



Geotechnical &
Environmental
Consultants

Locksmill Farm
Spalding

Remediation Method Statement For Ashwood Homes



GeoDyne Limited
9 Brunel Parkway, Pride Park, Derby, DE24 8HR
Tel: 01332 290798 email: info@geodyne.co.uk

Contents

	Page No.
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 THE SITE & CONTAMINATION SUMMARY	3
3.0 REMEDIATION STRATEGY	5
4.0 SITE ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA	9
5.0 CONCLUSIONS	12

Appendices

- I Plan Showing Approximate Location of Lead / TPH Hotspot
- II Conditions & Limitations

Project No: D40178		Date: 27th May 2021	
Issue/revision	Prepared by	Checked By	Approved By
	Stephen Sellers BSc (Hons) MSc FGS Principal Geo-Environmental Engineer	Daniel Brunt BSc (Hons) MSc CGeol FGS Associate	Paul Kershaw BSc (Hons) PGDip CGeol FGS Director
			
Comments			

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This report comprises a Remediation Method Statement (RMS) relating to a parcel of land known as Locksmill Farm, located to the east of Cowbit Road, Spalding, Lincolnshire. The RMS is based on the proposed construction of residential dwellings by the Client, Ashwood Homes.

The RMS has been prepared taking due consideration of the following previous reports:

- Geo-Matters report entitled '*Phase I & II Geo-Environmental Investigation – Site off Cowbit Road, Spalding*', reference GML19195/2/0, produced for Minster Property Group Ltd, dated September 2019.
- GeoDyne Limited letter report entitled '*Supplementary Contamination Assessment – Locksmill Farm, Spalding*', reference D40178, produced for Ashwood Homes, dated 27th May 2021.

This RMS should be read in conjunction with the above reports.

1.2 Project Understanding

It is understood that it is proposed to develop the site for a residential end-use incorporating private gardens. The assessments and recommendations made within this RMS are based on this understanding.

1.3 Project Overview

It is understood that a RMS is required by South Holland District Council, as stated following their review of the Geo-Matters Phase I & II report during the consultation process, and after completion of the further investigation works in the northern part of the site, as detailed within our Supplementary Contamination Assessment report (Local Authority review pending).

We have prepared this Remediation Method Statement for the site taking account of the findings of the previous reports (listed above), the comments from South Holland District Council and the development proposals.

1.4 Details of Remediation Method Statement (RMS)

This RMS details the necessary remediation and validation measures required at the site and represents a stand-alone report to act as a working document for use by the Site Manager to control remediation and validation works.

It also states the level of inspection and Clean-Up Goals/Site Acceptance Criteria considered appropriate by ourselves, which are to be agreed with the Local Authority Environmental Health Officer (EHO).

In addition, this RMS provides the Site Acceptance Criteria considered appropriate by ourselves for assessment of any soils which are proposed to be imported to site. We would, however, note that the existing topsoil present across the majority of the site (i.e. the greenfield area of the site) is considered suitable for re-use and on this basis we understand that there is no intention for the Client to import soils to the site.

1.5 Limitations

This report has been produced specifically to address remediation and validation issues at the site. For a detailed review of the sites history, geology, geotechnical and environmental setting and recommendations relating to all other matters, reference should be made to the reports detailed in Section 1.1.

The conclusions and recommendations made in this report are limited to those that can be made based on the findings of the investigations undertaken at the site. Where comments are made based on information obtained from third parties, GeoDyne Limited assumes that all third party information is true and correct. No independent action has been undertaken to validate the findings of third parties unless specifically stated.

This report has been prepared in accordance with our understanding of current best practice. However, new information or legislation, or changes to best practice may necessitate revision of the report after the date of its issue.

GeoDyne Limited has prepared this report for the sole use and reliance of the Client, Ashwood Homes, in accordance with our standard Conditions & Limitations (see Appendix II). This report may not be used or relied upon by any unauthorised third party without the explicit written agreement of GeoDyne Limited.

2.0 THE SITE & CONTAMINATION SUMMARY

2.1 Brief Site Description

The site (known as Locksmill Farm) essentially comprised, until recently, two open fields with dilapidated farm buildings in the northwest of the site. At the time of our most recent visit (May 2021), the site generally comprised open ground following site clearance works, including the removal of trees, a partial topsoil strip and the demolition / removal of the former buildings in the northern part of the site.

