

Letter Report

Revised Risk Assessment (contaminated land)

**SOIL AND
STRUCTURES**

Hamid Dhorat

DK Architects Ltd
Suite 4 Batley Business Park
Technology Drive
Batley
West Yorkshire
WF17 6ER

Our Ref.: 20639-L-001-V01

Your Ref.: 2025/62/93084

Date: 16 July 2026

Dear Hamid,

Re: 14 Thornhill Park Avenue, Dewsbury

Further to your email of 24 June 2026 please find hereafter our Revised Risk Assessment (contaminated land) and Validation Report (*the Report*) that has been prepared in support of the discharge of Conditions 7 to 10 of planning application ref. 2025/62/93084 relating to the above development (*the Site*).

Background to this Report

Numerous planning applications have been submitted relating to the Site across which similar ground-related planning conditions were carried across. These conditions fall under two broad categories – ‘contaminated land’¹ related hazards and coal mining related hazards.

In support of these planning applications, various ground-related reports have been prepared for the Site.

The most recently submitted reporting was prepared by GVR Geoservices Ltd, for and on behalf of Avant Engineers Ltd², and concluded that:

- i) The risk posed by coal mining related hazards (various) was acceptably low and no further assessment or risk mitigation was recommended; and,
- ii) The risk posed by ‘contaminated land’ related hazards (various) was likely to be acceptably low but recommended that some limited investigation was completed to confirm the chemical quality of soils across the north-eastern portion of the Site where the former railway embankment lay.

The Site includes two adjacent properties with the same address (14 Thornhill Park Avenue, Dewsbury) and, at the point of issue, development had effectively been completed across the Site. More specifically; a) reprofiling and landscaping of the rear garden areas had been completed including the formation of a new, raised terrace grassed area (discussed further below); and, b) the northernmost of the two properties was partially demolished (Section 80 notice in place).

The Coal Authority’s consultation response (attached to planning application 2025/62/93084) dated 31 December 2025 states:

...the Planning and Development Team at the Coal Authority has the reassurance that the site is safe and stable from a mining viewpoint

And with respect to the potential for mine gas to present a risk to the proposed development states:

...local planning authorities (LPA) should seek their own technical advice on.

¹ ‘Contaminated land’ hazards cover a broad range of historical, e.g. potentially harmful material in the soils and unexploded ordnance, and some, but not all, geological ground-related hazards, e.g. radon.

² Phase 1 Geoenvironmental Desk Study dated 27 February 2026; and Coal Mining Risk Assessment dated 27 November 2025

The latter essentially defers responsibility for mine gas regulation to the Local Planning Authority which is considered irregular given the Coal Authority are the statutory regulator for that hazard.

Kirklees Council's (KC) consultation response to a discharge of conditions application ref. 2026/90692 states:

In conclusion, the submitted details are considered acceptable for the purposes of Condition 6 and therefore the condition can be discharged. Officers would remind the applicant a robust phase 2 report is anticipated in order to justify the conclusions within the Phase 1 report, particularly in relation to potentially worked shallow coal and the potential associated gas risk.

The KC consultation response does not appear to reference the Coal Authority's earlier consultation response (or the GVR Geoservices reportin) and implies that an investigation into the stability of the Site remains outstanding. Equally, the statement could be taken to mean an assessment is needed specifically in relation to mine gas; something that is deferred to the LPA (Kirklees Council) by the Coal Authority in their consultation response.

Revised Risk Assessment (contaminated land)

Two 'contaminated land' related hazards are identified for further assessment. These hazards include: Made Ground (harmful material); and, mine gas.

With respect to Made Ground (harmful material):

The reprofiling and landscaping of the rear garden is understood to have included for: a) the placement of excavation arisings (natural clay soils) to form an elevated, grassed terrace - *Photograph 1*; and, b) the formation of extensive hardstanding (paving) areas - *Photograph 1*.

