MARTIN
ENVIRONMENTAL
SOLUTIONS LTD

Contaminated Land Phase One Desk Study for proposed ground floor extension at 108 Higher Road, Longridge, Preston, PR3 3SY.

Prepared for

Go Property Land Ltd,
108 Higher Road,
Longridge,
PR3 3SY.

November 2026

Summary

This report consists of a phase one contaminated land desk study produced in support of a planning application for the erection of a ground floor extension at 108 Higher Rd, Longridge, Preston PR3 3SY.

Following the site walkover and review of the available information it has been concluded that there is no contamination on or off site, which is likely to pose a significant risk of significant harm to the development site or identified receptors and as such the site is considered to be safe and suitable for the intended use.

The report further recommends that a watching brief is maintained throughout the construction works and any signs of potential contamination found are fully investigated, with appropriate remedial action taken as necessary.

Contents

Summary 2
Introduction 4
Aims and Objectives of the report 4
Scope of works 4
The Site: 5
Current Site use: 5
Research 5
Details of Research 5
Site History 6
Regulatory Information 7
Geology and Hydrogeology 8
Hydrology 9
Environmental Sensitivity 9
Site Walkover 10
Conclusions 11
Potential Contaminants 11
Receptors and Pathways 11
Conceptual Model 13
Recommendations 14
Figure 1 – Aerial Photograph 15
Appendix 1 – Groundsure Data 16
Appendix 2 – Historical Mapping 17
Appendix 3 – Site Walkover Photographs North side of the site 18
Appendix 4 – Conceptual Model Risk Assessment 26
Appendix 5 Report limitations and exclusions 30
Basis of Risk Assessment 30
Limitations and Exceptions of this Report 30

Introduction

Martin Environmental Solutions has been commissioned to carry out a phase one contaminated land desk study report in relation to a proposed development of a ground floor extension at 108 Higher Rd, Longridge, Preston PR3 3SY.

Aims and Objectives of the report

The aims and objectives of this report are as follows:

- Assess the likelihood of contamination affecting the site,
- Identify any likely receptors to be affected by the potential contamination,
- Identify the pathways by which the receptors will be exposed to any potential contamination,
- Identify any areas where further investigation will be required.

Scope of works

This report has been written in line with BS 10175: 2026 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites – Code of Practice' and Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM).

The scope of this report covers the phase one desk study only. It will look at relevant information on: -

- the history of the site and surrounding area,
- the current use of the site and surrounding area,
- the geology and hydrogeology of the area.

A site walk-over survey has been undertaken in addition to consultations with the existing site owner, to identify any potential contamination issues.

Evaluation of the above information will be used to construct an initial conceptual model as appropriate, with the identification of any additional investigations that may be required.

The Site:

Site Address: 108 Higher Rd, Longridge, Preston PR3 3SY

Grid reference: 361169; 437764

An aerial photograph of the site is included in Figure 1.

Current Site use:

The site currently consists of a single storey bungalow of conventional construction. There is an asphalt driveway through the centre of the site. Higher Road lies to the west, and Ridge Court to the east. The garden is raised above Higher Road and is contained by a short brick-built wall.

Research

Details of Research

This report has been based on information gathered from a number of reputable sources, covering details:

- on the historic and current use of the site,
- any known waste disposal activities in the area,
- any regulated industrial activities within the vicinity of the site including recorded industrial accidents,
- on the geology, hydrogeology, hydrology of the area,
- identification of any environmentally sensitive sites,
- any natural hazards.

Principal sources of this information have been:

- environmental data from Groundsure Limited
- the Local Planning Authority,
- historic maps (Groundsure Ltd),
- site walk-over survey and discussion with the current owners.

Site History

Information on the historic uses of the site has been obtained from historic mapping information (Appendix 2), and environmental data from Groundsure Limited.

