



Blue Signal Ltd
(Water and Environment)

Blue Signal Ltd (Water and Environment)
17 Upper Rose Hill
Dorking
Surrey
RH4 2EB

Phone 01306 501327
email: bluesignal987@gmail.com

Holborn Barn, Therfield, Hertfordshire

Phase II Site Investigation

March 2026

Document Control

Client	KpH
Document Name	Phase II Site Investigation
Date submitted	March 2026
Issue	Rev A
Author	M Casey
Reviewer	R Thornton
Signed on behalf of Blue Signal Ltd	

Use of this report

This report has been produced by Blue Signal Ltd (BSL) under contract to the Client. BSL have exercised reasonable skill, care and diligence in its production. No warranties are implied. Parties other than the Client use this report at their own risk. Copyright shall remain vested in BSL however the Client has a licence to copy and use this document for his own purposes related to the task. Unless otherwise stated this report is considered confidential and for distribution to the Client only. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by BSL, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the services. The results of any measurements taken may vary spatially or with time and further confirmatory measurements should be made after any significant delay in using this Report.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 INTRODUCTION	4
1.2 BACKGROUND	4
1.3 SCOPE OF WORKS	4
2 SITE WORK	6
2.1 INTRODUCTION	6
2.2 SITE INVESTIGATION STRATEGY	6
2.3 TRIAL PIT EXCAVATION, LOGGING AND SAMPLING	6
2.4 LABORATORY TESTING	6
2.5 CONCEPTUAL SITE MODEL	7
3 SITE INVESTIGATION RESULTS.....	8
3.1 GEOLOGY	8
3.2 HYDROGEOLOGY	8
3.3 GENERAL FIELD OBSERVATIONS	8
3.4 LABORATORY TEST RESULTS	8
3.5 SOIL ANALYSIS RESULTS	9
3.6 SOIL ANALYSIS ASSESSMENT	12
4 RISK ASSESSMENT.....	13
4.1 INTRODUCTION	13
4.2 PLAUSIBLE SOURCE-PATHWAY-TARGET SCENARIOS	13
4.3 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	13

FIGURES

Figure 1	Site Location
Figure 2	Trial Pit Locations

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Trial Pit Logs
Appendix B	Soil Analytical Test Results
Appendix B	Site Photographs

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

KPH Environmental Services Ltd (KpH) was appointed by Will Gamble Architects, Barnes High St, London to carry out a Phase II site investigation of their client's site, Holborn Barn, Dane End, Therfield, Hertfordshire, SG8 9RH (the Site) prior to a proposed redevelopment. The Site is currently occupied by a barn, two stables, and a lean-to, historically used for agriculture and storage. All the current structures are disused. The Site also includes open areas predominantly surfaced with concrete.

1.2 Background

The Site has obtained Planning Permission from North Hertfordshire District Council (ref. 25/01539/FP) for '...Extension and conversion of the existing barn into a four-bedroom dwelling with associated landscaping, following demolition of non-original stable extension, car port and lean to structure..'

A Phase I Desk Study was undertaken by Arbtech Consulting Ltd in December 2025¹ (Ref.1). The objectives of the Arbtech preliminary geoenvironmental site assessment were to develop a Preliminary Risk Assessment with a site reconnaissance to ascertain if there is a possible contamination risk. If potential pollution is identified, then site investigation works are recommended to confirm the presence of contamination and to establish a viable pollutant linkage to assess the associated risks to human health.

The report concluded that the site history could potentially have resulted in ground contamination. The report recommendations were therefore as follows:

'A targeted intrusive investigation should be undertaken in areas of clearance, minor demolition, and proposed landscaping. Soil testing should focus on hydrocarbons, metals, PAHs, minor asbestos (possible), and residual debris. Excavated soils should be classified to inform safe reuse, off-site disposal, or specialist handling. Imported soils for landscaping must be verified as clean and suitable for residential use in accordance with BS 10175. Standard construction-phase mitigation, including PPE, dust control, and controlled handling of materials, should be maintained throughout the works'.

This report provides the findings of a Phase II Site Investigation based on the findings of the Phase I report.

