



Geo-Environmental

VERIFICATION REPORT

PLOTS 127-128

WOODCROFT FARM, WOODCROFT LANE,

LOVEDEAN, PO8 9QA

on behalf of

VISTRY SOUTHERN

Report:	VERIFICATION REPORT
Site:	PLOTS 127-128, WOODCROFT FARM, WOODCROFT LANE, LOVEDEAN, PO8 9QA
Client:	VISTRY SOUTHERN
Date:	10/05/2022
Reference:	GE19455/VR/PLOTS 127-128/MAY22
Version:	1.0
Prepared by:	 FIONA GOODE BSc (Hons), MSc, FGS, MEnvSc, RSoBRA Senior Consultant Engineer
Reviewed by:	 GAVIN ROBERTS CGeol, BEng (Hons), MSc, FGS Technical Director
Authorised by:	 LAURA LEGATE CGeol, CSci, BSc (Hons), MSc, FGS Environmental Director
Geo-Environmental Services Ltd Unit 7, Danworth Farm, Cuckfield Road, Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex, BN6 9GL +44(0) 1273 832972 www.gesl.net Environmental Consultants Geotechnical Engineers Site Investigations	

AMENDMENT RECORD

Revision ref.	Date	Reasons for amendment	Author's initials	Reviewed by	Authorised by
1.0	10/05/2022	First issue for compiled report for Plots 127-128	FG	GR	LL

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	General	1
1.2	Objectives	2
1.3	Planning Permission	2
2.0	BACKGROUND	4
2.1	Proposed Site Use	4
2.2	Investigation and Assessment	4
2.3	Conceptual Site Model	5
2.4	Approach for Remediation, Monitoring and Validation	5
3.0	SOILS	6
3.1	End Users (Shallow Soils)	6
4.0	INSPECTION/VALIDATION (SOILS)	8
4.1	Validation inspection of installed subsoil	8
4.2	Validation inspection and sampling of Topsoil (cover system) placement	8
4.3	Topsoil and subsoil analysis of laboratory test results	8
5.0	DISCOVERY STRATEGY	10
6.0	VERIFICATION	11

FIGURES

FIGURE 1	Site Plan
FIGURE 2	Areas Requiring Remediation
FIGURE 3	Development Levels Plan – Phase 3 Horse Arena, Farmyard and Chalk Pit
FIGURE 4	Validation Sample Location Plan

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Site Photographs and Site Diary Records
APPENDIX B	Visual Inspection Records of Soil Cover System Installation
APPENDIX C	Geochemical Laboratory Test Results



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General

The site has been subject to several phases of investigation and assessment for the site, as reported in the Phase I Ground Condition Report, ref 21834, dated 2010 prepared by Peter Brett Associates (PBA), which included a desk study and preliminary risk assessment for the overall Woodcroft Farm site; a Factual Report, ref RML 4750, dated October 2011 prepared by Risk Management Limited, which included ground investigation and laboratory test results; and a Geo-environmental and Geotechnical Ground Investigation Report, ref 21834-030-R02, dated July 2013 prepared by PBA, which presented an interpretative assessment of the overall Woodcroft Farm site.

Further Phase II intrusive investigation was undertaken and reported by Geo-Environmental Services Limited ('Geo-Environmental') and presented in the Soil Contamination Assessment ref. GE16662-FG02-170929, dated 29th September 2017. An additional phase of investigation was also commissioned in 2018 to support development of the remedial strategies and the findings were presented within the remedial strategies for the site (see below). Subsequently, a Detailed Quantitative Gas Risk Assessment (DQGRA) was commissioned from The Environmental Protection Group Ltd (EPG), ref. EPG/8938/2018/DQGRA/V1 dated October 2018, in relation to the infilled former chalk pit located to the west of the farmyard area.

Subsequently Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan (RSVP) documents were prepared for the three separate areas of the site deemed to require remediation, referenced GE16943/RSVP-FY-V6.0/DEC20 for the Farmyard Area, GE16943/RSVP-CP-V6.0/DEC20 for the Chalk Pit Area and GE16943/RSVP-HA-V6.0/FEB21 for the Horse Arena area.

In line with the remedial strategies for the site, Geo-Environmental was instructed by 'the Client', Vistry Southern, to prepare a Verification Report to compile the relevant information in relation to the residential development for Plots 127-128, Woodcroft Farm, Woodcroft Lane, Lovedean, Hampshire, PO8 9QA, herein referred to as 'the site' (see Figure 1).

Plots 127 and 128 lie within the area of the site known as the former farmyard area (Figure 2), therefore the Remedial Strategy GE16943/RSVP-FY-V6.0/DEC20 for the former farmyard area is the strategy relevant for the proposed remedial works for these specific plots.