Across areas of soft landscaping – the original, pre-construction soils across the north-western portion of the Site have essentially been buried beneath the new, unspecified cover that, prior to inspection, were reportedly natural clay soils (arisings from foundation/drainage excavations).

It is also noted that the original, pre-construction soils identified as potentially presenting a risk to human health (and requiring further assessment) represented material at the toe/base of a former railway embankment that, nearby excavations indicate were mainly comprised of rock fill deposits – *Photograph 2*. Whilst railway ballast (directly below tracks) can include potentially harmful material, e.g. coal ash and oils and greases falling off trains, the fact the Site lay at the toe/base of a much larger embankment indicates that these soils are less likely to have been impacted.

Notwithstanding this, there remained residual uncertainty as to the condition, nature and chemical quality of soils across the soft landscaping areas and therefore intrusive investigation was recommended both validate the ground conditions and chemical quality of the material now present across the soft landscaping.

A total of 4 no. soil samples were obtained from 'very shallow' (0.05 to 0.10 m) and 'shallow' (0.25 to 0.35 m) depth intervals from 2 no. hand excavated trial pits. These depth intervals reflect those soils end users will be exposed to and the different materials present within each location.

A photographic record of these trial pits is enclosed but in overview, when excavated to 0.50 m depth, the trial pits confirmed the presence of a 'thin' (less than 100 mm) of dark brown silt (Topsoil) over the residual depth of 'reworked natural soils' (slightly sandy, gravelly CLAY with cobbles). No evidence of rock fill or railway ballast was noted over this depth with the boundary between placed and in-situ soils unlikely to be readily definable. In any case, no evidence of potentially harmful or polluting material was revealed within the exploratory trial holes nor any evidence of non-natural material that might otherwise suggest the material is not 'natural' in origin.

The samples were sent for testing at a UKAS and MCerts accredited testing laboratory and scheduled for a broad range of chemical determinants (testing certificate enclosed). The testing results were subsequently compared against Generic Assessment Criteria (material screening enclosed) reflecting the proposed 'residential with (the potential for) homegrown produce' end use. No exceedances were recorded and, on this basis, the soils present within the soft landscaping area are considered to be chemically suitable for use within this setting.

Taken together, the trial pits and chemical testing data confirm that at least 0.50 m of chemically suitable material is present across the soft landscaping area with no evidence of potentially harmful or polluting material present. The risk to end users of the Site from using the soft landscaping area is therefore considered acceptably low.

Across areas of hardstanding - the paving has introduced a 'hard' physical barrier between any residual Made Ground deposits and the end users of the Site effectively breaking the potential pollutant linkage.

With respect to mine gas:

Current guidance³ currently screens various lines of evidence to determine if mine gas will present a hazard on a given Site. All coalfield regions will be 'breathing' (emitting to surface) gases that are generated in relic mineworking voids.

In this scenario, there are no risk factors (shallow mine workings, mine entries within 20 m of the Site) identified noting that a geological fault is present just over 50 m north-east of the Site.

The guidance highlights that faults can serve as more direct pathways for mine gas emissions but also notes (p 21) how there is high variability associated with faults including their width, infill material and angle all of which influence how likely they would serve as a direct pathway to the surface. There is also rarely the opportunity to confirm if workings are fully flooded or not.

Taken together, it is considered unlikely that mine gas emissions will pose an unacceptable risk to end users of the Site. On this basis, no further assessment or risk reduction measures would be recommended.

It is noted that the Client intends to provide inherent ground gas protection through the installation of a continuous, well-sealed damp proof membrane that is at least 1200 gauge (0.3 mm) thick across the footprint of the replacement structure (following demolition). It is also noted that this measure was included as part of the original construction that is due to be replaced.

The inspection / validation of this membrane is not considered necessary in this scenario.

³ CL:AIRE 2021 - Good Practice for Risk Assessment for Coal Mine Gas Emissions

[3]

Letter Report

Revised Risk Assessment (contaminated land)

**SOIL AND
STRUCTURES**

Recommendations

It is recommended that, subject to Local Planning Authority approval, Conditions 7 to 10 of planning application ref. 2025/62/93084 can be discharged and that the Site and the proposed development could be considered both stable (coal mining related hazards) and suitable for use (contaminated land related hazards).

