manpower, timescales and resources devoted to it by agreement with Guildford Borough Council (the Client) as part or all of the services it has been appointed by the Client to carry out. It is subject to the terms and conditions of that appointment.

SLR shall not be liable for the use of or reliance on any information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document for any purpose by any person other than the Client. Reliance may be granted to a third party only in the event that SLR and the third party have executed a reliance agreement or collateral warranty.

Information reported herein may be based on the interpretation of public domain data collected by SLR, and/or information supplied by the Client and/or its other advisors and associates. These data have been accepted in good faith as being accurate and valid.

The copyright and intellectual property in all drawings, reports, specifications, bills of quantities, calculations and other information set out in this report remain vested in SLR unless the terms of appointment state otherwise.

This document may contain information of a specialised and/or highly technical nature and the Client is advised to seek clarification on any elements which may be unclear to it.

Information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document should only be relied upon in the context of the whole document and any documents referenced explicitly herein and should then only be used within the context of the appointment.

## CONTENTS

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project Background.....	1
1.2 Approach to Audit.....	2
<b>2.0 AIR QUALITY AUDIT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Tendering Process.....	3
2.2 Planning Process .....	3
2.2.1 Introduction .....	3
2.2.2 Conflict of interest.....	3
2.2.3 Validation process .....	4
2.2.4 Air quality and planning guidance .....	4
2.2.5 Conclusion.....	4
2.3 Environmental Permit Application .....	5
2.3.1 Introduction .....	5
2.3.2 D1 Calculations .....	5
2.3.3 Conclusion.....	6
2.4 Complaints Procedure.....	6
<b>3.0 CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>8</b>

## DOCUMENT REFERENCES

### APPENDICES

Appendix A: MCAL response to GBC, dated 23rd October 2019

Appendix B: MCAL responses to GBC, dated 22nd November 2018

## 1.0 Introduction

SLR Consulting Ltd (SLR) has been commissioned by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) to undertake an audit of the approach to air quality in any work undertaken as part of the planning application and subsequent Environmental Permit (EP) variation application to GBC from the redevelopment of the Guildford Crematorium. In addition, a review of GBC response to a complaint raised by a member of the public on the robustness of the air quality work submitted as part of the EP application is also presented.

The aim of the audit is to identify potential issues with the approach followed, and provide recommendations where appropriate.

### 1.1 Project Background

GBC has been operating a crematorium at their site in New Pond Road (the Site), Godalming since 1967 when the original chapel was built. GBC has also acted as the regulatory authority for the Crematorium, as it falls under Part B of the Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR) (2016) and therefore is regulated by GBC.

GBC began the process of redeveloping the Site with a view to install a new crematorium in 2014 with the process completed in 2020. An overview of the tendering and design process is presented in an internal report<sup>1</sup> compiled by [REDACTED] (PS), the project manager for the new Crematorium Planning and EP applications and at the time a GBC officer.

A planning application was submitted in July 2017 (planning application reference: 17/P/01389) and approved by the planning committee in October 2017. The planning validation lists that were applied do not require an air quality assessment report. During planning determination, advice was sought from Regulatory Services (RS) to determine whether an air quality report should be sought for the replacement crematorium facility. It was deemed that one was not required on the primary basis this was a replacement facility. RS advised that as there was an existing EP and the plant was a replacement, air quality should be considered as part of the EP variation application and therefore there was no requirement to consider air quality during the planning application.

The EP variation application was prepared by [REDACTED] (EHRC), commissioned by Councils Bereavement Service, and submitted to RS. RS outsources, as required, monitoring of emissions and review of air quality work submitted as part of Planning and EP applications to [REDACTED] (MCAL).

The EP variation application was reviewed by MCAL, including relevant technical work, which in this case included a calculation to identify a minimum stack discharge height for the Crematorium. This approach is detailed in Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Pollution (HMIP) Technical Guidance Note D1 "*Guidelines on Discharge Stack Heights for Polluting Emissions Calculation*" and is in line with the requirement set in Process Guidance Note – Statutory Guidance for Crematoria (PG5/2 (2012)), applicable to this project. The EP variation application was subsequently issued in July 2019.