2.2 Development Proposals

It is understood that it is proposed to develop the site for a residential end-use incorporating private gardens.

2.3 Contamination Assessment

The Geo-Matters report (referenced in Section 1.1) concludes that *'Localised small-scale remediation works to protect human health are considered necessary subject to the approval of the Local Authority / NHBC. This relates to the elevated heavy metals (Lead) and TPH within made ground (at 0.20m below existing ground level) at WS01. Capping and / or removal of shallow soils (provisionally recommended to be within 600mm of the finished surface levels) will be required for garden / soft landscaped areas where these materials remain in situ. Delineation testing is recommended to confirm the extent of contaminated made ground in this area'*.

Based on the above, Ashwood Homes opted to remove from site the lead / TPH impacted soils in the location of WS01, and asked GeoDyne to undertake confirmatory sampling at the limit of the open excavation for validation purposes. These validation works were reported by ourselves in our letter report dated 29th March 2021.

Subsequent to the issuing of the foregoing validation report, GeoDyne was made aware of the following comments made by the Environmental Protection Officer (Sue Armour) at South Holland District Council in relation to the earlier Geo-Matters report:

'The site investigation has identified that remediation is required, but I do not consider that the site is adequately characterised at this time. Zoning of the site would assist in defining any further site investigation works to be undertaken. There was very limited sampling and testing in the northern part of the site. No field logs for the hand dug pits were presented, so the soil sampled and tested is not clear. Only two samples of the made ground soils were analysed. The use of statistics on such a limited data set is not appropriate. Further characterisation of the northern part of the site, including areas of made ground soil, chemical storage and the above ground fuel tank, should be undertaken prior to the formulation of a remediation method statement.'

In light of these comments, Ashwood Homes commissioned GeoDyne to undertake a supplementary trial pitting / soil sampling exercise across the northern part of the site to enable further assessment and characterisation of the soils encountered in the northern portion of the site. These works were reported by ourselves in the Supplementary Contamination Assessment report (referenced in Section 1.1).

The foregoing GeoDyne report concluded the following:

'Contamination testing was carried out on selected samples of the Made Ground and the underlying Natural Strata. On the basis of the chemical contamination assessment undertaken by GeoDyne, the soils may be considered to be uncontaminated for the proposed residential with plant uptake end-use. There are considered to be no significant risks posed to Controlled Waters by the findings of the laboratory analysis undertaken.'

Based on the results of the soil sampling detailed herein, it is considered that the localised lead / TPH impacted soils, determined by others (in one location in the north-western portion), does indeed appear to constitute a 'hotspot' (i.e. these impacted soils have not been found to be pervasive across the wider site area). On this basis, the 'Localised small-scale remediation works to protect human health ... relating ... to the elevated heavy metals (Lead) and TPH within made ground (at 0.20m below existing ground level) at WS01' (as recommended by Geo-Matters) appears to be a reasonable approach with regard to a remediation strategy for the site. It is proposed that a Remediation Method Statement (RMS) is produced to document and confirm the procedures adopted in relation to the remediation works undertaken, and this will be issued under separate cover.'

3.0 REMEDIATION STRATEGY

3.1 Introduction

In accordance with the findings of the previous reports, comments by South Holland District Council and our understanding of the redevelopment proposals, the following remedial strategy is considered appropriate for the site.

3.2 Hotspot Removal & Validation Protocol

Previous works undertaken at the site have revealed the presence of a lead / TPH hotspot within the Made Ground (Geo-Matters borehole WS01, 0.20m begl). It is recommended that the Made Ground soils around the location of WS01 are excavated to the full depth of the Made Ground (approximately 0.70m begl in this area of the site). It is further recommended that the excavation is extended to remove any soils with suspected visual or olfactory evidence of contamination as appropriate.

A suitably qualified Engineer should attend site to inspect and photograph the excavation and obtain visually representative samples from the sides and base of the excavation. The samples would be scheduled for laboratory analysis comprising both lead and speciated TPH testing. The excavation arisings should be removed off site for disposal at a suitably permitted / exempt waste management / disposal facility. It would be necessary for the excavation to remain open for the duration of the laboratory analysis to ensure that all contaminated soil is removed from the site.

If the laboratory validation test results reveal the concentrations of the contaminants of concern (i.e. lead and TPH) within the excavation to be less than the SAC (see Section 4.0), the remedial works may be deemed to have been successful and the excavation may be suitably backfilled.