Mapping Year	Changes on Site	Changes off Site
1846-47	The site lies to the side of Tootle Height Quarry.	A reservoir is located 500m northeast of the site, still present today. A sandstone quarry is located ~30m to the northeast. There is a smithy located in this quarry. The area is predominantly agricultural.
1892	A building is located on the east side of the site.	The quarry is now much larger. There is another quarry 400m to the north and a smithy is located on that site. The reservoir to the northeast is Dilworth reservoir. A tan yard is located 200m to the southeast. A cotton mill is located 500m west. A pond is located ~15m southeast.
1910-12	The building has been removed	No Significant changes. A tunnel is located ~10m from the site. The smithies are no longer present.
1932	No Change	Some quarries are shown as overgrown with trees.
1951	No Change	Spade mill reservoir has been extended.
1967-69	A building is located on the site	A refuse tip is located ~120m to the northwest. The surrounding quarries are marked as disused.
1975-79	No Change	The refuse tip has been removed and replaced with a field. The tunnel has also been removed/decommissioned. The pond next to the site has been removed and houses have been built where it was located. The caravan park is now present.
1988-90	No Change	The caravan park is now present. A large circular tank is located 250m to the northeast of the site.
1991-94	No Change	No Significant changes.
2001-03	No Change	No Significant changes. The cotton mill has been replaced with houses.
2010	No Change	The caravan site is clearly shown with lodges present.
2025	No Change	No Significant changes.
Aerial photos	No Changes Shown	No Significant changes.

Regulatory Information

Relevant information obtained from the Groundsure report (Appendix 1) is summarised below.

No permitted activities that have been identified within 500m of the site as defined in the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 or previous legislation.

Only one pollution incident has been identified in the surrounding area, locates 321m northeast of the site in July 2023. It involved slurry and had a significant impact on the water environment.

Three discharge consents have been reported; one is located 395m northeast of the site, and two located 406m northwest of the site. All three were linked to the water company and revoked between 2008 and 2018. The above identified sites are unlikely to impact the development site given the age and locations.

One active landfill site record has been found in the area, located 273m north at Lords Delph Quarry operated by William Pye and taking non-biodegradable waste. Two Historic landfill records are identified: 121m southeast at Tan Yard, Old Tan Lane, and 172m east at Hollins Hall Farm, Tan Yard Lane.

The site at Tan Yard, Old Tan Lane, although no dates are provided in the purchased information, it appears to be located immediately adjacent to and under a property that has been present since 1890's. The adjacent yard area to the south is overgrown with mature trees. No other signs of fill have been identified from historic aerial images. The area is very small – 22m diameter and given the area, topography and geology unlikely to be capable of producing any significant ground gas to impact on the site.

The site at Hollins Hall Farm, Tan Yard Lane is larger, and dates to 1993, and was filled with inert and household waste. The company holding the license is a construction company, with one of the directors once living at Tan Yard Lane. The waste is therefore more likely to be inert construction waste than anything putrescible.

Furthermore, between this site and 108 Higher Road there is a deep valley. Therefore, any ground gas produced would have to sink and travel through the hard sandstone, under the valley and nearby quarry floors and then rise again to impact the development site. The area above and surrounding the infilled land is soft and therefore presents a more realistic emission path for any gas generated. It is therefore highly unlikely that even if landfill gases were produced, they could travel and impact

on the site, and therefore is considered not to present a significant risk to the development site.

Seven waste exemptions have been identified at two sites: The nearest at 110, Higher Road(Beacon Fell View Caravan Park) include burning waste as a fuel and burning waste at a port. In addition, exemptions are held at Billingtons Farm, Mile Lane covering the depositing dredging waste, burning waste in the open, use of waste in construction and depositing plant-based agricultural waste.

The only current potentially contaminative sites identified in the area are two electrical sub-stations, located 201m west of the site, and 228m southwest of the site. This is unlikely to impact on the site.

Historical potentially contaminative land uses have been identified within 250m of the site from the purchased information; most of these have been identified from the historical mapping and include:

The various quarries and railway facilities, the nearest being 3m away.

Three smithies, one 18m northeast, one 219m northeast and one 249m northeast.

