

Fuel Doctor,  
New Mill Rd,  
Honley,  
Holmfirth HD9 6QZ  
23<sup>rd</sup> February 2026

Dear Sir,

Thank you for the enquiry to review the findings of the reports and investigations at the site at Woodhead Road, Honley, due to passage of time between the initial report carried out by GES (Report reference 1623-21 PII V3 dated January 2022). A site visit was undertaken on the 27<sup>th</sup> of January 2026, by a representative of GeoEnviro Solutions Ltd (GES) to carry out additional soil contamination testing following previous investigations.

Hand dug inspection pits were excavated in proximity to previously tested samples with Made Ground materials found to be of comparable makeup to the previous investigation and a walk over assessment was made during the visit at which no significant change was noted from the original works

Contamination testing results are summarised in the following tables:

## Metalloids

Table 10.1: Metalloids Soil Exceedances

Determinant	Min	Max	GAC	Number of exceedances	Location of exceedances
Arsenic	5.6	41.8	37*	1	HP04 @ 0.50 mbgl
Cadmium	<1.6	<1.6	1.7	0	-
Chromium total	24.0	80.7	910*	0	-
Copper	18.0	55.5	2400*	0	-
Lead	32.4	102	200*	0	-
Mercury	0.9	1.5	1.2 <sup>a</sup>	2	HP02 @ 0.6 mbgl, HP04 @0.5 mbgl
Nickel	13.8	45.2	180 <sup>b</sup>	0	-
Selenium	<3.0	3.4	250*	0	-
Zinc	57.2	114	3700*	0	-
Total Phenols	<0.50	<0.50	1100*	0	-
Total Cyanide	<1.0	<1.0	34*	0	-

\*LQM/CIEH GAC for 'Residential with Home Grown Produce' use scenario based on a sandy loam soil and 6% SOM.

a) Based on the inorganic mercury GAC as the conceptual site model does not suggest that other forms of mercury are likely to be present on site.

b) LQM issued an update to the nickel S4ULs in August 2015, and this has been taken into account.

## Organics

Table 10.2: PAH Soil Exceedances

Determinant	Min	Max	GAC	Number of exceedances	Location of exceedances
Naphthalene	0.052	0.150	13*	0	-
Acenaphthylene	0.036	0.091	1100*	0	-
Acenaphthene	0.035	0.237	920*	0	-
Fluorene	0.038	0.198	860*	0	-
Phenanthrene	0.469	2.74	440*	0	-
Anthracene	0.165	1.20	11000*	0	-
Fluoranthene	1.25	5.47	890*	0	-
Pyrene	1.19	4.80	2000*	0	-
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.658	2.43	13*	0	-
Chrysene	0.554	2.38	27*	0	-
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.850	2.64	3.7*	0	-
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.312	1.08	100*	0	-
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.700	2.32	3*	0	-
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.574	1.86	41*	0	-
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	0.103	0.364	0.3*	0	-
Benzo(ghi)perylene	0.446	1.43	350*	0	-

\*LQM/ClEH GAC for 'Residential with Home Grown Produce' use scenario based on a sandy loam soil and 6% SOM.

Table 10.3: TPH CWG Aliphatic/Aromatic Soil Exceedances

Determinant	Min	Max	GAC	Number of exceedances	Location of exceedances
Aromatic >C5 - C7	<0.010	<0.010	300	0	-
Aromatic >C7 - C8	<0.010	<0.010	660*	0	-
Aromatic >C8 - C10	<0.010	<0.010	190*	0	-
Aromatic >C10 - C12	1.5	10.8	380*	0	-
Aromatic >C12 - C16	4.4	32.4	660*	0	-
Aromatic >C16 - C21	2.3	63.4	930*	0	-
Aromatic >C21 - C35	10.7	227	1700*	0	-
Aromatic >C35 - C44	<2.0	40.2	1700*	0	-
Aliphatic >C5 - C6	<0.10	<0.10	160*	0	-

