

Nicky Snoad Bury Hill Landscape Supplies Ltd The Estate Office Old Bury Hill Westcott Nr Dorking Surrey, RH4 3JU

> 31st October 2022 Our Ref: TOHA/22/7714/1/SS

Your Ref: see below

Dear Sirs

Subsoil Analysis Report: Bury Hill Horsham Yard - Washed Tree Pit Subsoil

We have completed the analysis of the soil sample recently submitted, referenced *Washed Tree Pit Subsoil*, and have pleasure reporting our findings.

The purpose of the analysis was to determine the suitability of the sample for use as a 'structural subsoil' for tree planting in hard landscape situations.

This report presents the results of analysis for the sample submitted to our office, and it should be considered 'indicative' of the subsoil source. The report and results should therefore not be used by third parties as a means of verification or validation testing, especially after the subsoil has left the Bury Hill Landscape Supplies Ltd site.

SAMPLE EXAMINATION

The sample was described as a yellow (Munsell Colour 2.5Y 7/6), slightly moist, friable, non-calcareous SAND with a single grain structure*. The sample was virtually stone-free and 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. Structure is a key soil characteristic that may only be accurately assessed by examination in an in-situ state.



Plate 1: Washed Tree Pit Subsoil 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 of the soil, and the concentration of selected potential contaminants. The following parameters were determined:

- detailed particle size analysis (5 sands, silt, clay);
- stone content (2-20mm, 20-75mm, >75mm);
- bulk density (saturated at field capacity);
- saturated hydraulic conductivity;
- pH and electrical conductivity values;
- exchangeable sodium percentage;
- organic matter content;
- 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);
- asbestos screen.

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

TOHA/22/7714/1/SS/Oct Page 2

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Particle Size Analysis and Stone Content

The sample fell into the *sand* texture class. The grading of the sand indicates a sufficiently narrow particle size distribution and a predominance of *medium sand* (0.25-0.50mm), followed by *coarse sand* (0.50-1.0mm). This is ideal for 'structural soils' as sufficient porosity levels are maintained in a compacted state and the risk of particle interpacking is minimised.

The sample was virtually stone free and as such, stones should not restrict the use of the sand for landscape purposes.

Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity and Bulk Density

The permeability of the sample when in a compacted state (Standard Compaction) was high (972mm/hr) and indicates that the sand would demonstrate satisfactory drainage performance for tree planting in hard landscape situations.

The sample displayed a bulk density when compacted at Field Capacity of 1.7 Mg/m³. The suitability of the bulk density result should be confirmed by the project engineer for the recipient site.

pH and Electrical Conductivity Values

The sample was slightly acid in reaction (pH 6.5), with a pH value that would be considered ideal for subsoil in general landscape applications.

The electrical conductivity (salinity) values (water and CaSO₄ extracts) were low, which indicates that soluble salts were not present at levels that would be harmful to plants.

Organic Matter Content

The sample contained a low organic matter content (<0.5%), which is appropriate for 'structural subsoil' material.

Potential Contaminants

With reference to *BS8601:2013 – Section 4.2: Note 2*, there is a recommendation to confirm levels of potential contaminants in relation to the subsoil'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 of selected potential contaminants that affect human health have been assessed for the concentrations that affect human health have been assessed for *residential* end-use against 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 for Assessment of Land Affected by Contamination – Policy Companion Document (2014).

Of the potential contaminants determined, none exceeded their respective 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 *BS8601:2013 – Table 1*.

TOHA/22/7714/1/SS/Oct Page 3

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the analysis was to determine the suitability of the sample for use as a 'structural subsoil' for tree planting in hard landscape situations.

From the soil examination and subsequent laboratory analysis, the sample was described as a slightly acid, non-saline, non-calcareous, stone-free sand with a single grain structure. The organic matter content was low and consistent with subsoil. The permeability rate of the sample was high. Of the potential contaminants determined, none exceeded their respective guideline values.

Based on our findings, the sand represented by this sample would be considered suitable for use as a 'structural subsoil' for tree planting in hard landscape situations.

The need for any further geotechnical tests in relation to use of the material as a load bearing substrate should be confirmed by the engineer for the recipient site as necessary.