I hope this Report meets with your current requirements.

If you have any questions or comments yourself or receive any relating to this Report. please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Russell Bowman

Director

Soil & Structures Ltd

*Enc. Photographic Record
 Clean cover – Inspection Record
 Material Screening – Chemical Suitability
 Laboratory Testing Certificate*

Photographic Record



Photograph 1 – View north-east from Site's north-western / western corner illustrating general arrangement of rear garden area and extent of soft landscaping – all other external areas are covered by paving / hardstanding.



Photograph 2 – View north-west of the Site towards former railway bridge and associated groundworks, that was a continuation of the raise railway line that ran near the Site's north-western boundary – illustrating the nature of the material recently excavated from the embankment (rock fill) present along the temporary access slope.

Clean Cover

Visual Inspection Record

SOIL AND STRUCTURES

Site name	14 Thornhill Park Avenue	Job number	20639
Clean cover design	Unspecified – soils placed as part of landscaping works; inspection proposed to confirm the nature, depth and chemical quality of the soils		
Nature of development	Residential housing – detached	Garden type	Private rear gardens with no front gardens
Visit number(s)	1	Inspection(s) by	Russell Bowman BSc (Hons) MSc CEng CWEM MCIWEM; and, Client
Revision	V01	Inspection of soft landscaping (rear garden)	
Date of Inspection	28 June 2026		
Notes	This 'Visual inspection record' represents the findings of a single inspection of the unspecified clean cover placed across the soft landscaping area.		
Status	Validated		
The soils present across the soft landscaping areas are considered suitable for use and of a suitable thickness to serve as a barrier to any material potentially present below the depths of investigation.			

HP101 location

Notes: targeting northern boundary where existing soils are more likely to be present at shallower depths

Advisory: none



HP101 location

150 mm dark brown sandy gravelly SILT over 450 mm light brown, light grey and dark brown mottled firm to stiff, slightly sandy, gravelly CLAY

INSERT: arisings from trial pit

Notes: Samples obtained at 0.05-0.10 m and 0.25 to 0.35 m depth (as illustrated by yellow dots)



HP102 location Notes: targeting northern boundary where existing soils are more likely to be present at shallower depths Advisory: none	
HP102 location 50 mm dark brown sandy gravelly SILT over 490 mm light brown, light grey and dark brown mottled firm to stiff, slightly sandy, gravelly CLAY INSERT: arisings from trial pit Notes: Samples obtained at 0.05-0.10 m and 0.25 to 0.35 m depth (as illustrated by yellow dots)	

Material Suitability
Chemical Suitability

SOIL AND STRUCTURES

Notes on Generic Assessment Criteria

1. Assumes sandy loam soil (default soil type)
2. Assumes 6% SOM
3. Assumes small terraced house
4. SAUL = Suitable 4 Use Levels (LQM/ClEH) - **minimal risk**
5. C4SL = Category 4 Screening Levels (DEFRA) - **acceptably low risk**
6. Bold GACs derived from SGV report input parameters in CLEA v.1.071

Material Description
Lab Sample Number
Sample Reference
Sample Number
Depth Top (m)
Depth Base (m)
Date Sampled

Surficial soils / Topsoil	Shallow soils / clay	Surficial soils / Topsoil	Shallow soils / clay
2133742	2133743	2133744	2133745
HP101	HP101	HP102	HP102
1	2	1	2
0.05	0.25	0.05	0.25
0.10	0.35	0.10	0.35
12-Jun-2026		12-Jun-2026	12-Jun-2026

Generic Assessment Criteria

Exceeds GAC by greater than 2 times	Exceeds GAC by less than 2 times	No exceedance	Key parameter highlighted
-------------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------

Analytical Parameter (Soil Analysis)	Units	Detection	Accredit?
Moisture Content	%	N/A	NONE