Following the submission of the EP variation, a complaint was raised through the Council's Corporate Complaint Procedure by [REDACTED] (DH) and [REDACTED] (MW) in the first quarter of 2019, regarding the robustness of the submitted D1 calculation. MW, first requested a copy of the D1 calculation after the Planning Application was submitted, in April 2018. The concerns raised were discussed through e-mail communication, telephone conversations and at a meeting held on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2020 at GBC offices. As a result, the D1 calculation, prepared by [REDACTED] (FT), the technology provider for the Crematorium, were revised and a new minimum stack height of 9m was identified. An external consultant ([REDACTED]) was commissioned by RS to independently check the revised D1 calculation to validate if it aligned with the calculations provided by DH/MW. The review concluded that following the D1 methodology, the minimum stack

<sup>1</sup> [REDACTED] (2020), Guildford Crematorium Stack Discharge Height Error Internal Investigation

height for the crematorium should be 9m. Subsequently a planning application was prepared for the increased stack height (ref: 20/P/01026), referred to and decided by planning committee, with approval granted 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020.

## 1.2 Approach to Audit

The audit included the review of relevant documents and discussions with key individuals involved in the preparation of the Planning application, the determination of the EP variation application and the complainants (DH/MW).

The following key documents were reviewed:

- [REDACTED] (DH) and [REDACTED] (MW) (2019), Guildford Crematorium, 'An independent review of the stack calculation by [REDACTED] (FT)', Dated 27 March 2019 for Guildford Borough Council; and
- [REDACTED] (PS) (2020), 'Guildford Crematorium Stack Discharge Height Error Internal Investigation' and associated appendices.

A series of e-mails between GBC and DH/MW was also reviewed with regard to the complaints' procedure.

In addition, discussions were held with the following:

- [REDACTED] (TD), Planning Development Manager, GBC
- [REDACTED] (PS), Applicant, Parks and Landscape Manager, GBC
- [REDACTED] (JF), Regulatory Service Manager, GBC
- [REDACTED] (GD), Environmental Control, Team Leader, GBC
- [REDACTED] (DH), Member of the public

The audit has addressed the following:

- Tendering process
- Planning application
- Environmental Permit and D1 Calculation; and
- Complaint procedure.

## 2.0 Air Quality Audit

### 2.1 Tendering Process

The tendering process, according to the evidence provided in the internal report compiled by PS, followed a formal Invitation to Tender (ITT). Discussions with PS on the process indicated that submissions were reviewed by a panel with a subsequent session where tender scores were adjusted by moderators. The scope of this audit does not extend to reviewing in detail the tender applications and subsequent scoring, however it has been indicated that those documents are available for review.

As part of the ITT, the applicants were required to submit an indicative D1 calculation, based on the conceptual design available at the time. FT, that were awarded the contract, submitted a D1 calculation with a minimum stack height of 11m (Appendix 10 of PS report). This is higher than the minimum stack height of 8m presented as part of the EP variation application. According to PS the height of the stack was not a criterion in awarding the contract to FT. In addition, reducing the height of the stack by a few metres, does not translate into a substantially reduced capital expenditure (Capex) for the crematorium, as such there was no significant benefit to GBC in awarding the contract to FT on the basis of their initial D1 calculation.

DH, during the complaint procedure raised the issue around potential competitive gains by FT around potentially presenting a reduced stack height in their tender when compared to other submissions. It should be noted that DH did not have access to FT's tender submission and D1 calculation when the issue was raised. Following the internal review and investigations during this audit, FT does not appear to have gained a commercial advantage through their indicative D1 calculation submitted during the tendering process.

A detailed review of the tender submissions and subsequent assessment and scoring, would clarify DH questions around the indicative stack heights presented by other submissions. However, given that a slightly reduced stack height does not translate to a substantial reduction in Capex, and the fact the remit of this audit is to address potential shortcoming in addressing air quality impacts from the proposals, a detailed review of the tender documents was not taken forward.

### 2.2 Planning Process

#### 2.2.1 Introduction

An overview of the Planning Application process, in relation to this project, as well as overall processes at the Council were discussed with TD. The planning application was submitted by PS, considered the applicant for the purpose of this project. During the Planning Application process, the design of the crematorium, as discussed in PS's report, evolved up to RIBA Stage 3. The option to include a pop-up roof was explored further during the EP variation process. The planning application was referred to members of the planning committee at the discretion of the Planning Development Manager on the basis that GBC were the applicant and approval was granted by GBC Planning committee. After the Planning permission was granted, design changes were made, to the crematory flues, pop-up roof and removal of louvres on the flue shroud (during RIBA Stage 4), these were applied for as a Non-Material Amendment and approved under delegated authority<sup>2</sup>.