If the validation test results reveal concentrations that exceed the SAC, it would be necessary to excavate further soils from the area in appropriate increments, with the relevant part of the excavation re-sampled and tested after each phase of excavation. Once the values of contaminants are less than the SAC, the excavation may be infilled with suitably clean / uncontaminated soils.

Following receipt of laboratory test results confirming contaminant concentrations below the SAC, a Validation Report relating to the hotspot removal may be produced.

The approximate location of the Lead / TPH hotspot is indicated on the plan presented in Appendix I (Figure No. D40178/01D).

3.3 Placement of Topsoil within Proposed Private Gardens / Areas of Soft Landscape

The Geo-Matters report states the following with respect to the placement of topsoil within proposed private gardens / areas of soft landscape at the site:

'Topsoil was encountered across the majority of the site during the recent intrusive works and generally extended to an average depth of 0.35m begl. Chemical analysis indicates that the topsoil is chemically suitable for re-use in all areas, subject to the approval of the Local Authority / NHBC. There is unlikely to be a requirement to import additional topsoil onto the site for use in private gardens etc., however, if they are then it is reiterated that any such works must be undertaken in full compliance with all regulatory licensing procedures (i.e. U1, MMP etc), and validation of the soils prior to importation will be required, subject to the approval of the Local Authority / NHBC.'

Where topsoil is discussed herein (and where it has been recorded within Engineer's logs for this site) it has been described and classified in general accordance with prevailing logging practice (e.g. BS5930 / ISO14688). Additional inspection(s) and analyses will be required should classification of such material be required against standards such as BS3882: 2015 'Specification for Topsoil'.

With the exception of the lead / TPH hotspot, the chemical analysis has revealed the general Made Ground and Natural Strata to be uncontaminated with respect to the determinants tested. Therefore, no remediation works (other than the hotspot removal works detailed herein) will be required except for the provision of topsoil in proposed gardens / areas of soft landscape to provide a suitable growing media for plants. It may be necessary to increase the thickness of topsoil around the root balls of trees to suit the proposed planting regime.

For aesthetic reasons, it is recommended that a minimum of 300mm of topsoil is placed in proposed gardens / areas of soft landscape. In northern areas of the site where Made Ground is present, prior to the placement of the topsoil we would recommend that the formation layer is visually inspected and that any aesthetically undesirable materials are removed.

3.4 Imported Topsoil & Subsoil

Should it become necessary to import any topsoil and / or subsoil to the site, all soils should be tested at source to ensure it is suitably clean (prior to importation) in accordance with CLEA / generic guidance. The topsoil should also ideally conform to BS3882: 2015 '*Specification for topsoil*', with respect to the presence of foreign objects, and ideally nutrient levels etc. The results of the chemical analysis for any topsoil proposed for importation should be forwarded to the Local Authority (Environmental Health Officer) for approval (prior to importation).

3.5 Segregation of Materials

It is imperative that 'clean' material is kept separate from 'contaminated' arisings generated at the site (including retained Made Ground materials). Any cross contamination may result in the necessity to remove all affected materials from the site. Appropriate measures should therefore be adopted by the chosen Contractor.

These measures should include the following:

- The Contractor shall take all necessary measures during excavation and loading into lorries or skips to prevent any spillages or leakages of contaminants onto the adjacent ground, in order to prevent the cross contamination of the surrounding soils.
- All vehicles are to be appropriately sheeted and 'clean', prior to leaving site. The Contractor shall take all reasonable and applicable measures to prevent the escape of material during transportation.
- It may be necessary to temporarily stockpile contaminated soils prior to removal from site, although this is considered unlikely at this site. If circumstances arise where temporarily stockpiling is required, contaminated soils shall be placed onto suitable polythene sheeting to prevent cross contamination from occurring.

3.6 Off-Site Disposal & Waste Classification

The chemical testing regime for off-site disposal is different to the chemical testing required to assess the suitability of the soils for retention on site and the risks to human health. Therefore, a separate contamination assessment may be required to classify the soils for off-site disposal with testing criteria to assess whether the soil is hazardous, non-hazardous or inert waste.

The receiving landfill may require additional specialist laboratory testing to further characterise the material proposed for disposal against Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC). We would recommend early consultation between the Contractor and the receiving landfill to determine any specific laboratory testing requirements. These may potentially include bespoke WAC leachate testing.