A tunnel, located ~7m northeast of the site.

Geology and Hydrogeology

Information from the British Geology Survey 1:50,000 mapping identifies the bedrock in the area as Pendle Grit Member – Sandstone, overlaid by Till, Devensian, Diamicton. There are no inferred faults within the bedrock.

The information obtained on the hydrogeology of the area identifies the site as having a Secondary A aquifer in the bedrock capable of supporting water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale, and in some cases forming an important source of base flow to rivers, with a secondary undifferentiated aquifer in the superficial layer.

Six groundwater abstraction licenses have been identified, the nearest is 1245m southwest of the site at Singleton Diary. The only other active site is at Longridge Golf Course, located 1805m northeast.

Four historic surface water abstraction licenses are identified, all were located 1939m northeast, at Longridge Golf Club.

The site is not located within a Source Protection Zone.

The Groundwater vulnerability is described as low on the surface and medium in the superficial and bedrock layer.

The site is not located on any superficial layers.

Hydrology

The nearest watercourse is located 127m north of the site running north.

The site is not within a floodplain, and the risk of flooding is classified as negligible.

Environmental Sensitivity

The only environmental sensitive sites identified are the College Wood ancient woodlands located 927m south, with additional ancient woodlands further away.

The property is in an area identified as having less than 1% of properties above the action level of 200 Becquerel's per cubic metre, based on specific property search. Radon protection measures are not required in line with BR211.

No additional natural hazards have been identified & the site has very low/negligible risk of shrink swell, running sand, and compressible ground.

There are no Coal mining activities identified in the area, but the historic sandstone quarries are recorded.

Site Walkover

A site walkover was undertaken on the 22nd October 2026 and confirmed much of what had already been identified from the information obtained on the site. The photographs in Appendix 3 provide some indication of the current layout and condition of the site.

The site is accessed from Ridge Court, which itself is accessible from Higher Road. There is no direct access to the site from the main road due to the elevation difference.

The main building on the site is located on the south side of the site. To the north is a decorative, sloped garden, and there is an asphalt driveway running through the centre. The land surrounding the building is mostly grassed, with some areas being paved with stone flags.

The building is a conventionally built bungalow, with rendered walls. It features a conventional tiled roof, which contains no dormers or skylights.

To the north of the site is a disused railway tunnel. This has been blocked off but not significantly filled. Northeast of the site lies a disused quarry, which has been converted into a caravan park. The topology of the park suggests that there was no significant fill when it was converted. Additionally, to the southeast of the site was a small pond that has since been built upon, which suggests no significant fill.

No signs of contamination, discoloration or olfactory evidence, dead or dying vegetation were seen during the walkover.

The current owners are unaware of any issues on site which could have led to contamination.

Conclusions

Potential Contaminants

Following a review of the information gathered on the history of the site and the surrounding area and following the site walkover, no contamination has been identified on or off site that is likely to pose a significant possibility of significant harm to the identified receptors.

Historical landfills identified are, for the reasons given above, not considered to pose any significant risk to the development site.

Receptors and Pathways

Potential receptors which may be affected by any unknown contamination on site will include:

- Construction workers who are likely to be affected by any potential contamination as they will initially be working in the ground and are likely to be the ones who unearth any potential contaminants.
- Future users of the site, including residents, staff and visitors to the site. For the purpose of evaluating any effects from any contamination found during any intrusive investigation future users/visitors to the site should be regarded as the 0-6-year-old female child.
- Any building on site e.g., foundations which may be attacked by any contaminants in the ground or services.
- The underlying groundwater which may be contaminated by migrating pollutants present on the site. There is also the potential for further pollution of the groundwater or the watercourse from disturbing any potential contaminants on site.

The pathways by which these receptors may be exposed to any unforeseen potential contamination will include:

Construction workers

- Inhalation, of gases or vapours released during ground work or fine particles.