1.3 Scope of Works

The proposed scope of works for the site investigation comprised the following:

- 7 No trial pits to a maximum depth of 2mbgl or until the underlying natural stratum is reached (whichever comes first);
- Collection of soil samples; and

¹ Preliminary Risk Assessment: Desk Study, Holborn Barn, Dane End, Therfield, Hertfordshire, SG8 9RH, 15 December 2025

- Backfilling of all trial pit locations with arisings.

The work was carried out in accordance with BS 10175:2011, Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice² and BS 5930:2015, Code of Practice for Ground Investigations³.

² British Standards Institution (2013). *BS 10175:2011+A1:2013 – Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice*. London: BSI.

³ British Standards Institution (2020). *BS 5930:2015+A1:2020 – Code of Practice for Ground Investigations*. London: BSI.

2 Site Work

2.1 Introduction

The site investigation was undertaken on Wednesday 11th February 2026. Trial pits logs are provided in Appendix A and selected photos from the site work are provided in Appendix C. The investigation locations are shown in Figure 2.

During the site work the weather was overcast. The trial pits were located across the Site to include areas proposed for external areas; trial pits were not excavated beneath the existing buildings on Site to maintain the integrity of floor slabs.

2.2 Site Investigation Strategy

The principal objective of the of site work was to provide a better understanding of shallow ground conditions at the Site. Trial pits were chosen as the preferred investigation technique as a good visual assessment of ground conditions can be made and soil samples can easily be obtained from various depths.

As an infilled pond was identified in the Phase I Desk Study as being present in the northeast corner of the Site, an investigation location is located there (TP1). The remaining investigation locations are then well spread across the Site.

2.3 Trial Pit Excavation, Logging and Sampling

The trial pit excavations were undertaken by KpH using a tracked excavator, under the supervision of a qualified and experienced contaminated land specialist from Blue Signal Ltd who also logged the arisings in accordance with BS5930. Soil samples were taken at shallow and deeper depths within each trial pit.

On completion of trial pitting, the excavations were backfilled in the order material was excavated and compacted as far as practically possible. There was no excess material from the trial pits and therefore no soil disposal was required as part of the works.

2.4 Laboratory Testing

A total of 13 soil samples were taken during the Site works. All samples were sent under a chain of custody system to Chemtech Environmental, Unit 6 Park Head, Stanley, DH9 7YB, a UKAS and MCERTS accredited laboratory for the required analysis. Scheduling of samples for testing was undertaken by Blue Signal Ltd, based on the findings of the excavations, with one soil sample tested from each trial pit location.

The test suites included a general suite including a broad range of organic and inorganic determinands including Heavy Metals, Total Monohydric Phenols, Moisture Content, Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons, BTEX (Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Xylene), TPH (Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons), SVOC (Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds) and Asbestos.

2.5 Conceptual Site Model

In accordance with current published guidelines⁴ and best practise, a conceptual site model (CSM) has been developed for the Site. This model identifies potential sources of contamination and assesses potential unacceptable risk to identified receptors through the concept of source-pathway-receptor linkage. The analytical results obtained through the site investigation process are assessed in relation to the developed CSM for the Site to identify areas of potential unacceptable risk to Human Health or the Environment.

Prior to the consideration of potential risks posed by contamination at the Site, potential receptors need to be identified. The three elements of the CSM have been assessed on the basis of the desk-based study and will be refined following the assessment of the site investigation data. The CSM is tabulated below:

Source	Pathway	Receptors
Localised made ground associated with historic farm buildings, residual materials beneath hardstanding, and the possible presence of asbestos containing materials within the existing building fabric. Waste processing on the Site and skip storage. Potential hydrocarbons from vehicle parking.	Direct contact with soils, inhalation of dust during groundworks Minor downward and lateral migration of contaminants via leaching through soils. On-site inhalation of vapours from soil outdoors.	Construction workers and future residents Controlled waters. Ecological receptors limited to local agricultural land.

The investigation locations were selected to be located in the northeast corner (to target the infilled pond) and then evenly across the Site.

Given the inferred depth of groundwater (from the Phase I Desk Study), the risk to this receptor is considered to be very low.

⁴ Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, Contaminated Land Report 11, Environment Agency and DEFRA, 2004

3 Site Investigation Results

3.1 Geology

The ground conditions encountered across the Site are detailed in the trial pit logs provided in Appendix A. General ground conditions encountered during the site investigation are summarised below:

Surface cover: Concrete or topsoil with cobb of rubble.

