

Mr Simon Sivyer H. Sivyer Transport Ltd 160 Sydenham Road London SE26 5JZ

> 12th October 2018 Our Ref: TOHA/18/7783/SS Your Ref: 167852

Dear Sirs

Topsoil Analysis: Trugrow Topsoil

We have completed the analysis of the soil sample recently submitted, referenced *Trugrow Topsoil*, and have pleasure reporting our findings.

The purpose of the analysis was to determine the suitability of the sample for general landscape purposes. In addition, this sample has been assessed to determine its compliance with the requirements of the British Standard for Topsoil (*BS3882:2015 – Specification for Topsoil – Table 1, Multipurpose Topsoil*).

This report presents the results of analysis for the sample submitted to our office, and it should be considered 'indicative' of the topsoil source. The report and results should therefore not be used by third parties as a means of verification or validation testing or waste designation purposes, especially after the topsoil has left the H Sivyer Transport Ltd site.

SAMPLE EXAMINATION

The sample was described as a dark yellowish brown (Munsell Colour 10YR 3/4), slightly moist, friable, noncalcareous, very fine LOAMY SAND with a weakly developed, very fine to fine granular structure*. The sample was slightly stony, with stones up to 20mm, and contained occasional organic fines and occasional woody fragments. No unusual odours, deleterious materials, roots or rhizomes of pernicious weeds were observed.

* This appraisal of soil structure was made from examination of a disturbed sample(s). Structure is a key soil characteristic that may only be accurately assessed by examination in an in-situ state.

Tim O'Hare Associates LLP Howbery Park Wallingford Oxfordshire OX10 8BA T:01491 822653 E:info@toha.co.uk www.toha.co.uk



Plate 1: Trugrow topsoil sample

ANALYTICAL SCHEDULE

The sample was submitted to a UKAS and MCERTS accredited laboratory for a range of physical and chemical tests to confirm the composition and fertility of the soil, and the concentration of selected potential contaminants. The following parameters were determined:

- detailed particle size analysis (% 5 sands, silt, clay);
- pH and electrical conductivity values;
- exchangeable sodium percentage;
- major plant nutrients (N, P, K, Mg);
- organic matter content;
- C:N ratio;
- heavy metals (As, B, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Hg, Ni, Se, Zn);
- total cyanide and total (mono) phenols;
- speciated PAHs (US EPA16 suite);
- aromatic and aliphatic TPH (C5-C35 banding);
- benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene (BTEX).

The results are presented on the attached Certificate of Analysis and an interpretation of the results is given below.

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Particle Size Analysis and Stone Content

The sample fell into the *loamy sand* texture class. However, further detailed particle size analysis revealed the sample to have a very high proportion of particles in the *very fine sand* (0.05-0.15mm) fraction. Topsoils such as this are prone to self-compaction when initially placed in a landscape environment, which can lead to limited drainage and poor aeration, particularly if the soil does not display a well defined structure. To reduce the risk of self-compaction, we recommend placing this soil to a maximum depth of 300mm, which is in line with *BS3882:2015*, section A.3.

The stone content of the sample was low and, as such, stones should not restrict the use of the soil for general landscape purposes.

pH and Electrical Conductivity Values

The sample was alkaline in reaction (pH 7.7). This pH value would be considered suitable for general landscape purposes providing species with a wide pH tolerance or those known to prefer alkaline soils are selected for planting, turfing and seeding.

The electrical conductivity (salinity) value (water extract) was moderate, which indicates that soluble salts should not be present at levels that would be harmful to plants.

The electrical conductivity value by CaSO₄ extract (*BS3882* requirement) fell below the maximum specified value (3300 μ S/cm) given in *BS3882:2015 – Table 1*.

Organic Matter and Fertility Status

The sample was well supplied with organic matter and most major plant nutrients.

The sample contained an elevated level of extractable potassium (1633 mg/l) that exceeded the maximum permissible value given in *BS3882:2015 – Table 1* (1500 mg/l).

The C:N ratio of the sample was acceptable for general landscape purposes.