This report relates specifically to the installation and validation of remedial measures within Plots 127-128 in relation to soft landscaping validation. At the time of reporting, private gardens and areas of soft landscaping on further plots on site were not ready for final validation inspections and will be validated within a separate verification (or an updated) report in due course.

Previous phases of validation onsite have already been undertaken and reported for the site under:

- GE19455/VR/PLOTS 79-80/SEP21, which presented the validation of soil cover systems associated with Plots 79-80 only
- GE19455/VR/PLOTS 100-107 and 119-122/DEC21, which presented the validation of soil cover systems associated with Plots 100-107 and 119-122 only
- GE19455/VR/PLOTS 108-112/FEB22, which presented the validation of soil cover systems associated with Plots 108-112 only
- GE19455/VR/PLOTS 113-116 & 139-140/MAR22, which presented the validation of soil cover systems associated with Plots 113-116 and 139-140 only
- GE19455/VR/PLOTS 123-126/APR22, which presented the validation of soil cover systems associated with Plots 123-126 only
- GE19455/VR/PLOTS 117-118 & 136-138/APR22, which presented the validation of soil cover systems



associated with Plots 117-118 & 136-138 only.

This report details and compiles the construction stages independently verified by Geo-Environmental in relation to the installation of a soil cover system in Plots 127-128 completed in April and May 2022.

This report sets out the works undertaken to date to provide independent verification of the risk mitigation measures incorporated into the development to protect the development and end users thereof. This report provides final validation for works undertaken and independent inspection in relation to Plots 127-128 only. Outstanding validation for other plots will be reported under separate cover (or within an updated report) due course.

1.2 Objectives

A desk study and investigation undertaken by a third party and additional ground investigation undertaken by Geo-Environmental identified the presence of potential hazards and, through a risk assessment process, a series of pollutant linkages were identified which required action to mitigate or otherwise reduce the risk. The Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan (RSVP) for the former farmyard area of the site sets out the proposed remedial works to be undertaken within this area of the subject site to support its development for a proposed residential end use.

This Verification Report (VR) presents the details and findings of inspection visits undertaken throughout the construction period by Geo-Environmental and/or to compile data provided by the Client with respect to Plots 127-128 in relation to soils in order to demonstrate that the soil risk mitigation measures were implemented within these specific plots.

1.3 Planning Permission

It is understood that a planning application has been approved for the site by Havant Borough Council under Planning Reference APP/13/00804. The following pre-commencement planning conditions are understood at the time to writing to have been attached to the application which relate to the remediation and validation of land contamination on the site.

11. Prior to the commencement of construction within any specified phase or defined area the development approved by this Planning Permission (as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority), a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That scheme shall include all of the following elements unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

1. *A scheme of further investigation, based on the previously submitted Geo-Environmental & Geotechnical report. The scope of the investigation shall be sufficient to:*
 - *confirm the preliminary assessment of the nature and extent of contamination at the site,*
 - *inform an appropriate assessment of the risks to all receptors that may be affected, including controlled waters, and;*
 - *enable the appropriate design of remediation and/or risk mitigation measures (if required).*
2. *The results of the further investigation and risk assessment (1) and if appropriate, a method statement based on these results giving full details of the remediation and/or risk mitigation measures required, and how they are to be undertaken.*
3. *A verification report or statement (as appropriate) upon completion of the works set out in (2) [if any], confirming that measures undertaken have been implemented in accordance with the method statement, and have achieved the required performance standards. The verification report/ statement shall provide details of any measures necessary for maintenance, further monitoring and reporting.*



All elements shall be adhered to unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent future occupants of proposed residential properties being exposed to unacceptable risks from identified contamination & soil gas associated with automotive repair and landfill activity previously undertaken at the site, and to ensure that the site does not pose an unacceptable risk to the groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; having due regard to policies and proposals E1 of the Hampshire County Structure plan 1996-2011 (Review), and DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy (2011), and DM17 of the Draft Local Plan (Allocations) 2012.

12. Prior to the commencement of construction of any part of the development approved by this Planning Permission, a protocol for the identification & assessment of any unforeseen ground conditions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The provisions of the approved protocol shall be observed throughout the undertaking of all relevant construction activities.

Reason: For the protection of workers and the general public during the development of potentially contaminated land, and to prevent future occupants of proposed residential properties being exposed to unacceptable risks from unidentified &/or unexpected contamination that may be associated with previous activities undertaken at the site; having due regard to policies and proposals E1 of the Hampshire County Structure plan 1996-2011 (Review), and DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy (2011), and DM17 of the Draft Local Plan(Allocations) 2012.