Not applicable

Asbestos in Soil			
	Type	N/A	ISO 17025

Type
Detected or not?
Analyst

No Asbestos Detected	No Asbestos Detected	No Asbestos Detected	No Asbestos Detected

General Inorganics

pH - Automated	pH Units	N/A	MCERTS
Water Soluble SO ₄ 16hr extraction (2:1 Leachate Equivalent)	g/l	0.01	MCERTS
Water Soluble SO ₄ 16hr extraction (2:1 Leachate Equivalent)	mg/l	1.25	MCERTS
Organic Matter	%	0.1	MCERTS

Review when <5 or >9
Not applicable
Not applicable
GSV variable

8.2	8.0	7.8	7.8
0.019	0.010	< 0.010	0.022
0.019	0.019	0.019	0.019
7.9	3.5	5.8	1.2

Speciated PAHs

Acenaphthene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Acenaphthylene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Anthracene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Benzo(a)anthracene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Benzo(a)pyrene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Benzo(ghi)perylene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	mg/kg	1.05	MCERTS
Chrysene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Fluoranthene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Fluorene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Naphthalene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Phenanthrene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Pyrene	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Coronene	mg/kg	0.05	NONE

[illegible]

< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05
< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05
0.09	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05
0.19	< 0.05	0.08	< 0.05
0.37	< 0.05	0.14	< 0.05
0.40	< 0.05	0.16	< 0.05
0.54	0.06	0.22	< 0.05
0.26	< 0.05	0.12	< 0.05
0.42	< 0.05	0.16	< 0.05
0.07	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05
0.75	0.07	0.27	< 0.05
< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05
0.27	< 0.05	0.12	< 0.05
< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05	< 0.05
0.34	< 0.05	0.12	< 0.05
0.68	0.07	0.26	< 0.05

Total PAH

Speciated Total EPA-16 PAHs	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
-----------------------------	-------	------	--------

Not available	
---------------	--

4.4	0.20	1.6	< 0.05
-----	------	-----	--------

Phenols

Total - Monohydric	mg/kg	1	MCERTS
--------------------	-------	---	--------

S4UL	C4SL
420	<

--	--	--	--

Heavy Metals / Metalloids

Arsenic (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.50	MCERTS
Boron (water soluble)	mg/kg	0.40	MCERTS
Cadmium (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.10	MCERTS
Chromium (hexavalent)	mg/kg	0.50	MCERTS
Chromium (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.50	MCERTS
Copper (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.50	MCERTS
Lead (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.50	MCERTS
Mercury (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.05	MCERTS
Nickel (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.50	MCERTS
Selenium (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.25	MCERTS
Zinc (aquia regia extractable)	mg/kg	0.50	MCERTS

S4UL	C4SL
>	37
290	<
>	22
21	<
910	<
2400	<
>	200
1	<
130	<
350	<
3700	<

26	13	20	9.2
0.48	< 0.40	< 0.40	< 0.40
0.28	0.16	0.14	0.13
26	21	19	17
< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50	< 0.50
51	30	51	24
70	27	36	19
0.18	0.07	0.11	0.05
28	33	24	35
0.80	0.74	0.58	0.37
100	67	63	69



Final Report

Report No.: 26-20358-1

Initial Date of Issue: 15-Jul-2026

Re-Issue Details:

Client *Soil and Structures Ltd*

Client Address: *89 Moorhead Lane
Shipley
BD18 4JW*

Contact(s): *Russell Bowman*

Project *14 Thornhill Park Avenue*

Quotation No.: Q26-41362

Date Received: 02-Jul-2026

Order No.: 20639-1

Date Instructed: 02-Jul-2026

No. of Samples: 4

Turnaround (Wkdays): 10

Results Due: 15-Jul-2026

Date Approved: 15-Jul-2026

Approved By:

Details: David Smith, Technical Director

For details about application of accreditation to specific matrix types, please refer to the Table at the back of this report