Made Ground: Type 1 and gravelly clays to depths of between 0.3 to 0.6m below ground level (bgl).

Natural Ground: Calcareous Clay.

The geology noted in the Phase I Desk Study, from published sources states Superficial geology comprises Head-Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel – to the southwest boundary. Noted as mixed high to very low permeability. Lowestoft Formation-Diamicton – to the majority of the upper northeast of the site. Noted as mixed moderate to low permeability. No landslip recorded within 500m.

Bedrock geology is recorded as Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation-Chalk. Noted as fractured with very high permeability.

The findings from the Site work concur with this information

3.2 Hydrogeology

Groundwater was not encountered in any of the excavations.

3.3 General Field Observations

The trial pits remained stable during the excavation work and sufficient quantities of material were excavated from each trial pit to facilitate logging and sampling.

The observations from the boreholes indicated that the Site is underlain by shallow Made Ground comprising Type 1 (gravel) and gravelly clay. A number of trial pits did not exhibit the presence of Made Ground, with the natural Clayey gravel present directly beneath the concrete/topsoil surfacing.

There were no odours or staining noted in the arisings from the trial pits. No asbestos was visibly identified across the Site.

3.4 Laboratory Test Results

Assessment Criteria

UK Government policy and guidance on the identification, assessment and remediation of contaminated land advocates the use of risk assessment to assess the potential significance of source-pathway-target linkages, which may present an unacceptable level of risk. This ensures that remedial actions (if any) are directed towards such “potentially significant pollutant linkages” so that risks are reduced to acceptable levels.

Guideline values are generally used in the assessment of potentially contaminated sites in the UK with regards to human health. The Contaminated Land Report 11 (CLR)⁵ is the overarching document within a series of reports which have been produced by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) to provide regulators, developers, landowners and other interested parties with relevant, authoritative, appropriate and scientifically-based information on the assessment of risks arising from the contamination from soils. This series of reports replaces the previous guidelines such as those provided by the Inter-Departmental Committee for the Redevelopment of Contaminated Land (ICRCL), and the oft referenced Dutch Intervention Values (DIV) for soils.

The CLR guidelines present a series of Soil Guideline Values (SGVs) to be used in the assessment of chronic risks to human health arising from land contamination in accordance with paragraph B47 of the statutory guidance⁶. The SGVs are also useful in the context of planning applications, where, again, they are not binding standards, but may be used to ensure that a new use of land does not pose any unacceptable risk to the health of intended users. More recently, Category 4 Screening Levels (C4SLs) have been developed for a limited number of contaminants, and are intended as generic screening values to help show when land is within Category 4 i.e. land where there is “no risk or where the level of risk posed is low”. C4SLs have only been developed for six key contaminants to date including Benzo(a)pyrene, Cadmium, Arsenic, Benzene, Hexavalent chromium and Lead.

In addition, the use of generic assessment criteria (GAC) is an integral part of the risk assessment process for land affected by contamination. Forty-seven risk assessors from twenty-six member companies of EIC (Environmental Industries Commission) and AGS (The Association of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Specialists) have been working in collaboration with CL:AIRE (Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments) to produce a set of industry agreed soil GACs to aid the assessment of risks to human health from 35 substances. These GACs complement the Environment Agency SGV and 2nd edition LQM/CIEH GAC, which together, result in CLEA compliant GACs for a significant number of substances detected in UK soils. The relevant guidance is by the LQM/CIEH entitled ‘Suitable for Use Levels’ (S4ULs)⁷ that follow on from the previous LQM/CIEH Generic Assessment Criteria. The assessment criteria have been updated recently in line with developments in UK human health risk assessment, in particular the additional landuse and exposure assumptions presented in DEFRA’s C4SL guidance. The S4ULs are all based on health criteria that represent minimal or tolerable levels of risk to health as described in the Environment Agency’s SR2 guidance. The S4ULs have been used in this assessment as they include for the full aromatic/aliphatic split of TPH.

The end use chosen for the most appropriate screening levels is Residential with Plant Uptake with a Soil Organic Matter (SOM) of 2.5%.