13. If, during development, contamination not previously identified at the site is found to be present, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for an addendum to the Method Statement required under Condition 1, (2). This addendum shall detail how this unexpected contamination shall be dealt with, and the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the protection of workers and the general public during the development of potentially contaminated land, and to prevent future occupants of proposed residential properties being exposed to unacceptable risks from unidentified &/or unexpected contamination that may be associated with previous activities undertaken at the site; having due regard to policies and proposals E1 of the Hampshire County Structure plan 1996-2011 (Review), and DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy (2011), and DM17 of the Draft Local Plan (Allocations) 2012.



2.0 BACKGROUND

This Validation Report has been produced in order to demonstrate that the works required and presented within the Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan (RSVP) for these specific plots located within the former farmyard area have been carried out. The RSVP for the former farmyard area of the site was developed following several phases of investigation and assessment as referenced in Section 1.1 above. Whilst a summary of these reports is presented below, reference should be made to the full reports for further details.

2.1 Proposed Site Use

The proposed wider development is understood to comprise the construction of 288No. residential units, associated car parking, open space and landscaping. The former farmyard area covers c. 30-40No. plots (houses and flats), including associated gardens/areas of soft landscaping.

2.2 Investigation and Assessment

The wider site's previous uses included use as a farm with associated barns and buildings, scrapyard, horse arena and a former chalk pit which was subsequently infilled as an inert landfill. The portion of the site considered specifically herein comprised the former farmyard area, as shown in Figure 2.

The ground conditions encountered within the farmyard comprised Made Ground and/or, in isolated locations, a mantle of Topsoil, overlying sandy clay and clay with occasional bands of sand. Chalk was encountered within two locations, TP215 and TP312. Made Ground was encountered within the majority of investigation locations to depths between 0.25m bgl and 2.20m bgl, and comprised, gravelly clay with brick, concrete, flint cobbles, tarmac and chalk fragments, ash and charcoal; clayey fine to coarse flint and chalk gravel with brick, concrete, tarmac and pieces of tree; sandy clay with plastic, decaying roots, flint gravel and glass. Cement tile and cement sheet fragments were observed to be present sporadically across the farmyard area following demolition and clearance.

The Made Ground and/or Topsoil was underlain by soft to firm clay and sandy clay in the majority of locations with occasional bands of sand overlying the Chalk. The Chalk was only encountered within two locations, TP215 and TP312, within the farmyard area from a depth of between 1.70m bgl and 2.30m bgl.

Previous investigation and testing by third parties identified exceedances of metals and PAH along with the presence of asbestos within the Made Ground in the former farmyard area of the site. The investigation and testing of soils on site undertaken as part of the development of the RSVP identified contaminant concentrations of concern within the Made Ground in relation to Arsenic, Beryllium, Lead, Nickel, PAH and Asbestos. Following further assessment and statistical analysis it was considered that remedial action would be warranted to protect end users of a residential development in this area of the site in relation to the identified PAH and Asbestos (ACMs).

Groundwater was not encountered within any of the investigation locations and was anticipated to be present at depths in excess of 25.00m bgl.

Subsequent to several phases of intrusive investigation and ground gas monitoring, and a surface emissions survey, a Detailed Quantitative Gas Risk Assessment was undertaken by EPG in relation to the infilled chalk pit which was located immediately to the west of the former farmyard. The DQGRA concluded that ground gas protection measures were not required for the proposed residential development.



2.3 Conceptual Site Model

The conceptual site model (CSM) developed as part of the various phases of intrusive investigation and risk assessment undertaken for the site identified particular hazards, or potential hazards which were considered to require intervention (remediation) to mitigate the risk of harm.

2.4 Approach for Remediation, Monitoring and Validation

Remediation works were proposed to break the pathways of identified sources of contamination to receptors. The aim of the remediation was not necessarily to remove all contamination from the site but to provide betterment and to reduce the identified risk to an acceptable level with respect to relevant receptors, e.g. human health, the built environment and controlled waters.



3.0 SOILS

3.1 End Users (Shallow Soils)

With reference to the Soil Contamination Assessment undertaken by Geo-Environmental ref. GE16662-FG02-170929, dated 29th September 2017 for the entire site and the former farmyard area of the site, ref. GE16943/RSVP-FY-V6.0/DEC21, through a process of statistical analyses on the results of chemical analyses on both natural and Made Ground soil samples, it was demonstrated that the Made Ground materials in the farmyard were impacted by PAH and ACMs. Therefore, remedial measures were deemed necessary to protect end users of the proposed properties from soil contamination within private garden and soft landscaped areas within the former farmyard area of the site. ACMs and asbestos fibres have been identified (both visually and within laboratory chemical analysis) to be present within the Made Ground.

In areas remote from those designated for tree root protection it was required that a combination of a reduced dig to accommodate the soil cover system in the finished level, or complete removal of the Made Ground where Made Ground was found to be shallower, and the installation of a clean cover system within private gardens and areas of communal soft landscaping was required within the former farmyard area.