Results - Soil

Project: 14 Thornhill Park Avenue

Client: Soil and Structures Ltd		Chemtest Job No.:	26-20358	26-20358	26-20358	26-20358
Quotation No.: Q26-41362		Chemtest Sample ID.:	2133742	2133743	2133744	2133745
		Client Reference:	HP101	HP101	HP102	HP102
		Sample Type:	SOIL	SOIL	SOIL	SOIL
		Top Depth (m):	0.05	0.25	0.05	0.25
		Bottom Depth (m):	0.10	0.35	0.10	0.35
		Date Sampled:	26-Jun-2026	26-Jun-2026	26-Jun-2026	26-Jun-2026
		Asbestos Lab:	NEW-ASB	NEW-ASB	NEW-ASB	NEW-ASB
Determinand	HWOL Code	Accred.	SOP	Units	LOD	
ACM Type		N	2192		N/A	-
Asbestos Identification		U	2192		N/A	No Asbestos Detected
Moisture		N	2030	%	0.020	11
Soil Colour		N	2030		N/A	Brown
Other Material		N	2030		N/A	Stones and Roots
Soil Texture		N	2030		N/A	Loam
pH at 20C		M	2010		4.0	8.2
Boron (Hot Water Soluble)		M	2120	mg/kg	0.40	0.48
Sulphate (2:1 Water Soluble) as SO4		M	2120	g/l	0.010	0.019
Arsenic		M	2455	mg/kg	0.5	26
Cadmium		M	2455	mg/kg	0.10	0.28
Chromium		M	2455	mg/kg	0.5	26
Copper		M	2455	mg/kg	0.50	51
Mercury		M	2455	mg/kg	0.05	0.18
Nickel		M	2455	mg/kg	0.50	28
Lead		M	2455	mg/kg	0.50	70
Selenium		M	2455	mg/kg	0.25	0.80
Zinc		M	2455	mg/kg	0.50	100
Chromium (Hexavalent)		N	2490	mg/kg	0.50	< 0.50
Organic Matter		M	2625	%	0.40	7.9
Naphthalene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	< 0.05
Acenaphthylene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	< 0.05
Acenaphthene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	< 0.05
Fluorene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	< 0.05
Phenanthrene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.34
Anthracene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.09
Fluoranthene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.75
Pyrene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.68
Benzo[a]anthracene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.37
Chrysene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.42
Benzo[b]fluoranthene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.54
Benzo[k]Fluoranthene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.19
Benzo[a]pyrene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.40
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)Pyrene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.27
Dibenz(a,h)Anthracene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.07
Benzo[g,h,i]perylene		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	0.26
Total Of 16 PAH's		M	5003	mg/kg	0.05	4.4

Test Methods

SOP	Title	Parameters included	Method summary	Water Accred.
2010	pH Value of Soils	pH at 20°C	pH Meter	
2030	Moisture and Stone Content of Soils(Requirement of MCERTS)	Moisture content	Determination of moisture content of soil as a percentage of its as received mass obtained at <30°C.	
2120	Water Soluble Boron, Sulphate, Magnesium & Chromium	Boron; Sulphate; Magnesium; Chromium	Aqueous extraction / ICP-OES	
2192	Asbestos Quantification in Soils Sediments Ballast & Aggregate Crushed Concrete & Demolition Rubble	Asbestos	Polarised light microscopy / Gravimetry	
2455	Acid Soluble Metals in Soils	Metals, including: Arsenic; Barium; Beryllium; Cadmium; Chromium; Cobalt; Copper; Lead; Manganese; Mercury; Molybdenum; Nickel; Selenium; Vanadium; Zinc	Acid digestion followed by determination of metals in extract by ICP-MS.	
2490	Hexavalent Chromium in Soils	Chromium [VI]	Soil extracts are prepared by extracting dried and ground soil samples into boiling water. Chromium [VI] is determined by 'Aquakem 600' Discrete Analyser using 1,5-diphenylcarbazine.	
2625	Total Organic Carbon in Soils	Total organic Carbon (TOC)	Determined by high temperature combustion under oxygen, using an Eltra elemental analyser.	
5003	Speciated Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) in Soil by GC-MS	Acenaphthene; Acenaphthylene; Anthracene; Benzo[a]Anthracene; Benzo[a]Pyrene; Benzo[b]Fluoranthene; Benzo[ghi]Perylene; Benzo[k]Fluoranthene; Chrysene; Dibenzo[ah]Anthracene; Fluoranthene; Fluorene; Indeno[123cd]Pyrene; Naphthalene; Phenanthrene; Pyrene	Hexane / Acetone extraction GC-MS	