#### 2.2.2 Conflict of interest

The potential for a conflict of interest in the planning system where a local authority is both applicant and planning authority is recognised in the 'Nolan Committee's Third Report on Standards in Public Life'<sup>3</sup>. Guidance

<sup>2</sup> 19/N/00032 | Non-material amendment to application number 17/P/01389 approved 05/10/2017 to allow changes to the crematory flues, fenestration and louvres. | Guildford Crematorium, New Pond Road, Peasmarsh, Guildford

<sup>3</sup> Standards of Conduct in Local Government in England, Scotland and Wales Summary of the Nolan Committee's Third Report on Standards in Public Life (July 1997)

from the Local Government Association<sup>4</sup> recommends that “such proposals should be reported to the planning committee and not dealt with by officers under delegated powers”. The planning application process, in this case (ref: 17-P-01389 and 20/P/1026), accorded with this principle with the application being referred to and decided by committee.

It was noted in discussions with TD, after the issues raised by DH, the then Legal Lead Specialist ( ) prepared a template structure for projects that GBC has a potential conflict of interest through their role as applicant, determining authority, and regulator. It is understood this has now been rolled out to officers in the development management teams.

### 2.2.3 Validation process

During the validation of the planning application for this replacement crematorium, replacing with newer cremators operating to a higher standard on the existing footprint, which was already operating under an EP, local planning validation lists used by GBC did not require an air quality assessment report. Therefore, the application was validated without an air quality report. Following validation, the decision on whether to require an air quality report was further considered during the planning stage. The planning department were advised, according to GD in RS, that as this was a replacement plant, air quality did not need to be considered during the Planning Application process and would be considered under the pollution control regime. The advice relied on the fact that there was an existing EP in place, and any air quality issues associated with the replacement plant to be addressed through the EP variation application. The 2019 National Planning Policy Framework<sup>5</sup> states that:

*“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.”*

### 2.2.4 Air quality and planning guidance

GBC did not have specific guidance documentation that dictates how projects and proposals by developers can be classified in relation to the level of air quality assessment required to support planning applications. There are numerous examples of such guidance in use by other Planning Authorities that provide a clear and transparent way in which air quality should be considered during planning. The guidance examples available do not consider whether a proposal is covered by an existing EP or whether a project is a replacement, but rather rely on the potential changes in emissions as well as stipulating that specific projects (e.g. a biomass boiler) and specific circumstances would always require a level of air quality assessment.

### 2.2.5 Conclusion

The planning application process for the replacement crematorium dealt with the potential conflict of interest in accordance with LGA guidance, i.e. by referral to planning committee. The approach to requirements for air quality impact assessment to support the planning application accorded with the NPPF, i.e. given the existing crematorium was an established land-use with an existing EP, emissions to air would be dealt with through the pollution control regime. As such, in this case, a detailed review of flue height in terms of impacts on air quality (i.e. D1 calculations), was not a requirement for consideration within the planning decision.

<sup>4</sup> Local Government Association ‘Probity in planning for councillors and officers’ (April 2013)

<sup>5</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2019). National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.

## 2.3 Environmental Permit Application

### 2.3.1 Introduction

The preparation of the EP variation application was undertaken by EHRC on behalf of GBC, with MCAL instructed by RS to complete the technical review in relation to the EP process. After planning was approved, the design evolved during RIBA stage 4 with changes that removed the louvred shroud (or wind shield), changed the dimensions of the pop-up roof, and increased the height of crematory flues. E-mail communication between RS and the architect discuss the potential need for dispersion modelling, given the potential issues around dispersion with the use of louvred shroud (Appendix A). The louvred shroud element of the design was removed on the advice by MCAL, as the louvres were not compatible with Para 6.1.2 of the D1. As a result, dispersion modelling was no longer considered to be required. Therefore, the flue height design was to be informed by the D1 calculation which accords with Process Guidance Note<sup>6</sup> 5/2 (12). During this period a number of D1 calculations were prepared by EHRC and FT as the detailed design progressed, these are discussed below.