Table 3.1 below presents the minimum reduced dig depths required to accommodate the soil cover system and achieve the development levels for specific plots within the former farmyard area. Plots which required a soil cover system without any reduced dig are omitted from Table 3.1.

Plot Number	Minimum Depth of Reduced Dig (m bgl)
79 -80	0.68 or full extent of Made Ground if Made Ground shallower than reduced dig depth
Former Farmhouse (289)	0.75 or full extent of Made Ground if Made Ground shallower than reduced dig depth
116	0.48 or full extent of Made Ground if Made Ground shallower than reduced dig depth
117 - 118	0.60 or full extent of Made Ground if Made Ground shallower than reduced dig depth
119 - 122	0.44 in areas of proposed soft landscaping
123 - 124	0.52 or full extent of Made Ground if Made Ground shallower than reduced dig depth
125	0.21
126	0.17


Table 3.1 Specific plots in former farmyard area requiring reduced dig

Where the full extent of the Made Ground soils was removed, validation inspections were to be undertaken at the base and sides of the excavation to demonstrate the full extent of the Made Ground had been suitably removed.


Where Made Ground soils were to remain in private garden areas and areas of soft landscaping, a soil cover system was to be installed. The cover system was required to comprise certifiably 'clean' Topsoil and subsoil. Both aspects of the cover system were required to be both chemically and physically suitable for the proposed end use. A minimum soil cover thickness of 600mm was required in proposed gardens and 450mm in areas of soft landscaping. The upper 300mm of a cover system was required to comprise Topsoil. The cover system was also required to incorporate a capillary break layer comprising 150mm depth of stone or crushed concrete, between two layers of geotextile to be installed beneath the subsoil and Topsoil. A high visibility deterrent dig geofabric was to be laid over the upper geotextile to provide a visible deterrent to excavation.

Where the reduced dig removed all of the Made Ground, subject to verification inspection and testing, the cover system was required to comprise subsoil and a minimum 300mm thickness of Topsoil.

An example of the recommended cover system for use in private gardens where Made Ground remain in-situ is provided below:



An example of the recommended cover system for use in areas of communal soft landscaping where Made Ground was to remain in-situ is provided below:





4.0 INSPECTION/VALIDATION (SOILS)

An Engineer from Geo-Environmental visited the site on several separate occasions prior to, during the remedial works being undertaken and on completion of the works reported herein to check on the progress of the development works.

4.1 Validation inspection of installed subsoil

The inspection/validation works to inspect the subsoil layer of the cover systems installed within the rear garden areas and soft landscaping area associated with Plots 127-128 were undertaken by a Geo-Environmental Engineer on 28th April 2022. The site diary records and site photographs are presented in Appendix A.

At the time of the visit a reduced dig had been undertaken, a layer of crushed concrete installed (including membranes) with subsoil installed above, within the rear garden areas of Plots 127-128. It should be noted that Geo-Environmental did not supervise the actual reduced dig works. The groundworkers had installed a number of plastic tubes within the subsoil layer such that it was possible to observe the high visibility geotextile membrane that had been installed above the crushed concrete layer. Inspection was also undertaken at edges/boundaries where these facilitated examination of the membranes, crushed layer and subsoil. It should be noted that no soft landscaping was evident to the front of these plots, nor is it understood to be proposed.

The materials excavated from these garden areas are understood to have been disposed of off-site under the control of Statom Group. Geo-Environmental understand that the groundworkers (Statom) have copies of waste transfer notes however, Geo-Environmental has not been provided with these to date.

It should be noted that Geo-Environmental did not independently oversee the reduced dig on site (which was undertaken by Statom Group) as part of this inspection visit, but visually inspected the areas on completion of these works.

4.2 Validation inspection and sampling of Topsoil (cover system) placement

The inspection/validation works of the cover systems installed within the rear garden areas was undertaken by a Geo-Environmental Engineer on 3rd May 2022. The visual inspection records including site photographs and logs are presented in Appendix B.

Inspection comprised two locations (Plot 127 – A and Plot 128 – B), vertical plastic pipe had been installed by the groundworkers prior to the installation of the Topsoil. This was to confirm the thickness of the soil cover system. The location of all the inspection pits excavated is presented on Figure 4, photographs and site inspection records taken during this inspection visit are presented in Appendix B, which confirm the depth of the installed Topsoil within the cover system installed, along with soil logs of the material encountered. It should be noted that at the point of inspection the turf and the soil likely associated with the turf placement had not been laid within any of the areas of soft landscaping at the time of the inspection.

The inspection confirmed that within the inspection pits, Topsoil was found to be 300mm in thickness within all the inspected areas. It should be noted that the soil cover system comprised both subsoil and Topsoil and both the subsoil and Topsoil utilised within Plots 127-128 comprised site-won soils which had previously been deemed suitable for re-use, as reported in the RSVP for the farmyard area (GE16943/RSVP-FY-V6.0/DEC21).