Potential Contaminants

With reference to *BS3882:2015* - *Table 1*: Notes 3 and 4, there is a recommendation to confirm levels of potential contaminants in relation to the topsoil's proposed end use. This includes human health, environmental protection and metals considered toxic to plants. In the absence of site-specific assessment criteria, the concentrations that affect human health have been compared with the *residential with homegrown produce* land use in the Suitable For Use Levels (S4ULs) presented in *The LQM/CIEH S4ULs for Human Health Risk Assessment* (2015) and the DEFRA SP1010: *Development of Category 4 Screening Levels* (C4SLs) *for Assessment of Land Affected by Contamination – Policy Companion Document* (2014).

Of the potential contaminants determined, none was found at levels that exceed their guideline values.

Phytotoxic Contaminants

Of the phytotoxic (toxic to plants) contaminants determined (copper, nickel, zinc), none was found at levels that exceeded the maximum permissible levels specified in BS3882:2015 – Table 1.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the analysis was to determine the suitability of the topsoil sample for general landscape purposes. The analysis has also been undertaken to determine the sample's compliance with the requirements of the British Standard for Topsoil (*BS3882:2015 – Specification for Topsoil – Table 1, Multipurpose Topsoil*).

From the soil examination and subsequent laboratory analysis, the sample was described as an alkaline, non-saline, non-calcareous, very fine loamy sand with a weak structure and low stone content. The sample was well supplied with organic matter and all major plant nutrients. Of the potential contaminants determined, none exceeded their guideline values.

Based on our findings, the topsoil represented by this sample would be considered suitable for general landscape purposes, provided species with a wide pH tolerance or those known to prefer alkaline soils are selected.

The sample was largely compliant with the requirements of the British Standard for Topsoil (BS3882:2015 – Specification for Topsoil – Table 1, Multipurpose Topsoil), except for the elevated extractable potassium level.

On this occasion, this non-compliance is considered minor when reviewed in the context of all the other results and considering the proposed end-use of this soil.

Recommendations

Soil Handling Recommendations

It is important to maintain the physical condition of the soil and avoid structural damage during all phases of soil handling (e.g. stockpiling, respreading, cultivating, planting, seeding or turfing). As a consequence, soil handling operations should be carried out when soil is reasonably dry and non-plastic (friable) in consistency.

It is important to ensure that the soil is not unnecessarily compacted by trampling or trafficking by site machinery, and soil handling should be stopped during and after heavy rainfall and not continued until the soil is friable in consistency. If the soil is structurally damaged and compacted at any stage during the course of soiling or landscaping works, it should be cultivated appropriately to relieve the compaction and to restore the soil's structure prior to any planting, turfing or seeding.

Further details on soil handling are provided in Annex A of BS3882:2015.

Further guidance on the management, preparation and handling of soils is provided in the DEFRA publication Construction code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites, 2009.

We hope this report meets with your approval and provides the necessary information. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if we can be of further assistance.

Yours faithfully

Aaron Cross BSc Graduate Soil Scientist

Tim O'Hare BSc MSc MISoilSci MBIAC CSci Principal Consultant

For and on behalf of Tim O'Hare Associates LLP



Trugrow Topsoil

8 71 5 3 LS 4 0 0 7.7 1273 3093 6.3 9.9 0.31 19 46 1633 263 9 < 0.2 23 < 4.0 36 29 < 0.3 9 < 1.0 68 3.6 < 1 < 1 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05

< 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.05 < 0.8 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 1.0 < 2.0 < 8.0 11 12 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 1.0 < 2.0 < 10 < 10 < 10 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001 < 0.001