### 2.3.2 D1 Calculations

The PS internal review describes the timeline of D1 calculations undertaken by FT and EHRC on behalf of the operator. PS's internal review acknowledges that there was an error with the calculations, which is also audited in detail in the DH/MW report. The available documents present the calculation methodology in D1 and identify the fact that the building dimensions (the width in this case) used in the FT D1 calculation submitted as part of the EP variation application was incorrect. DH's report also questions a number of other decisions on how the D1 methodology was applied in relation to similar crematoria applications, involving FT, MCAL and the appointed architects. Given the existing evidence around the calculation error, it has not been subject to further as part of this audit. A summary of key points is as follows:

- There were numerous iterations of building design and consequently stack height calculation, with the design requiring a collaborative process between client, architect, technology supplier, and consultant.
- EHRC undertook calculations (set out within Appendix 16<sup>7</sup> of PS report) identifying stack heights of 8.01m to 8.10m, which if rounded up would result in a 9.0m flue, in November 2018. These calculations are based on a series of monitoring data provided to EHRC by FT, whereas the FT spreadsheet calculations were based on stack emission parameters derived from in-house heat and mass balance calculations. A review of the stack emission parameters used in the EHRC calculations do not match exactly the FT emission data submitted with the EP variation application. This according to the PS report, relates to misinterpretation of the test data by EHRC, identified after the EHRC calculations were reviewed by FT. The flue height of 8.1 was stated on drawings submitted as part of the NMA to planning application 17/P/01389.
- The report by PS (Section 2.2), lists the D1 calculations that were produced as part of this project by FT and EHRC. It includes the timeline of D1 calculations undertaken and references errors identified in EHRC calculations (November 2018 report) by FT. Although it references an e-mail by FT where the heights were recalculated and communicated to EHRC, this was not provided as evidence within the report. PS report does acknowledge that the eventual building dimensions used in the FT calculations were taken from the EHRC report, FT did not review the drawings to confirm that the interpretation by EHRC was correct. FT did though identify that EHRC calculations interpreted the test data incorrectly, leading to a revised D1 being issued in March 2019 by FT.
- The e-mail evidence available (Appendix B), indicates that there were checks by MCAL (on behalf of RS as the Regulator) on the EHRC calculations from November 2018. Within the e-mail chain it is evident

<sup>6</sup> DEFRA, Process Guidance Note 5/2 (12) Statutory Guidance for Crematoria (September 2012)

<sup>7</sup> EHRC, Chimney Height Calculation Supporting information document (November 2018)



that drawings were provided to MCAL before the EHRC calculations were signed off by MCAL. Within the correspondence there are comments on the requirements set in paragraph 5.4.7 (specifying that the minimum stack height should be rounded up to the nearest metre) and later concludes that there should be no concerns in rounding to the nearest metre. It has been assumed that this approach was followed as the submitted EP variation supplementary information<sup>8</sup> by EHRC in April 2019 (Appendix 2.2 of PS report), states an 8.0m flue height (with FT's D1 calculation of 27<sup>th</sup> March 2019 stating minimum height requirement of 8.0m included as an appendix).

- The PS internal report identifies that EHRC had applied an incorrect approach in the consideration of buildings in the D1 calculations (Refer to section 2.2 of the PS report) and not just identified the incorrect width. The FT and EHRC approaches were therefore different, although both utilised the same incorrect building width. The resultant minimum stack height calculated by FT and EHRC (based on the November 2018 report that appears to have included errors) were comparable.

There is no detailed evidence, presented for the purposes of this audit, indicating how the calculations deriving an 8.0m flue height submitted as part of the EP variation application, were checked and validated by MCAL. The evidence on email (Appendix B) implies checks were undertaken, but there is no documented audit trail.

### 2.3.3 Conclusion

The PS internal audit report has been reviewed by the parties involved (RS, FT, EHRC and MCAL), and its findings do not appear to be disputed<sup>9</sup>. The error in the D1 calculation, with regard to the input parameter concerning building width, as discovered by DH is agreed on by all parties.

It is understood, GBC RS contracted MCAL to provide technical review of the EP variation application given that GBC were both the applicant and the regulator in order to address any potential conflict of interest, although the details of the contract with MCAL and scope of delegated responsibility have not been reviewed in this audit.