Report Information

Key	
U	UKAS accredited
M	MCERTS and UKAS accredited
N	Unaccredited
S	This analysis has been subcontracted to a UKAS accredited laboratory that is accredited for this analysis
SN	This analysis has been subcontracted to a UKAS accredited laboratory that is not accredited for this analysis
T	This analysis has been subcontracted to an unaccredited laboratory
I/S	Insufficient Sample
U/S	Unsuitable Sample
N/E	not evaluated
<	"less than"
>	"greater than"
SOP	Standard operating procedure
LOD	Limit of detection

Text example All items indicated in italic font represent customer-supplied information that may not be independently verified by the laboratory

This report shall not be reproduced except in full, and only with the prior approval of the laboratory.

Any comments or interpretations are outside the scope of UKAS accreditation.

The Laboratory is not accredited for any sampling activities and reported results relate to the samples 'as received' at the laboratory.

Uncertainty of measurement for the determinands tested are available upon request .

None of the results in this report have been recovery corrected.

All results are expressed on a dry weight basis.

The following tests were analysed on samples 'as received' and the results subsequently corrected to a dry weight basis EPH, VPH, TPH, BTEX, VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs, Phenols.

For all other tests the samples were dried at $\leq 30^{\circ}\text{C}$ prior to analysis.

All Asbestos testing is performed at the indicated laboratory .

Issue numbers are sequential starting with 1 all subsequent reports are incremented by 1.

Where analysis is performed on a dried and crushed sample, it has been prepared by crushing all of the sample. If material has been removed prior to crushing, or by request of the client, this will be stated on the report.

NEW_ASB Eurofins Chemtest Limited, 11 Depot Road, Newmarket, CB8 0AL

DURHAM Eurofins Chemtest Limited, Unit A North Wing, Prospect Business Park, Crookhall Lane, Consett, Co Durham, DH8 7PW

Sample Deviation Codes

As a result of any of the below deviations applying, the test results may be unreliable

- A - Date of sampling not supplied
- B - Sample age exceeds stability time (sampling to extraction)
- C - Sample not received in appropriate containers
- D - Broken Container
- E - The required amount of sample for analysis was not received
- H - Appropriate cooling measures were not taken for sample transportation

Sample Retention and Disposal

All soil samples will be retained for a period of 30 days from the date of receipt.

All water samples will be retained for 14 days from the date of receipt.

Charges may apply to extended sample storage.

Report Information

Water Sample Category Key for Accreditation

DW - Drinking Water (Non-Regulatory)
GW - Ground Water
LE - Land Leachate
NA - Not Applicable
PL - Prepared Leachate
PW - Processed Water
RE - Recreational Water
SA - Saline Water
SW - Surface Water
TE - Treated Effluent
TS - Treated Sewage
UL - Unspecified Liquid

Clean Up Codes

NC - No Clean Up
MC - Mathematical Clean Up
FC - Florisil Clean Up

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 - Aromatic only
2D - GC-GC – Double coil gas chromatography
#1 - EH_2D_Total but with humics mathematically subtracted
#2 - EH_2D_Total but with fatty acids mathematically subtracted
+ - Operator to indicate cumulative e.g. EH+EH_Total or EH_CU+HS_Total

Asbestos Tests LOD = LOQ

Limit of Detection = Limit of Quantification for asbestos results only

If you require extended retention of samples, please email your requirements to:
cs@etuki.eurofins.com