3.5 Soil Analysis Results

A summary of the soil analysis results is provided in the following table:

⁵ Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, Contaminated Land Report 11, Environment Agency and DEFRA, 2004

⁶ Environmental Protection Act 1990, Part 2A, Contaminated Land, Sept 2006

⁷ The LQM/CIEH S4ULs for Human Health Risk Assessment, 2015

Determinand	Soil Screening Value (mg/kg)	Derivation Tool	Range of Concentrations identified	Number of exceedances
Inorganic Compounds				
Arsenic	37	C4SL	9.1 – 52.2 mg/kg	1 (TP5)
Barium	1,300	SGV	26.8 – 537.0 mg/kg	0
Cadmium	2.3	C4SL	<1.1 – 1.8 mg/kg	0
Chromium (total)	130,000	LQM/CIEH S4UL	14.5 – 38.4 mg/kg	0
Copper	3,700	LQM/CIEH S4UL	13.9 – 102.0 mg/kg	0
Lead	200	C4SL	3.0 – 135.0 mg/kg	0
Mercury	180	LQM/CIEH S4UL	<0.6 mg/kg	0
Selenium	350	LQM/CIEH S4UL	<3.0 mg/kg	0
Nickel	230	LQM/CIEH S4UL	13.4 – 63.0 mg/kg	0
Vanadium	410	SGV	28.0 – 71.0 mg/kg	0
Zinc	10,000	LQM/CIEH S4UL	24.7 – 233.0 mg/kg	0
Phenols				
Phenol	420	LQM/CLEA GAC	<0.5 mg/kg	0
PAH				
Naphthalene	130	LQM/CIEH S4UL 2.5%SOM	<0.016 – 0.121 mg/kg	0
Acenaphthylene	190	LQM/CIEH S4UL 2.5%SOM	<0.015 – 0.032 mg/kg	0
Acenaphthene	190	LQM/CIEH S4UL 2.5%SOM	<0.013 – 0.123 mg/kg	0
Fluorene	240	LQM/CIEH S4UL 2.5%SOM	<0.013 – 0.111 mg/kg	0
Phenanthrene	240	LQM/CIEH S4UL 2.5%SOM	<0.014 – 1.4 mg/kg	0
Anthracene	240	LQM/CIEH S4UL 2.5%SOM	<0.017 – 0.115 mg/kg	0
Fluoranthene	240	LQM/CIEH S4UL 2.5%SOM	0.061 – 2.14 mg/kg	0
Pyrene	240	LQM/CIEH S4UL 2.5%SOM	0.090 – 1.590 mg/kg	0

Benzo(a)anthracene	20	LQM/CIEH 2.5%SOM	S4UL	0.065 – 0.672 mg/kg	0
Chrysene	200	LQM/CIEH 2.5%SOM	S4UL	0.057 – 0.886 mg/kg	0
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	20	LQM/CIEH 2.5%SOM	S4UL	0.093 – 1.2 mg/kg	0
Benzo(a)pyrene	1.5	C4SL		0.074 – 0.831 mg/kg	0
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	20	LQM/CIEH 2.5%SOM	S4UL	0.058 – 0.812 mg/kg	0
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	2	LQM/CIEH 2.5%SOM	S4UL	<0.017 – 0.160 mg/kg	0
Benzo(ghi)perylene	-	LQM/CIEH 2.5%SOM	S4UL	0.037 – 0.559 mg/kg	0
Monoaromatics					
Benzene	0.33	CLEA-based LQM GACs	/	<0.001 mg/kg	0
Toluene	130	CLEA-based LQM GACs	/	<0.001 mg/kg	0
Ethylbenzene	100	CLEA-based LQM GACs	/	<0.001 mg/kg	0
Xylenes	160	CLEA-based LQM GACs	/	<0.002 mg/kg	0
MTBE	70 - 100	GACs		<0.002 mg/kg	0
TPH-CWG					
Aliphatic >EC5 - EC6	70	LQM/CLEA- derived GACs		<0.1 mg/kg	0
Aliphatic >EC6 – EC8	90	LQM/CLEA- derived GACs		<0.1 mg/kg	0
Aliphatic >EC8 – EC10	130	LQM/CLEA- derived GACs		<0.1 mg/kg	0
Aliphatic >EC10 - EC12	370	LQM/CLEA- derived GACs		<1 mg/kg	0
Aliphatic >EC12 - EC16	1,600	LQM/CLEA- derived GACs		<0.5 mg/kg	0
Aliphatic >EC16 – EC21	4,000	LQM/CLEA- derived GACs		<0.7 mg/kg	0