4.3 Topsoil and subsoil analysis of laboratory test results

Notwithstanding the previous testing of site-won subsoil and Topsoil, two soil samples from Plots 127-128 were



submitted for testing for a suite of commonly occurring brownfield contaminants and asbestos screening.

The collected samples were referenced Plot 127 A at 0.20m bgl and Plot 128 B at 0.10m bgl. The laboratory test results are presented within Appendix C.

The results of the analyses were compared to the Suitable for Use (S4UL) Levels for 'private gardens with home-grown produce' (representative of the proposed development end use), which are summarised in Table 4.1 below:

Determinand	Soil Screening Value (mg/kg)	Sample Max. Conc. (mg/kg)	Below Screening Value?
Arsenic	37	9.0	Yes
Benzo(a)pyrene	2.7	0.2	Yes
Beryllium	1.7	<1.0	Yes
Boron (Water Soluble)	290	0.6	Yes
Cadmium	11	<0.5	Yes
Chromium (Total)	130	21.0	Yes
Copper	2400	14.1	Yes
Hexavalent Chromium	6	<0.8	Yes
Lead	200	24.1	Yes
Mercury (inorganic)	40	<0.5	Yes
Nickel	180	15.8	Yes
Phenols	110	<6	Yes
Selenium	250	<1.0	Yes
Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons	110	2.7	Yes
Vanadium	410	32.2	Yes
Zinc	3700	59.3	Yes

Table 4.1 Summary of chemical analyses (Plots 127-128 Inspection Visit 03/05/2022)

The results indicated that all of the determinands tested were below the limiting concentrations set within the Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan (RSVP).

All samples were submitted for asbestos screening and returned with no asbestos fibres identified.

In addition, the results of the speciated hydrocarbon analyses were all returned as either below the laboratory detection limits or below their respective human health screening values for the proposed end use.



5.0 DISCOVERY STRATEGY

A discovery strategy remains in place throughout the development works on this site. Geo-Environmental has not been made aware of any discoveries having been made to date and thus the strategy, as set out in the RSVP did not require enacting (to the best of our knowledge). However, the strategy remains in place for the remainder of the development works.



6.0 VERIFICATION

In accordance with the Client's instruction, Geo-Environmental undertook routine and independent inspection during key stages of the construction process. The risk mitigation measures in relation to remedial measures for Plots 127-128, have been inspected and were considered to comply with the requirements of the design and Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan at the point of inspection or defects otherwise noted and subsequently rectified and plots re-inspected. Further plots and validation work for the site will be reported via an updated report or under separate cover in due course.

The inspection of the installed soil cover system was undertaken by Geo-Environmental via the inspection of pre-installed plastic pipes in number of selected locations. There was no visual evidence on the site to indicate that the areas remote from these inspection areas were likely to differ significantly from the inspected areas. However, the confirmation of the presence of a geo-textile membrane, the confirmation of depth and composition Topsoil has only been independently verified by Geo-Environmental within these inspection locations. It has been assumed that these inspection locations are representative of the reused site-won soils within the rear garden areas of Plots 127-128.

Geo-Environmental can only verify the installation of a cover system at the locations and depths inspected at the point and time of inspections. Geo-Environmental accepts no liability for areas that have not been directly inspected or works that have subsequently been undertaken on the site following our inspection visit(s) that may in any way alter or affect the validation works inspected and reported herein.

The report relates solely to the validation of the soil cover system remedial measures installed within Plots 127-128. Validation with respect to the soil cover systems to be installed within remaining plots will be presented under separate cover (or an updated report) in due course.

This report remains the property of Geo-Environmental and the Client has no rights to, or reliance upon this document or supporting documents until such time as payment has been received in full for all invoices for works undertaken in connection with this report.



FIGURES







Project:	Woodcroft Farm, Lovedean, PO8 9QA			Title	Site Location Plan	
Client:	Vistry Homes Southern			 Geo-Environmental Geo-Environmental Services Ltd Unit 7 Danworth Farm, Cuckfield Road Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex BN6 9GL +44(0)1273 832972 www.gesl.net		
Ref No:	GE19455	Revision:	0			
Drawn:	FG	Date:	16/06/2021			
Figure:	1	Scale:	Not To Scale			



Project:	Woodcroft Farm, Lovedean, PO8 9QA			Title	Areas Requiring Remediation	
Client:	Vistry Homes Southern			Geo-Environmental Services Ltd Unit 7 Danworth Farm, Cuckfield Road Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex BN6 9GL +44(0)1273 832972 www.gesl.net  Geo-Environmental		
Ref No:	GE19455	Revision:	0			
Drawn:	FG	Date:	16/06/2021			
Figure:	2	Scale:	Not To Scale			