Individuals / companies removing soils from the site are bound by a **duty of care**; as such this should only be undertaken by an **authorised person**. All waste movements should be accompanied by a **waste transfer note and Environment Agency waste consignment notes**.

3.7 Licenses, Registrations, Permits and Approvals

The Contractor / Developer is responsible for, and must ensure that, all necessary licences, permits, plans, registrations and approvals are in place prior to commencing with the construction works at the site. These may include any Materials Management Plans (MMPs), Site Waste Management Plans (SWMPs) and/or Environmental Permits / Exemptions as necessary to enable the completion of the proposed works. Any MMP should be accompanied by a Qualified Person Declaration (QPD) and will require verification in due course.

3.8 Unforeseen Circumstances

Should any areas of potentially contaminated soil be encountered during site construction works we would recommend consultation with GeoDyne to ensure that our recommendations continue to apply. Any potentially contaminated soils should be left in-situ and subjected to further assessment, to potentially include further chemical testing and risk assessment.

The following procedure should be adhered to if any areas of previously unidentified suspected contamination are encountered during the development of the site:

- i. Suspected contaminated material will remain in-situ.
- ii. GeoDyne to be notified. We will then undertake a visual assessment of the possible contamination, followed by appropriate sampling/testing (as necessary).
- iii. If necessary, contamination will then be treated or removed from site. All necessary remediation works should be validated by testing in accordance with an approved strategy, with the relevant Regulators informed accordingly.

3.9 Construction Workers

It is recommended that construction personnel involved with direct contact with the soils at the site use appropriate PPE equipment (i.e. gloves and overalls) together with welfare facilities in accordance with general health and safety guidelines. The successful remediation / site works contractor should undertake a suitable Risk Assessment to confirm the appropriate level of PPE.

A copy of all reports relating to the site should be included within the Health & Safety file and site workers should be made fully aware of the sites setting.

3.10 Site Managers Site Diary

It is the responsibility of the Site Manager to keep a site diary to record the progress of remediation works. This should include, but not be limited to:

- Photographic and written records of remediation works, with specific attention paid to unforeseen circumstances.
- Records of all movements of waste materials, including consignment notes etc.

3.11 Communication

We would recommend that regular communication is maintained between GeoDyne Limited and the Site Manager throughout the development works.

3.12 Statutory Consultation

At the request of the Client, Ashwood Homes, a copy of this Remediation Method Statement shall be issued to the Local Authority EHO for review / comment and approval. The NHBC, or other warranty provider, will require written approval of the remediation proposals from the Environmental Health Department at South Holland District Council in order to satisfy their Land Quality Conditions.

3.13 Closure

Following satisfactory completion of remediation works, GeoDyne Limited will produce a Validation Report to demonstrate compliance with this RMS.

4.0 SITE ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

4.1 Site Acceptance Criteria for Hotspot Removal Works

These Site Acceptance Criteria (SAC) herein, relate specifically to the validation of the lead / TPH hotspot.

The SAC in Table 1 have been derived for a residential end-use with home grown produce (i.e. private gardens).

The following SAC are proposed for assessment of the validation laboratory test results following the removal of the soils from the hotspot area around WS01 in the northwest portion of the site:

TABLE 1 – PROPOSED SITE ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA (RESIDENTIAL END-USE WITH PLANT UPTAKE)	
Determinand	Tier 1 SAC (mg/kg)
Metals	
Lead	200 C4SL
TPH	
Aliphatics C5-C6	42 S4UL
Aliphatics C6-C8	100 S4UL
Aliphatics C8-C10	27 S4UL
Aliphatics C10-C12	130 S4UL
Aliphatics C12-C16	1100 S4UL
Aliphatics C16-C35	65000 S4UL
Aromatics C5-C7	70 S4UL
Aromatics C7-C8	130 S4UL
Aromatics C8-C10	34 S4UL
Aromatics C10-C12	74 S4UL
Aromatics C12-C16	140 S4UL
Aromatics C16-C21	260 S4UL
Aromatics C21-C35	1100 S4UL
BTEX	
Benzene	0.087 S4UL
Toluene	130 S4UL
Ethyl Benzene	47 S4UL
o-Xylene	60 S4UL
m-Xylene	59 S4UL
p-Xylene	56 S4UL
Key S4UL – CIEH/LQM Suitable 4 Use Levels (2015). Copyright Land Quality Management Limited. All rights reserved. C4SL - value for Lead taken from DEFRA publication SP1010.	
Note SAC values for metals derived from S4UL values assume 6% Soil Organic Matter. SAC values for TPH and BTEX compounds derived from S4UL values assume 1% SOM in the first instance (where appropriate, S4UL values for 2.5% or 6% SOM may be considered for the assessment of donor soils).	