Client:	H Shavor Transport I to		
Client: Project	H Sivyer Transport Ltd Trugrow Topsoil		
Job:	Topsoil Analysis - BS3882:20	15	
Date:	11/10/2018		
Job Ref No:	TOHA/18/7783/SS		
Comple D-f			
Sample Refere	nce	<u> </u>	Acreditation
Clay (<0.002mi	n)	%	UKAS
Silt (0.002-0.05mm)		%	UKAS
ery Fine Sand	(0.05-0.15mm)	%	UKAS
ine Sand (0.1		%	UKAS
	0.25-0.50mm)	%	UKAS
Coarse Sand (0.50-1.0mm)		%	UKAS
Very Coarse Sand (1.0-2.0mm) Texture Class (UK Classification)		70	UKAS UKAS
Stones (2-20mm)		% DW	GLP
Stones (20-50mm)		% DW	GLP
Stones (>50mm)		% DW	GLP
	water extract)	units	UKAS
	uctivity (1:2.5 water extract)	uS/cm	UKAS
	uctivity (1:2 CaSO ₄ extract) Sodium Percentage	uS/cm %	UKAS UKAS
rganic Matter		%	UKAS
otal Nitrogen		%	UKAS
: N Ratio		ratio	UKAS
xtractable Ph	osphorus	mg/l	UKAS
xtractable Pot	assium	mg/l	UKAS
xtractable Ma	gnesium	mg/l	UKAS
atal Arcasis (n	MOEDTO
otal Arsenic (/		mg/kg	MCERTS MCERTS
otal Cadmium		mg/kg mg/kg	MCERTS
	romium (Cr VI)	mg/kg	MCERTS
otal Copper (0		mg/kg	MCERTS
otal Lead (Pb		mg/kg	MCERTS
otal Mercury (mg/kg	MCERTS
otal Nickel (Ni		mg/kg	MCERTS
otal Selenium		mg/kg	MCERTS
otal Zinc (Zn)		mg/kg	MCERTS
ater Soluble		mg/kg mg/kg	MCERTS MCERTS
otal Cyanide (otal (mono) P		mg/kg	MCERTS
aphthalene	-	mg/kg	MCERTS
cenaphthylen	9	mg/kg	MCERTS
cenaphthene luorene		mg/kg mg/kg	MCERTS MCERTS
henanthrene		mg/kg	MCERTS
nthracene		mg/kg	MCERTS
luoranthene		mg/kg	MCERTS
yrene		mg/kg	MCERTS
enzo(a)anthra	cene	mg/kg	MCERTS
hrysene		mg/kg	MCERTS
enzo(b)fluora		mg/kg	MCERTS
enzo(k)fluora		mg/kg	MCERTS MCERTS
enzo(a)pyren ndeno(1,2,3-co		mg/kg mg/kg	MCERTS
ibenzo(a,h)ar		mg/kg	MCERTS
enzo(g,h,i)pei		mg/kg	MCERTS
otal PAHs (su		mg/kg	MCERTS
liphatic TPH >		iiig/iig	MCERTS
liphatic TPH >		mg/kg	MCERTS
liphatic TPH >C8 - C10 liphatic TPH >C10 - C12		mg/kg	MCERTS
liphatic TPH >		mg/kg mg/kg	MCERTS MCERTS
		mg/kg	MCERTS
Aliphatic TPH >C16 - C21 Aliphatic TPH >C21 - C35		mg/kg	MCERTS
liphatic TPH (mg/kg	MCERTS
Aromatic TPH (C5 - C5)			MCERTS
Aromatic TPH >C7 - C8			MCERTS
Aromatic TPH :		mg/kg mg/kg	MCERTS
romatic TPH :		mg/kg	MCERTS
romatic TPH :		mg/kg	MCERTS
romatic TPH :		mg/kg	MCERTS
at memory -		mg/kg	MCERTS
romatic TPH : romatic TPH (mg/kg	MCERTS

Benzene	mg/kg	MCERTS
Toluene	mg/kg	MCERTS
Ethylbenzene	mg/kg	MCERTS
p & m-xylene	mg/kg	MCERTS
o-xylene	mg/kg	MCERTS
MTBE (Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether)	mg/kg	MCERTS

LS = LOAMY SAND

Visual Examination The sample was described as a dark yellowish brown (Munsell Colour 10YR 3/4), slightly moist, friable, noncalcareous, very fine LOAMY SAND with a weakly developed, very fine to fine granular structure*. The sample was slightly stony, with stones up to 20mm, and contained occasional organic fines and woody fragments. No unusual odours, deleterious materials, roots or rhizomes of pernicious weeds were observed.

Results of analysis should be read in conjunction with the report they were issued with.

The contents of this certificate shall not be reproduced without the express written permission of Tim O'Hare Associates LLP.

AGOST

Aaron Cross BSc Graduate Soil Scientist