Aliphatic >EC21 - EC35	10,000	LQM/CLEA-derived GACs	<0.4 – 17.9 mg/kg	0
Aliphatic (EC35 – EC40)	20,000	LQM/CLEA-derived GACs	<0.5 mg/kg	
Aromatic >EC5 - EC7	70	TPHCWG + CLEA model	<0.01 mg/kg	0
Aromatic >EC7 - EC8	90	TPHCWG + CLEA model	<0.01mg/kg	0
Aromatic >EC8 - EC10	130	TPHCWG + CLEA model	<0.01 mg/kg	0
Aromatic >EC10 - EC12	370	TPHCWG + CLEA model	<0.6 – 1.8 mg/kg	0
Aromatic >EC12 - EC16	1,600	TPHCWG + CLEA model	<1 – 5.1 mg/kg	0
Aromatic >EC16 - EC21	4,000	TPHCWG + CLEA model	<2 – 4.7 mg/kg	0
Aromatic >EC21 - EC35	10,000	TPHCWG + CLEA model	<4.5 – 12.8 mg/kg	0
Aromatic (EC35 – EC40)	20,000	TPHCWG + CLEA model	<1.5 – 1.9 mg/kg	0

3.6 Soil Analysis Assessment

The soil samples were analysed for a wide range of potential contaminants. Apart from an isolated exceedance of Arsenic in TP5 at 0.15 – 0.45m bgl, all of the determinands tested for, both organic and inorganic, were either below detection or at concentrations well below the appropriate screening level.

The Arsenic detected in TP5 at shallow depth coincides with the ash layer that was visually identified in the trial pit. Ash-derived materials are a commonly recognised source of elevated arsenic concentrations and are frequently encountered within historical made ground.

Asbestos

Asbestos was not identified in any of the soil samples tested.

Summary of Findings

The absence of significant organic or inorganic contamination at the Site indicates that the Site has not been impacted from either the fill used to raise levels at the Site or has been impacted from contamination entering the soil as a result of the activities undertaken at the Site.

4 Risk Assessment

4.1 Introduction

Risk assessment associated with contaminated land can relate both to the issue of environmental liability (of which risks to groundwater and surface water are usually the key issues) and also to site redevelopment (i.e. making the site suitable for the proposed use). It generally involves the identification and characterisation of the hazard source (which has the potential to cause harm), the exposure pathway(s) for the hazard and the effect of the exposure on a receptor (the so-called hazard-pathway-target model).

This generic risk assessment considers the sources, pathways and receptor identified in the conceptual site model.

4.2 Plausible Source-Pathway-Target Scenarios

The site appraisal needs to address key concerns:

- does the contamination at the Site present a threat to future construction workers and site users?
- Does the contamination at the Site present a threat to humans or controlled waters?

For human health to be adversely affected there needs to be a plausible source-pathway-receptor linkage that could lead to unacceptable exposure levels. With the identification of one elevated Arsenic soil sample, associated with ash in the made ground, this indicates the presence of a 'source'. However, the elevated concentration is considered to be spatially limited and not representative of site-wide conditions, as other samples across the site did not record comparable concentrations. The distribution of Arsenic is interpreted to be localised and associated with discrete ash inclusions rather than widespread contamination. In the context of a residential end use, the potential for exposure is considered to be limited.

On this basis, a complete pollutant linkage is not considered to be present, and the identified exceedance does not represent a significant risk to human health. No further assessment or remediation (or subsequent validation) is considered necessary, although standard good practice measures during development are recommended.

4.3 Conclusions and Recommendations

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are as follows:

- The site history indicates that the site has been in farm use in the past and has remained in the same use for many years.
- The site investigation included a total of seven trial pits to a maximum depth of 1.0m that identified both made ground and natural ground.
- The site investigation did not identify any olfactory evidence of widespread or significant contamination.