- Ingestion of the contaminants, principally from cross contamination with contaminated soil and inadequate hand washing before smoking and eating.
- Absorption through the skin following contact with contaminated soil.

Future users and visitors

- Inhalation of gas/vapours or fibres, particularly if these are allowed to enter the new structures through the ground and build up in an enclosed area.
- Ingestion of contaminants, through the ingestion of contaminated soil from the garden area via direct contact, e.g., playing in the garden.
- Absorption of contaminants from dermal contact with contaminated soil.

Buildings

Contaminants on site have the potential to affect the foundations to the new building or the services supplying it.

Watercourses

As discussed above, if they exist on site, there is a potential for any contaminants to migrate through the ground into the groundwater and aquifer or via run-off into the watercourse.

Neighbouring sites

If present on site contaminants have the potential to migrate to neighbouring sites through ground water or air blown transfer.

Conceptual Model

The table represents a basic conceptual model. It highlights the potential sources of pollutants identified from the gathered information, and potential pathways in which any contaminants could reach the identified receptors.

Pathway	Description	Identified sources	Receptor at risk	Probability	Consequence	Risk
1	Run off and seepage into groundwater from any spillages	N/A	Watercourse/ Environment	Unlikely	Mild	Very Low
2	Migration of gases into the building.	Historical Landfill	Future users	Unlikely	Medium	Low
3	Inhalation of gases/ vapours outside	Historical Landfill	Construction workers/future users	Unlikely	Mild	Very Low
4	Inhalation of fine particles	N/A	Construction workers/future users	Unlikely	Medium	Low
5	Direct ingestion of contaminated soil	N/A	Construction workers	Unlikely	Medium	Low
6	In-direct ingestion of contaminated soil	N/A	Future users	Unlikely	Medium	Low
7	Absorption via direct dermal contact with contaminated soil	N/A	Construction workers/future users	Unlikely	Mild	Very low

		CONSEQUENCE			
		Severe	Medium	Mild	Minor
PROBABILITY	High Likelihood	Very High Risk	High Risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk
	Likely	High Risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk
	Low Likelihood	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk	Very low Risk
	Unlikely	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk	Very low Risk	Very low Risk

Recommendations

As a result of the investigation into the historical use of the site and surrounding area no sources of contamination have been identified on or off site which present a significant possibility of significant harm to any of the identified receptors, the site is therefore considered to be suitable for the intended use.

It is further recommended that a watching brief is maintained throughout the construction of the building works and any signs of potential contamination found are fully investigated, with appropriate remedial action taken as necessary and the local planning authority informed of the findings.

Figure 1 – Aerial Photograph



Appendix 1 – Groundsure Data

See Appendix 1, attached separately

Appendix 2 – Historical Mapping

See Appendix 2A.pdf and Appendix 2B.pdf, attached separately

Appendix 3 – Site Walkover Photographs

North side of the site





Eastern side of the site, looking north, then south, then west







Western side of the site, looking from the main road, then from the grassed area











Other pictures from the site





The tunnel





The caravan park



Appendix 4 – Conceptual Model Risk Assessment

A Preliminary Risk Assessment is usually undertaken as part of a desk study, outlines potential risks posed by potential contamination to all receptors by defining plausible “pollution linkages” and developing a preliminary conceptual model (PCM).

The purpose of this model is to define all possible complete pollution linkages, where the requisite source – pathway – target elements are present, and these elements being defined as:

- a contaminant (source) is a hazardous substance or agent, present at levels that have the potential to cause harm or damage a receptor
- a pathway is the means by or through which a contaminant comes into contact with, or otherwise affects, the receptor
- a receptor (target) is an entity (human being, aquatic environment, flora and fauna etc) that is vulnerable to the adverse effects of the contaminant

This relationship is termed a “pollution linkage”. It should be recognised that for a health or environmental risk to exist, all three elements of the relationship or linkage must be present, i.e.