4.2 Site Acceptance Criteria for Importation of Soils

These Site Acceptance Criteria (SAC) herein, relate specifically to any imported soils should this prove necessary.

It will be necessary for the Local Authority Environmental Protection Officer to review the suggested Site Acceptance Criteria (SAC) detailed in Table 2, should it become necessary to import soils (i.e. topsoil and / or subsoil, as appropriate etc).

The SAC in Table 2 have been derived for a residential end-use with home grown produce (i.e. private gardens).

The following SAC are proposed for assessment of the laboratory results relating to any topsoil and / or subsoil) which may be imported to site:

TABLE 2 – PROPOSED SITE ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA (RESIDENTIAL END-USE WITH PLANT UPTAKE)	
Determinand	Tier 1 SAC (mg/kg)
Metals	
Arsenic	37 S4UL
Cadmium	11 S4UL
Chromium III	910 S4UL
Chromium VI	6 S4UL
Lead	200 C4SL
Inorganic Mercury	40 S4UL
Selenium	250 S4UL
Nickel	130 S4UL
Copper	2400 S4UL
Zinc	3700 S4UL
PAHs	
Acenaphthene	210 S4UL
Acenaphthylene	170 S4UL
Anthracene	2400 S4UL
Benz(a)anthracene	7.2 S4UL
Benzo(a)pyrene	2.2 S4UL
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	2.6 S4UL
Benzo(ghi)perylene	320 S4UL
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	77 S4UL
Chrysene	15 S4UL
Dibenzo(ah)anthracene	0.24 S4UL
Fluoranthene	280 S4UL
Fluorene	170 S4UL
Indeno(123-cd)pyrene	27 S4UL
Naphthalene	2.3 S4UL
Phenanthrene	95 S4UL
Pyrene	620 S4UL
Asbestos	
Asbestos	Absence
Key S4UL – CIEH/LQM Suitable 4 Use Levels (2015). Copyright Land Quality Management Limited. All rights reserved. C4SL - value for Lead taken from DEFRA publication SP1010.	
Note SAC values for metals derived from S4UL values assume 6% Soil Organic Matter. SAC values for PAHs derived from S4UL values assume 1% SOM in the first instance (where appropriate, S4UL values for 2.5% or 6% SOM may be considered for the assessment of donor soils).	

Topsoil and subsoil samples should be tested at the donor site for the metals, PAHs and asbestos detailed in the above table (this may be undertaken by a Consultant under instruction from the Client or directly by the Supplier).

Please note that where donor materials are sourced from an unknown or potentially contaminated source (i.e. 'brownfield' sites) it may also be necessary to test the materials for additional determinands (i.e. speciated Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons, pesticides etc.), as well having the appropriate permits in place to allow transport of the material.

4.3 Pre-Importation Testing Methodology

In accordance with the requirements of the YALPAG document for a greenfield source, it is recommended that the donor topsoil / subsoil should be sampled and analysed at a minimum density of 1 No. sample per 250m³ or 3 No. samples per source site / stockpile (whichever is the greater) to ensure that the results are representative and provide sufficient confidence that the soils will be acceptable in the proposed residential context.

If soils are proposed to be imported from an unknown or potentially contaminated source, then an increased testing frequency of a minimum of 1 No. sample per 100m³ or 6 No. samples per source (whichever is the greater) would be necessary, along with laboratory analysis for additional determinands to those contained in Table 1 (depending upon the source).

In the first instance, the results of the testing will be compared directly to the SAC (Table 1). If the individual values are less than the SAC the source shall be considered suitable for use at the site.

If the individual values are greater than the SAC, the supervising Engineer may elect to calculate the 95th percentile Upper Confidence Level (UCL) Mean Value of the topsoil / subsoil samples, which would then be compared to the appropriate SAC to determine whether the soil is 'clean' and suitable for use at the site. Similarly, it may be appropriate to adjust the Tier 1 SAC to account for the Soil Organic Matter (SOM) before reviewing results.