- Laboratory testing identified only one shallow soil sample with an elevated Arsenic concentration considered to be related to the ash observed in the shallow made ground. In the location where the elevated Arsenic was identified, TP5, there was a shallow band of ash identified (noted to be a thickness of 3cm) at 15cm below the ground surface. The ash is considered likely to be the result of a localised area of combustion such as a small fire and is not considered to represent widespread Site contamination. Whilst the recorded concentration marginally exceeds generic assessment criteria (52.2 mg/kg compared to the guideline of 37.0 mg/kg), these values are conservative screening tools and are not intended to be applied to isolated, localised occurrences of contamination. The observed exceedance is therefore not considered to be indicative of unacceptable risk. No other contaminants were found to be elevated across the Site.
- The location of the ash is on an area of proposed grass in the very northeast corner of the main barn on the Site. Given this location, it is considered very unlikely that home grown produce would be planted here. The shallow depth also indicates that the material will be removed as part of the groundworks to prepare for the redevelopment.
- The findings from the site investigation and laboratory testing indicate that the Site is currently considered to be a clean Site and is suitable for residential use without the need for remediation, or subsequent validation (with some recommendations as provided below).

Based on these conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

- During the redevelopment works, ground excavations in the location of TP5, vigilance should be maintained and works undertaken slowly and the area damped down to avoid air-borne ash occurring. Disposal of the ash material should be undertaken by a registered waste contractor with the soil sample test results provided to the waste disposal site in advance of the waste being transported to ensure the correct disposal route. As an alternative, the localised ash material could be reused beneath hardstanding areas, subject to suitable materials management procedures.
- During the redevelopment works, if any unexpected contamination is identified, work must be stopped and a suitably qualified contaminated land specialist must be called to the Site to advise further.

FIGURES

FIGURE 1 – SITE LOCATION

FIGURE 2 – TRIAL PIT LOCATIONS





APPENDIX A

TRIAL PIT LOGS

TP	Depth, m	Description	Samples	Notes
1	0 - 0.1	MG: Concrete slab	S1 0-0.5m	
	0.1 - 0.3	MG: Type 1		
	0.3 - 0.5	MG: Gravelly CLAY	S2 0.5 - 1m	
	0.5 - 1m	Calcareous CLAY (NG)		
2	0 - 0.1	MG: Concrete slab	S1 0.25-0.5m	
	0.1 - 0.25	MG: Type 1	S2 0.5 - 1m	
	0.25 - 0.6	MG: Gravelly CLAY		
	0.6 - 1m	Calcareous CLAY (NG)		
3	0 - 0.3	MG: Topsoil	S1 0-0.3m	
	0.6 - 1m	Calcareous CLAY (NG)	S2 0.3 - 0.8m	
4	0 - 0.1	MG: Concrete slab	S1 0.1-0.5m	TP is adjacent to the barn. Cable in metal casing runs W-E at 0.5m
	0.1 - 0.5	MG: Type 1	S2 0.5 - 1m	
	0.6 - 1m	Calcareous CLAY (NG)		
5	0 - 0.1	MG: Concrete slab	S1 0.15-0.45m	Metal rods below concrete
	0.1 - 0.15	MG: Type 1	S2 0.45 - 0.9m	
	0.15 - 0.18	MG: Ash		
	0.18 - 0.45	MG: Gravelly CLAY		
	0.6 - 1m	Calcareous CLAY (NG)		
6	0 - 0.5	MG: Topsoil and cobb of rubble	S1 0-0.5m	Stopped by neighbour
	0.5 - 0.6	Calcareous CLAY (NG)		
7	0 - 0.1	MG: Concrete slab	S1 0.-0.3m	TP is adjacent to the barn. Pocket of coarse rubble on E side.
	0.1 - 0.3	MG: Type 1		
	0.3 - 0.6	MG: Gravelly CLAY(NG)	S2 0.3 - 0.8m	
8	Access only through neighbour property. No access due to possible tanks and water mains.			

Key: MG Made Ground, NG Natural Ground

APPENDIX B

SOIL ANALYTICAL TEST RESULTS

APPENDIX C

SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



Photo 1: TP1 Spoil



Photo 2: TP2 Spoil



Photo 3: TP3 Spoil



Photo 4: TP4 excavation



Photo 5: TP4 Spoil



Photo 6: TP5 Excavation



Photo 7: TP5 Spoil



Photo 8: TP7 excavation



Photo 9: TP7 Spoil