- if there is no contaminant, or contaminant present at levels below those considered to be harmful or damaging to a receptor, then there can be no adverse effect on a receptor
- if there is no receptor present that can be adversely affected by a contaminant, no harm or damage can arise
- even where both a contaminant and a receptor are present, no harm or damage will occur if there is no pathway by or through which a linkage between the two can be established

The absence of one or more of each component (source, pathway, receptor) would prevent a pollutant linkage being established and there would be no significant environmental risk.

Consequence of Risk

CLASSIFICATION	DEFINITION	EXAMPLES
Severe	Highly elevated concentrations likely to result in "significant harm" to human health as defined by the EPA 1990, Part 2A, if exposure occurs. Equivalent to EA Category 1 pollution incident including persistent and/or extensive effects on water quality; leading to closure of a potable abstraction point; major impact on amenity value or major damage to agriculture or commerce. Short term risk of pollution of sensitive (H1/H2) water resource. Major damage to aquatic or other ecosystems, which is likely to result in a substantial adverse change in its functioning or harm to a species of special interest that endangers the long-term maintenance of the population. A short term risk to a particular ecosystem, or organism forming part of such ecosystem. Catastrophic damage to crops, buildings or property.	Significant harm to humans is defined in circular 01/2006 as death, disease, serious injury, genetic mutation, birth defects or the impairment of reproductive functions. Major fish kill in surface water from large spillage of contaminants from site. Highly elevated concentrations of List I and II substances present in groundwater close to small potable abstraction (high sensitivity). Explosion, causing building collapse (can also equate to immediate human health risk if buildings are occupied).
Medium	Elevated concentrations which could result in "significant harm" or "significant possibility of significant harm" to human health as defined by the EPA 1990, Part 2A if exposure occurs. Equivalent to EA Category 2 pollution incident including significant effect on water quality; notification required to abstractors; reduction in amenity value or significant damage to agriculture or commerce. Pollution of a highly sensitive (H1/H2) water resource. Significant damage/change to aquatic or other ecosystems, which may result in a substantial adverse change in its functioning or harm to a species of special interest that may endanger the long-term maintenance of the population. Significant damage to crops, buildings or property.	Significant harm to humans is defined in circular 01/2006 as death, disease, serious injury, genetic mutation, birth defects or the impairment of reproductive functions. Damage to building rendering it unsafe to occupy e.g. foundation damage resulting in instability. Ingress of contaminants through plastic potable water pipes.
Mild	Exposure to human health unlikely to lead to "significant harm". Equivalent to EA Category 3 pollution incident including minimal or short lived effect on water quality; marginal effect on amenity value, agriculture or commerce. Pollution of moderately sensitive (M1/M2) water resources. Minor or short lived damage to aquatic or other ecosystems, which is unlikely to result in a substantial adverse change in its functioning or harm to a species of special interest that would endanger the long-term maintenance of the population.	Exposure could lead to slight short-term effects (e.g. mild skin rash). Surface spalling of concrete.

	Significant damage to crops, buildings, structures and services ("significant harm" as defined in Circular 1/2006).	
Minor	No measurable effect on humans. Equivalent to insubstantial pollution incident with no observed effect on water quality or ecosystems. Repairable effects of damage to buildings, structures and services. Pollution of low sensitive (L1/L2) water resource. Harm, although not necessarily significant harm, which may result in a financial loss, or expenditure to resolve. Non-permanent health effects to human health (easily prevented by means such as personal protective clothing etc). Easily repairable effects of damage to buildings, structures and services.	The loss of plants in a landscaping scheme. Discoloration of concrete.