There is no detailed evidence, either within the PS internal audit, or presented by any parties for the purposes of this audit, demonstrating the technical review undertaken by MCAL, that led to the decision to issue the EP variation with a flue height based on an erroneous calculation. It is stated within the PS internal audit that *"MCAL have not checked the building dimensions and used the building dimensions as previously used in relation to figure 6 of the D1 guidance submitted as part of the application to vary the sites permit submitted on 13th May 2019"*.

In conclusion with regard to the EP process, GBC RS have contracted an independent consultant to provide technical support, to avoid a potential conflict of interest. There has been a technical failing attributed to the contactor MCAL for not checking all inputs and source data to the D1 calculation. It was not reasonable for RS to undertake a detailed audit themselves of MCAL's work, however there should be measures or procedures in place to allow RS to satisfy themselves that the work undertaken on their behalf has been undertaken in a comprehensive and technically robust manner, such as:

- requiring evidence of the audit procedure, and documented audit trail; and
- requiring contractors to have a quality assurance system certified to a recognised standard (e.g., ISO 9001).

## 2.4 Complaints Procedure

MW first requested a copy of the D1 calculation from GBC in October 2017. It is noted from the evidence that a D1 calculation was prepared by FT as part of the tendering process. It was not until November 2017 in the period

<sup>8</sup> EHRC, Guildford Crematorium: Permit Variation (April 2019)

<sup>9</sup> Documents: Draft Private and Confidential Stack Discharge Height Investigation 23.09.20, Draft Private and Confidential Stack Discharge Height Investigation MCAL 23.09.20 (003) GD Additions 30-09-20, JSP & TR comments on Draft Private and Confidential Stack Discharge Height Investigation 01.10.20

---

where the design was evolving, when FT provided GBC with options in regard to the acceptable chimney height. As air quality was not a material consideration during planning and the design was evolving, a D1 calculation would not become publicly available until the EP variation application was submitted. This illustrates that when air quality was scoped out during planning, it removed the ability for the public to meaningfully comment on the application.

It was only after DH's Freedom of Information (Fol) request that the D1 calculation was provided in September 2019 for comment. A meeting took place on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2020 between FT, GBC, DH/MW and follow up questions were submitted to PS in March 2020, with responses provided in April 2020, after the submission of the DH/WC report to GBC. Timely responses to DH/MW concerns, according to GBC, were hampered by the GBC response to the Covid-19 pandemic with both RS and Parks and Countryside who operate crematorium significantly involved in the response.

It is considered that during the complaint procedure, any responses to comments would have been better managed by someone within the Council that was not involved in preparing or commissioning the submitted documentation, given the conflict of interest issues and to avoid giving the impression of lack of transparency. PS should have been responsible in feeding through the responses to comments via the nominated representative. Following the meeting of the 2<sup>nd</sup> March, GBC acknowledges the shortcomings of the submitted technical work and implements clear steps in rectified the issue (i.e. increasing the stack to 9m).

---

## 3.0 Conclusions

In conclusion:

- The D1 calculation submitted with the tender submissions was not considered in scoring of the submissions and it was not material in the eventual commissioning of FT.
- The planning application process for the replacement crematorium dealt with the potential conflict of interest in accordance with LGA guidance, i.e. by referral to planning committee.
- The approach to requirements for air quality impact assessment to support the planning application accorded with the NPPF, i.e. given the existing crematorium was an established land-use with an existing EP, emissions to air would be dealt with through the pollution control regime. As such, in this case, a detailed review of flue height in terms of impacts on air quality (i.e. D1 calculation), was not required for consideration within the planning decision.
- GBC RS contracted MCAL to provide technical review of the EP variation application given that GBC were both the applicant and the regulator in order to address any potential conflict of interest.
- PS's internal review describes the errors in the D1 calculations with regards to the building width input parameter, that were used to inform the planning and EP variation submissions. The error is not disputed by the parties involved. The error, as described in the internal audit is a combination of misinterpretation of the D1 guidance and not verifying the correct dimensions from design drawings.
- There is no detailed evidence, either within the PS internal audit, or presented by any parties for the purposes of this audit, demonstrating the technical review undertaken by MCAL, that led to the decision to issue the EP Variation.
- The complaints procedure response appeared slow, this is attributed by GBC to the Covid-19 pandemic with both RS and Parks and Countryside who operate crematorium significantly involved in the response.