Project: Woodcroft Farm Lovedean PO8 9QA

Client: Vistry Homes Southern

Ref No: GE19455

Revision: 1

Drawn: FG

Date: 06/05/2022

Figure: 4

Scale: Not To Scale

Title Validation Location Plan

Geo-Environmental Services Ltd

Unit 7 Danworth Farm, Cuckfield Road

Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex BN6 9GL

+44(0)1273 832972 www.gesl.net





APPENDIX A

Site Photographs and Site Diary Records



Project No. GE19455

Project Name Woodcroft Farm

Client Vistry

Engineers

 Gavin Roberts gavin.roberts@gesl.net

 Fiona Goode fiona.goode@gesl.net

Location Plot 127/128

Date 28/04/2022

(1 record)

Site Diary

Date & Time	Location	Remarks	Weather	Photograph(s)
28/04/2022, 15:04	50° 54' 13.164" N 1° 1' 58.158" W	Base membrane and subsoil layer laid	Dry	

Time

(0 records)



28th April 2022



Plate 1 – Overview of the subsoil laid across Plots 127-128



Plate 2 – Subsoil laid across Plots 127-128



Plate 3 – Orange geotextile membrane visible beneath installed subsoil



Plate 4 – Orange geotextile beneath subsoil in base of inspection pipe



APPENDIX B


Visual Inspection Records



ID	GE19455		
Project Name	Woodcroft Farm		
Client	Vistry		
Engineers			
 Gavin Roberts	gavin.roberts@gesl.net		
 Fiona Goode	fiona.goode@gesl.net		
Project Manager			
 Fiona Goode	fiona.goode@gesl.net		
Location	Plots 127 & 128		
Date	03/05/2022		
Details of Hole			
(2 records)			
Hole ID	A		
Plot No./Position	127		
Date of Hole	03/05/2022, 13:41		
Hole Type	HP		
Final Depth	0.3		
Ground Conditions			
(1 record)			
<i>Top Depth</i>	<i>Base Depth</i>	<i>General description of stratum</i>	
0	0.3	Brown slightly gravelly silty CLAY with roots and grass. Gravel is flint	
Samples			
(1 record)			
<i>Top Depth</i>	<i>Base Depth</i>	<i>Sample type</i>	<i>Sample reference</i>
0	0.2	ES	1
Pass/Fail	(X) Pass () Fail		
Remarks	Subsoil and lower portion of the cover system were inspected during g a previous visit		
Photo of Spoil			



Photo of hole with tape in place



Photographs

(1 record)

Photograph



Description 127 topsoil

Hole ID B

Plot No./Position 128

Date of Hole 03/05/2022, 13:48

Hole Type HP

Final Depth 0.3

Ground Conditions

(1 record)

Top Depth	Base Depth	General description of stratum
0	0.3	Brown slightly gravelly silty CLAY with roots and grass. Gravel is flint

Samples

(1 record)

Top Depth	Base Depth	Sample type	Sample reference
0.1	0.1	ES	1

Pass/Fail

(X) Pass
() Fail

Remarks

Subsoil and lower portion of cover system inspected previously

Photo of Spoil




Photo of hole with tape in place



Photographs

(1 record)

Photograph



Description

128 Topsoil

Approved By

 Fiona Goode

fiona.goode@gesl.net



APPENDIX C

Geochemical Laboratory Results





Unit A2
Windmill Road
Ponswood Industrial Estate
St Leonards on Sea
East Sussex
TN38 9BY
Telephone: (01424) 718618

cs@elab-uk.co.uk
info@elab-uk.co.uk

THE ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY LTD

Analytical Report Number: 22-40344

Issue: 1

Date of Issue: 10/05/2022

Contact: Gavin Roberts

Customer Details: GESL
Unit 7
Danworth Farm
Hurstpierpoint
West Sussex BN6 9GL

Quotation No: Q22-02720

Order No: PO-5258

Customer Reference: GE19455

Date Received: 05/05/2022

Date Approved: 10/05/2022

Details: Woodcroft Farm

Approved by:

Mike Varley, General Manager

Any comments, opinions or interpretations expressed herein are outside the scope of UKAS accreditation (Accreditation Number 2683)

This report may only be reproduced in full



Sample Summary

Report No.: 22-40344, issue number 1

Elab No.	Client's Ref.	Date Sampled	Date Scheduled	Description	Deviations
277561	127 A 0.00 - 0.20	03/05/2022	05/05/2022	Silty loam	c
277562	128 B 0.10	03/05/2022	05/05/2022	Silty loam	c

Results Summary

Report No.: 22-40344, issue number 1

ELAB Reference	277561	277562
Customer Reference		
Sample ID		
Sample Type	SOIL	SOIL
Sample Location	127 A	128 B
Sample Depth (m)	0.00 - 0.20	0.10
Sampling Date	03/05/2022	03/05/2022