Determinant	Min	Max	GAC	Number of exceedances	Location of exceedances
Aliphatic >C6 - C8	<0.10	<0.10	530*	0	-
Aliphatic >C8 - C10	<0.10	<0.10	150*	0	-
Aliphatic >C10 - C12	<1.0	3.9	760*	0	-
Aliphatic >C12 - C16	<0.7	6.0	4300*	0	-
Aliphatic >C16 – C21	<0.7	6.0	110,000*	0	-
Aliphatic >C21 – C35	<4.0	46.9	110,000*	0	-
Aliphatic >C35-C44	<0.5	5.8	110,000*	0	-

\* LQM/CIEH GAC scenario based on a sandy loam soil and 6% SOM. It is noted that the LQM/CIEH S4UL guidance recommends an additive approach for the TPH fraction, so that a hazard index approach is used. Based on a preliminary conservative comparison of maximum concentrations to S4ULs, no forward modelling is necessary to prove that this would still result in no exceedances at the site.

The Conceptual Site Model from the previous report has been reassessed and is included below

Contaminant Source	Pathways	Receptor	Pollutant Linkage	Probability of Risk	Classification of Consequence	Level of Risk	Justification
On Site:  Made Ground soils on site possibly containing elevated metals, other organics such as TPH, PAH, phenols, VOC and SVOCs.	Ingestion, dermal contact, inhalation of dusts/vapours	Future end users and site visitors	Considered Possible	Likely	Mild	Moderate to Low ●	Contaminants have been identified in the site soils. Further consideration required.
		Construction Workers	Considered Possible	Likely	Medium	Moderate ●	Contaminants have been identified in the site soils. Further consideration required.
	Leaching through soils and migration via groundwater or soil pore moisture	Controlled Waters	Considered Possible	Low Likelihood	Mild	Low ●	The proximity of the river and the presence of contaminants in the site soils elevate the risk level. Further consideration required.
	Permeation of water pipes	Construction materials, future end users and site visitors	Considered Possible	Low Likelihood	Minor	Very low ●	No significantly elevated hydrocarbons encountered.

Contaminant Source	Pathways	Receptor	Pollutant Linkage	Probability of Risk	Classification of Consequence	Level of Risk	Justification
	Uptake	Plant and Wildlife	Considered Unlikely	Unlikely	Minor	Very low ●	No elevated phytotoxic contaminants identified.
On Site: Asbestos at/near ground surface in Made Ground soils.	Inhalation of fibres in airborne dust	Future end users and site visitors	Considered Possible	Likely	Medium	Moderate ●	Asbestos encountered in WS02 in excess of 0.001%.
		Construction Workers	Considered Possible	Likely	Medium	Moderate ●	Asbestos encountered in WS02 in excess of 0.001%.
On Site: Ground Gases (CH <sub>4</sub> , CO <sub>2</sub> ) from on-site Made Ground.	Gas migration and build up within buildings (explosion/asphyxiation risk)	Future end users and building structures.	Considered Unlikely	Unlikely	Minor	Very low ●	Based on the gas monitoring the site would be classified as CS(1) – very low risk.
Off Site: Ground Gases (CH <sub>4</sub> , CO <sub>2</sub> , H <sub>2</sub> S) from off-site historical landfilling activities.	Gas migration and build up within buildings (explosion/asphyxiation risk)	Future end users and building structures.	Considered Unlikely	Unlikely	Minor	Very low ●	Based on the gas monitoring the site would be classified as CS(1) – very low risk.

It is the opinion of GES that the findings of this investigation do not show a significant increase in the presence of contaminants and that the previous Conceptual Site Model and any related recommendations are unchanged from the previous investigation and the recommendations made therein should be followed.

If we can be of any further assistance – please do not hesitate to contact us

Kind Regards

Jacob Fenton  
(Geoenvironmental Engineer)