Should the UCL Mean Value of the topsoil / subsoil samples be in excess of the SAC, further samples may be obtained to enlarge the dataset prior to reassessment and a final decision being reached. Alternatively, the Client may elect to reject the donor site and select an alternative donor site.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

To the best of our knowledge, this RMS has been prepared to be compliant with the requirements of South Holland District Council.

Written approval of this report should be obtained from South Holland District Council prior to implementation of the recommendations.

This RMS presents methodologies and procedures which, when implemented, are considered to be appropriate to enable the future development of the site without creating unacceptable risk to end-users.

APPENDIX I

**Plan Showing Approximate Location of Lead / TPH Hotspot
(Figure No. D40178/01D)**



KEY

X Lead / TPH Hotspot (Geo-Matters WS01)

Note: All locations are approximate

REPRODUCED FROM THE ANDREW M WRIGHT LTD DWG TITLED 'PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT', DWG NO. PD02, DATED SEPTEMBER 2019; USED, EDITED AND REPRODUCED WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CLIENT

Project No.	D40178	Title	Plan Showing Approximate Location of Lead / TPH Hotspot	Drawn	SS	
Client	Ashwood Homes			Checked	PK	
Project	Locksmill Farm Spalding	Date Drawn	26/05/2021	Approved	PK	
		Scale	NTS			
		Revision				
				Figure No.	D40178/01D	

APPENDIX II
Conditions & Limitations

Conditions & Limitations

Phase I Desk Studies

1. Works undertaken to provide the basis of the Phase I Desk Study report comprise a review of information available from a number of sources/parties (potentially also including the Client) together with a walk over of the site (where applicable and included within the quotation). The opinions given in the Phase I Desk Study are based on the information available from third parties/sources that has been obtained within the available timeframe. GeoDyne Limited assumes all third party information to be true and correct and therefore cannot accept liability for the accuracy of such information supplied.
2. Should additional information become available that may affect the comments and opinions made within the Phase I Desk Study, GeoDyne Limited reserves the right to review such information and make modifications to comments/opinions as appropriate.
3. It should be borne in mind that a Phase I Desk Study collates available information to generate a conceptual model of the site. The actual geotechnical and environmental considerations can only be fully quantified by intrusive investigation works to confirm the accuracy of the conceptual site model.

Phase II Intrusive Investigations

1. Our quotation assumes that access to the site will be arranged by others at no cost to ourselves.
2. We have assumed that free access is available throughout to the entire site and that works can be undertaken during a single mobilisation. Where restricted access is encountered, or where additional unscheduled mobilisations are required, additional costs may be incurred to the client.
3. We have assumed that all available information relating to buried services will be supplied by the Client at no cost to ourselves. No responsibility will be accepted for damage to underground services that have not been brought to our prior attention by the Client.
4. All excavations/boreholes will be backfilled with compacted arisings upon completion, with any excess arisings left proud of ground levels. Excess arisings will not be removed from the site unless specifically requested by the Client. Where we are requested to remove excess arisings, all associated costs will be passed to the Client.
5. We will attempt to leave the site in a clean and tidy state, however, it must be understood that some disturbance of the site is unavoidable during intrusive works.
6. Exploratory holes are positioned approximately on site by GeoDyne Limited. Should the client require precise locations of all exploratory points, additional fees will be incurred. It must be borne in mind that backfilled trial pits can create 'soft spots', therefore, should the Client wish to designate 'no dig' zones, for example under the footprint of proposed structures, these must be brought to our attention prior to commencement of works.
7. Groundwater observations relate to conditions encountered at the time of investigation. It must be understood that groundwater levels may vary as a result of recent climatic conditions or seasonal variation.
8. Trial pits and boreholes examine only a small proportion of the total site area. No liability can be accepted for conditions not revealed in exploratory holes, particularly between positions. All extrapolations of available data are given in good faith.

Payment

1. Payment terms are strictly 28 days from the invoice date.
2. Prior to commencement of works, we require receipt of formal written instruction from the party accepting full financial responsibility for the work. In the absence of such an instruction, we would expect the instructing Consulting Engineers/Architects to accept full financial responsibility for the works.
3. Receipt of instruction to commence work shall be taken as acceptance and compliance of the foregoing conditions.

Liability

1. GeoDyne Limited offer £5,000,000.00 Professional Indemnity Insurance (in aggregate over the year). This shall be the limit of our liability for works undertaken. No individual liability shall be implied to, or accepted by, any employee for works undertaken for and on the behalf of GeoDyne Limited.