Determinand	Codes	Units	LOD		
Soil sample preparation parameters					
Moisture Content	N	%	0.1	14.3	14.1
Material removed	N	%	0.1	26.5	34.7
Description of Inert material removed	N		0	Stones/Wood	Stones/Wood
Metals					
Arsenic	M	mg/kg	1	8.1	9.0
Beryllium	U	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
Cadmium	M	mg/kg	0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5
Chromium	M	mg/kg	5	19.5	21.0
Copper	M	mg/kg	5	14.1	12.4
Lead	M	mg/kg	5	24.1	24.0
Mercury	M	mg/kg	0.5	< 0.5	< 0.5
Nickel	M	mg/kg	5	15.8	14.0
Selenium	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
Vanadium	M	mg/kg	5	32.2	31.5
Zinc	M	mg/kg	5	59.3	46.6
Anions					
Water Soluble Chloride	M	mg/kg	40	50	43
Water Soluble Sulphate	M	g/l	0.02	0.06	0.03
Inorganics					
Elemental Sulphur	M	mg/kg	20	< 20	< 20
Hexavalent Chromium	N	mg/kg	0.8	< 0.8	< 0.8
Total Sulphide	N	mg/kg	2	< 2	< 2
Total Cyanide	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
Acid Soluble Sulphate (SO ₄)	U	%	0.02	0.04	0.04
Water Soluble Boron	N	mg/kg	0.5	c 0.6	c 0.6
Miscellaneous					
pH	M	pH units	0.1	7.5	7.4
Total Organic Carbon	N	%	0.01	1.1	0.94
Phenols					
Total Phenols	N	mg/kg	6	< 6	< 6

Results Summary

Report No.: 22-40344, issue number 1

ELAB Reference	277561	277562
Customer Reference		
Sample ID		
Sample Type	SOIL	SOIL
Sample Location	127 A	128 B
Sample Depth (m)	0.00 - 0.20	0.10
Sampling Date	03/05/2022	03/05/2022

Determinand	Codes	Units	LOD		
Polyaromatic hydrocarbons					
Naphthalene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Acenaphthylene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Acenaphthene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Fluorene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Phenanthrene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.2
Anthracene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Fluoranthene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.4
Pyrene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.3
Benzo(a)anthracene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.2
Chrysene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.2
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.2
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.2
Benzo(a)pyrene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.2
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	0.1
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Benzo[g,h,i]perylene	M	mg/kg	0.1	< 0.1	< 0.1
Total PAH(16)	M	mg/kg	0.4	< 0.4	2.2
BTEX					
Benzene	M	ug/kg	10	< 10.0	< 10.0
Toluene	M	ug/kg	10	< 10.0	< 10.0
Ethylbenzene	M	ug/kg	10	< 10.0	< 10.0
Xylenes	M	ug/kg	10	< 10.0	< 10.0
MTBE	U	ug/kg	10	< 10.0	< 10.0
TPH CWG					
>C5-C6 Aliphatic (HS_1D_MS)	N	mg/kg	0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
>C6-C8 Aliphatic (HS_1D_MS)	N	mg/kg	0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
>C8-C10 Aliphatic (HS_1D_MS+EH_2D_AL)	N	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C10-C12 Aliphatic (EH_2D_AL)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C12-C16 Aliphatic (EH_2D_AL)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C16-C21 Aliphatic (EH_2D_AL)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C21-C35 Aliphatic (EH_2D_AL)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C35-C40 Aliphatic (EH_2D_AL)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
Total aliphatic hydrocarbons (>C5 - C40) (HS_1D_MS+EH_2D_AL)	N	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C5-C7 Aromatic (HS_1D_MS)	N	mg/kg	0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
>C7-C8 Aromatic (HS_1D_MS)	N	mg/kg	0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01
>C8-C10 Aromatic (HS_1D_MS+EH_2D_AR)	N	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C10-C12 Aromatic (EH_2D_AR)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C12-C16 Aromatic (EH_2D_AR)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C16-C21 Aromatic (EH_2D_AR)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C21-C35 Aromatic (EH_2D_AR)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
>C35-C40 Aromatic (EH_2D_AR)	M	mg/kg	1	< 1.0	< 1.0
Total aromatic hydrocarbons (>C5 - C40) (HS_1D_MS+EH_2D_AR)	N	mg/kg	1	2.0	1.5
Total petroleum hydrocarbons (>C5 - C40) (HS_1D_MS+EH_2D_Total)	N	mg/kg	1	2.7	2.0



2683

Unit A2, Windmill Road, Ponswood Industrial Estate, St Leonards on Sea, East Sussex, TN38 9BY