It is recommended that measures or procedures are reviewed and where necessary improved, to allow RS to satisfy themselves that work undertaken on their behalf has been undertaken in a comprehensive and technically robust manner, such as:

- requiring evidence of the audit procedure, and documented audit trail; and
- requiring contractors to have a quality assurance system certified to a recognised standard (e.g., ISO 9001).

## EUROPEAN OFFICES

### United Kingdom

#### AYLESBURY

T: +44 (0)1844 337380

#### BELFAST

belfast@slrconsulting.com

#### BRADFORD-ON-AVON

T: +44 (0)1225 309400

#### BRISTOL

T: +44 (0)117 906 4280

#### CARDIFF

T: +44 (0)29 2049 1010

#### CHELMSFORD

T: +44 (0)1245 392170

#### EDINBURGH

T: +44 (0)131 335 6830

#### EXETER

T: + 44 (0)1392 490152

#### GLASGOW

glasgow@slrconsulting.com

#### GUILDFORD

guildford@slrconsulting.com

#### LONDON

T: +44 (0)203 805 6418

#### MAIDSTONE

T: +44 (0)1622 609242

#### MANCHESTER (Denton)

T: +44 (0)161 549 8410

#### MANCHESTER (Media City)

T: +44 (0)161 872 7564

#### NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

T: +44 (0)191 261 1966

#### NOTTINGHAM

T: +44 (0)115 964 7280

#### SHEFFIELD

T: +44 (0)114 245 5153

#### SHREWSBURY

T: +44 (0)1743 23 9250

#### STIRLING

T: +44 (0)1786 239900

#### WORCESTER

T: +44 (0)1905 751310

### Ireland

#### DUBLIN

T: + 353 (0)1 296 4667

### France

#### GRENOBLE

T: +33 (0)6 23 37 14 14

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 23 October 2019 08:34  
**To:**  
**Subject:** Re: 1100 Guildford Crem\_Cremator Flue height [UNC]

We flagged earlier that the shroud needed to be removed and it has been, this was shown in Fay's revised calculation.

So not sure why you want to commission any further modelling?

Regards

---

**Sent:** 27 September 2018 09:22

**Subject:** FW:1100 Guildford Crem\_Cremator Flue height [UNC]

This chap was very helpful. Obviously the dispersion modelling will be an extra cost to the Council, however I have a nagging feeling that the originator of the topic may have a point.

Are you happy with this approach?

Regards

---

**Sent:** 25 September 2018 16:27

**Subject:** 1100 Guildford Crem\_Cremator Flue height

Thanks for speaking with me earlier.

As discussed the approved planning scheme shows the flue to the proposed new crematorium finishing level with the top of a surrounding metal shroud, we have been advised that the D1 calcs would regard the shroud as having a potentially influencing effect on the dispersion of flue gases. Hence under D1 calc guidance the flue would either be required to terminate above the shroud or remain at the same height with the shroud removed.

A more informed understanding of the effect the shroud design may have upon flue gases can be established through dispersion modelling, from our conversation I understand that you would accept the findings of such a study to take precedent over the general guidance given in D1 calcs.

I would be grateful if you could confirm your position with regards to dispersion modelling noted above is correct.

Kind regards,

---

[Follow us on Twitter](#)

[Blackrock Quarry Police Training Centre Civic Trust Award Winner 2017](#)  
[Emsworth Baptist Church Civic Trust Award Regional Finalist 2017](#)  
[Alexandra Centre New London Awards Winner 2015](#)

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Guildford Borough Council **UNCLASSIFIED** EXTERNAL

---

Guildford Borough Council has arrangements for handling sensitive emails. For more information on how you may be affected please go to [www.guildford.gov.uk/SecureEmail](http://www.guildford.gov.uk/SecureEmail). If you have received this message in error, please (a) notify the sender immediately, (b) destroy this email and any attachments, and (c) do not use, copy, and/or disclose this email or any attachments to any person.

Guildford Borough Council regularly updates virus software to ensure as far as possible that its networks are free of viruses. However, you will need to check this message and any attachments for viruses as Guildford Borough Council can take no responsibility for any computer virus that might be transferred by this email.