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

Harriet MacRae BSc MSc

H.MacKae

Graduate Soil Scientist

Matthew Heins

BSc (Hons) MISoilSci Senior Soil Scientist

For & on behalf of Tim O'Hare Associates LLP

TOHA/22/7714/1/SS/Oct Page 4



Client:	Bury Hill Landscape Supplies Ltd
Project:	Bury Hill Horsham Yard - Washed Tree Pit Subsoil
Job:	Subsoil Analysis - BS8601:2013
Date:	31/10/2022
Job Ref No:	TOHA/22/7724/1/SS

			ļ	
				Washed Tree
Sample Reference				Pit Subsoil
		Accreditation		
Clay (<0.002mm)	%	UKAS		2
Silt (0.002-0.05mm)	%	UKAS		0
Very Fine Sand (0.05-0.15mm)	%	UKAS		3
Fine Sand (0.15-0.25mm)	%	UKAS		9
Medium Sand (0.25-0.50mm)	%	UKAS		62
Coarse Sand (0.50-1.0mm)	%	UKAS		22
Very Coarse Sand (1.0-2.0mm)	%	UKAS		2
Total Sand (0.05-2.0mm)	%	UKAS		98
Texture Class (UK Classification)		UKAS		<u> </u>
Stones (2-20mm)	% DW	GLP		0
Stones (20-75mm)	% DW	GLP		0
Stones (>75mm)	% DW	GLP	Į.	0
D. H. D H. / Fill 10			ı	
Bulk Density (Field Capacity)	Mg/m3	UKAS		1.7
Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity	mm/hr	A2LA	Į.	972
-11)/-1 - (4.0.5 (((((((111/40	ı	0.5
pH Value (1:2.5 water extract)	units	UKAS		6.5
Electrical Conductivity (1:2.5 water extract)	uS/cm	UKAS		60
Electrical Conductivity (1:2 CaSO ₄ extract)	uS/cm	UKAS		2016
Exchangeable Sodium Percentage	%	UKAS		4.4
Organic Matter (LOI)	%	UKAS	Į.	<0.5
<u></u>				
Total Arsenic (As)	mg/kg	MCERTS		3.6
Total Cadmium (Cd)	mg/kg	MCERTS	[< 0.2
Total Chromium (Cr)	mg/kg	MCERTS		4.3
Hexavalent Chromium (Cr VI)	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 1.8
Total Copper (Cu)	mg/kg	MCERTS		2
Total Lead (Pb)	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 1.0
Total Mercury (Hg)	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.3
Total Nickel (Ni)	mg/kg	MCERTS	ľ	< 1.0
Total Selenium (Se)	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 1.0
Total Zinc (Zn)	mg/kg	MCERTS	i	2.6
Water Soluble Boron (B)	mg/kg	MCERTS	i	< 0.2
Total Cyanide (CN)	mg/kg	MCERTS	i	< 1.0
Total (mono) Phenols	mg/kg	MCERTS	i	< 1.0
Naphthalene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Acenaphthylene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Acenaphthene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Fluorene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Phenanthrene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Anthracene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Fluoranthene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Pyrene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Benzo(a)anthracene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Chrysene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
		MCERTS		
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	mg/kg			< 0.05
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Benzo(a)pyrene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Benzo(q,h,i)perylene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.05
Total PAHs (sum USEPA16)	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.80
Aliphatic TPH >C5 - C6	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
Aliphatic TPH >C6 - C8	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
Aliphatic TPH >C8 - C10	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
Aliphatic TPH >C10 - C12	mg/kg	MCERTS	i	< 1.0
Aliphatic TPH >C12 - C16	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 2.0
Aliphatic TPH >C16 - C21	mg/kg	MCERTS	i	< 8.0
Aliphatic TPH >C21 - C35	mg/kg	MCERTS	i	< 8.0
Aliphatic TPH (C5 - C35)	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 10
Aromatic TPH >C5 - C7	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
Aromatic TPH >C7 - C8	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
Aromatic TPH >C8 - C10		MCERTS		< 0.001
Aromatic TPH >C0 - C10	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 1.0
Aromatic TPH >C10 - C12 Aromatic TPH >C12 - C16	mg/kg			
	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 2.0
Aromatic TPH > C16 - C21	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 10
Aromatic TPH >C21 - C35	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 10
Aromatic TPH (C5 - C35)	mg/kg	MCERTS	Į.	< 10
Description	// -	MOEDTO	r	. 0.004
Benzene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
Toluene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
Ethylbenzene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
o-xylene	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
MTBE (Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether)	mg/kg	MCERTS		< 0.001
Asbestos	ND/D	ISO 17025		Not-detected

H.MacRae

Harriet MacRae BSc MSc Graduate Soil Scientist

S = SAND

Visual Examination

The sample was described as a yellow (Munsell Colour 2.5Y 7/6), slightly moist, friable, non-calcareous SAND with a single grain structure. The sample was virtually stone-free and 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.