Tel: +44 (0)1424 718618, Email: info@elab-uk.co.uk, Web: www.elab-uk.co.uk

Results Summary

Report No.: 22-40344, issue number 1

Asbestos Results

Analytical result only applies to the sample as submitted by the client. Any comments, opinions or interpretations (marked #)
in this report are outside UKAS accreditation (Accreditation No2683). They are subjective comments only which

Elab No	Depth (m)	Clients Reference	Description of Sample Matrix #	Asbestos Identification	Gravimetric Analysis Total (%)	Gravimetric Analysis by ACM Type (%)	Free Fibre Analysis (%)	Total Asbestos (%)
277561	0.00 - 0.20	127 A	Brown soil, stones	No asbestos detected	n/t	n/t	n/t	n/t
277562	0.10	128 B	Brown soil, stones	No asbestos detected	n/t	n/t	n/t	n/t

Method Summary

Report No.: 22-40344, issue number 1

Parameter	Codes	Analysis Undertaken On	Date Tested	Method Number	Technique
Soil					
Sulphide	N	As submitted sample	06/05/2022	109	Colorimetry
Hexavalent chromium	N	As submitted sample	06/05/2022	110	Colorimetry
pH	M	Air dried sample	10/05/2022	113	Electromeric
Acid Soluble Sulphate	U	Air dried sample	10/05/2022	115	Ion Chromatography
Aqua regia extractable metals	M	Air dried sample	09/05/2022	118	ICPMS
Phenols in solids	N	As submitted sample	06/05/2022	121	HPLC
Elemental Sulphur	M	Air dried sample	09/05/2022	122	HPLC
PAH (GC-FID)	M	As submitted sample	06/05/2022	133	GC-FID
Water soluble anions	M	Air dried sample	09/05/2022	172	Ion Chromatography
Low range Aliphatic hydrocarbons soil	N	As submitted sample	09/05/2022	181	GC-MS
Low range Aromatic hydrocarbons soil	N	As submitted sample	09/05/2022	181	GC-MS
BTEX in solids	M	As submitted sample	09/05/2022	181A	GC-MS
Water soluble boron	N	Air dried sample	09/05/2022	202	Colorimetry
Total cyanide	M	As submitted sample	06/05/2022	204	Colorimetry
Total organic carbon/Total sulphur	N	Air dried sample	09/05/2022	210	IR
TPH CWG soil by gc-gc	M	As submitted sample	06/05/2022	271	
Asbestos identification	U	Air dried sample	09/05/2022	280	Microscopy

Tests marked N are not UKAS accredited

Report Information

Report No.: 22-40344, issue number 1

Key

U	hold UKAS accreditation
M	hold MCERTS and UKAS accreditation
N	do not currently hold UKAS accreditation
^	MCERTS accreditation not applicable for sample matrix
*	UKAS accreditation not applicable for sample matrix
S	Subcontracted to approved laboratory UKAS Accredited for the test
SM	Subcontracted to approved laboratory MCERTS/UKAS Accredited for the test
NS	Subcontracted to approved laboratory. UKAS accreditation is not applicable.
I/S	Insufficient Sample
U/S	Unsuitable sample
n/t	Not tested
<	means "less than"
>	means "greater than"
LOD	LOD refers to limit of detection, except in the case of pH soils and pH waters where it means limit of discrimination. Soil sample results are expressed on an air dried basis (dried at < 30°C), and are uncorrected for inert material removed. ELAB are unable to provide an interpretation or opinion on the content of this report. The results relate only to the sample received. PCB congener results may include any coeluting PCBs Uncertainty of measurement for the determinands tested are available upon request Unless otherwise stated, sample information has been provided by the client. This may affect the validity of the results.

Deviation Codes

a	No date of sampling supplied
b	No time of sampling supplied (Waters Only)
c	Sample not received in appropriate containers
d	Sample not received in cooled condition
e	The container has been incorrectly filled
f	Sample age exceeds stability time (sampling to receipt)
g	Sample age exceeds stability time (sampling to analysis)

Where a sample has a deviation code, the applicable test result may be invalid.

Sample Retention and Disposal

All soil samples will be retained for a period of one month
 All water samples will be retained for 7 days following the date of the test report
 Charges may apply to extended sample storage

TPH Classification - HWOL Acronym System

HS	Headspace analysis
EH	Extractable Hydrocarbons - i.e. everything extracted by the solvent
CU	Clean-up - e.g. by florisil, silica gel
1D	GC - Single coil gas chromatography
Total	Aliphatics & Aromatics
AL	Aliphatics only
AR	Aromatics only
2D	GC-GC - Double coil gas chromatography
#1	EH_Total but with humics mathematically subtracted
#2	EH_Total but with fatty acids mathematically subtracted
_	Operator - underscore to separate acronyms (exception for +)
+	Operator to indicate cumulative e.g. EH+HS_Total or EH_CU+HS_Total
MS	Mass Spectrometry