The contents of this email may not reflect Guildford Borough Council policy. We store and monitor all emails and attachments sent and received by Guildford Borough Council employees in our Cryoserver system for up to 2 years to prevent misuse of the Council's networks.

---

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 22 November 2018 08:46  
**To:**  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RE:Guildford Chimney Height Report [UNC]

Thank you.  
I will catch up with you next week sometime.  
Kind regards

---

**From**  
**Sent:** 21 November 2018 18:53  
**To:**  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** FW: Guildford Chimney Height Report [UNC]

I think this satisfies the stack height requirements. The lip will cause some turbulence round the stack but the revised stack should be acceptable. I am not overly concerned re rounding up to the nearest metre.  
I am working away in Cannock and North Yorkshire for the rest of this week and next but you should be able to contact me  
Via email if there is any queries?

Regards

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 21 November 2018 16:32  
**To:**  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** RE: Guildford Chimney Height Report [UNC]

Sorry this took a little longer than anticipated.

A fresh drawing has been received from the architect, and planners appear to be at their limits of NMA with changes to design. I've included these drawings in addition to answers to your questions.

Ultimately, you and Gary will have to decide and confirm if you think the proposed design is acceptable. If not acceptable, then please confirm your requirements, and I will liaise with the Crem.

Kind regards,

**Confidentiality Notice:**

The information transmitted in this email and/or any attached document(s) is confidential and intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete any material from any computer.



**Think! Do you really need to print this email?**

---

**From****Sent:** 16 November 2018 10:05**To:****Cc:****Subject:** RE: Guildford Chimney Height Report [UNC]

Thanks for the comprehensive D1 calculations.

Just a couple of points.

Can you confirm the "pop up" is the roof cowl and that the proposed stack extends 1.1metres above the shroud?  
(sectional diagram would help here?)

And that the stack arrangement complies fully with Para 6.1.2 of D1?

I assume you have chosen not to address para 5.4.7 ?

Regards

---

**From:****Sent:** 15 November 2018 15:17**To:****Cc:****Subject:** RE: Guildford Chimney Height Report [UNC]

Hello

Absolutely no problem, I've got so much work on at the moment.

Revised report attached.

I've done six D1 runs in total, using data from two crematoria operating a 2 x FTIII abated configuration. All stack heights come out within 9cm of each other. I would recommend that the minimum stack height be no less than 8.10m above ground level, which was the tallest stack height generated.



Any questions, please let me know.

Kind regards,

**Confidentiality Notice:**

The information transmitted in this email and/or any attached document(s) is confidential and intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete any material from any computer.



**Think! Do you really need to print this email?**

---

**From:**

**Sent:** 15 November 2018 12:13

**To:**

**Cc:**

**Subject:** RE:Guildford Chimney Height Report [UNC]

Hello

Please don't think I am chasing, but any update?

Thanks

---

**From:**

**Sent:** 26 October 2018 06:49

**To:**

**Cc:**

**Subject:** Guildford Chimney Height Report

**Importance:** High

Please accept my apologies, I would like to withdraw the D1 report I sent you yesterday, I am not happy with one element of the report and want to check the component again.

– sorry about this.

Kind regards,

**Confidentiality Notice:**

The information transmitted in this email and/or any attached document(s) is confidential and intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete any material from any computer.



**Think! *Do you really need to print this email?***

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Guildford Borough Council **UNCLASSIFIED** EXTERNAL

---

Guildford Borough Council has arrangements for handling sensitive emails. For more information on how you may be affected please go to [www.guildford.gov.uk/SecureEmail](http://www.guildford.gov.uk/SecureEmail). If you have received this message in error, please (a) notify the sender immediately, (b) destroy this email and any attachments, and (c) do not use, copy, and/or disclose this email or any attachments to any person.

Guildford Borough Council regularly updates virus software to ensure as far as possible that its networks are free of viruses. However, you will need to check this message and any attachments for viruses as Guildford Borough Council can take no responsibility for any computer virus that might be transferred by this email.

The contents of this email may not reflect Guildford Borough Council policy. We store and monitor all emails and attachments sent and received by Guildford Borough Council employees in our Cryoserver system for up to 2 years to prevent misuse of the Council's networks.

---

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