Probability of Risk Occurring

CLASSIFICATION	DEFINITION	EXAMPLES
High Likelihood	There is pollutant linkage and an event would appear very likely in the short-term and almost inevitable over the long-term, or there is evidence at the receptor of harm or pollution.	a) Elevated concentrations of toxic contaminants are present in soils in the top 0.5m in a residential garden. b) Ground/groundwater contamination could be present from chemical works, containing a number of USTs, having been in operation on the same site for over 50 years.
Likely	There is pollutant linkage and all the elements are present and in the right place which means that it is probable that an event will occur. Circumstances are such that an event is not inevitable, but possible in the short-term and likely over the long-term.	a) Elevated concentrations of toxic contaminants are present in soils at depths of 0.5-1.0m in a residential garden, or the top 0.5m in public open space. b) Ground/groundwater contamination could be present from an industrial site containing a UST present between 1970 and 1990. The tank is known to be single skin. There is no evidence of leakage although there are no records of integrity tests.
Low Likelihood	There is pollutant linkage and circumstances are possible under which an event could occur. However, it is by no means certain that even over a long period such an event would take place, and is less likely in the shorter term.	a) Elevated concentrations of toxic contaminants are present in soils at depths >1m in a residential garden, or 0.5-1.0m in public open space. b) Ground/groundwater contamination could be present on a light industrial unit constructed in the 1990s containing a UST in operation over the last 10 years – the tank is double skinned but there is no integrity testing or evidence of leakage.
Unlikely	There is pollutant linkage but circumstances are such that it is improbable that an event would occur even in the very long-term.	a) Elevated concentrations of toxic contaminants are present below hardstanding. b) Light industrial unit <10 yrs old containing a double skinned UST with annual integrity testing results available.

Calculation of Risk

		CONSEQUENCE			
		Severe	Medium	Mild	Minor
PROBABILITY	High Likelihood	Very High Risk	High Risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk
	Likely	High Risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk
	Low Likelihood	Moderate Risk	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk	Very low Risk
	Unlikely	Moderate / Low Risk	Low Risk	Very low Risk	Very low Risk

Appendix 5 Report limitations and exclusions

Basis of Risk Assessment

The methods used follow a risk-based approach with the potential risk assessed using the 'Source – pathway – receptor pollution linkage concept.

Limitations and Exceptions of this Report

This report was undertaken for at the request of Go Property Land and as such should not be entrusted to any third party without written permission of ***Martin Environmental Solutions***. No other third parties may rely upon or reproduce the contents of this report without the written permission of ***Martin Environmental Solutions***. If any unauthorised third party comes into possession of this report, they rely on it at their own risk and the authors do not owe them any duty of care or skill.

This report has been compiled from a number of sources, within the time constraints of the programme, which ***Martin Environmental Solutions*** believes to be trustworthy. However, ***Martin Environmental Solutions*** is unable to guarantee the accuracy of information provided by third parties.

The findings and opinions provided in this document are made in good faith and are based on data provided by third parties (Groundsure, Environment Agency, The Coal Authority, and Regulatory Bodies) and the report should be read in conjunction with the limitations on the document control form. The accuracy of map extracts cannot be guaranteed and it should be recognised that different conditions on /adjacent to the site may have existed between and subsequent to the various map surveys.

This report is prepared and written in the context of the purposes stated above and should not be used in a different context. Furthermore, new information, improved practices and legislation may necessitate an alteration to this report in whole or in part after its submission.

The conclusions and recommendations of this report are based on the development described, for any other development the report may require revision.

All of the comments and opinions contained in this report, including any conclusions, are based on the information obtained by ***Martin Environmental Solutions***. The conclusions

drawn by ***Martin Environmental Solutions*** could therefore differ if the information obtained is found to be misrepresentative, inaccurate, or misleading. ***Martin Environmental Solutions*** reserves the right to amend their conclusions and recommendations in the light of further information that may become available.

The report should be read in its entirety, including all associated drawings and appendices.

Martin Environmental Solutions cannot be held responsible for any misinterpretations arising from the use of extracts that are taken out of context.

This report does not comprise a geotechnical assessment of the strata underlying the site.

Any borehole data from the British Geological Survey sources is included on the following basis: 'The British Geological Survey accept no responsibility for omissions or misinterpretations of the data from their Data Bank as this may be old or obtained from non-BGS sources and may not represent current interpretation'.

The copyright in this report and other plans and documents prepared by ***Martin Environmental Solutions*** is owned by them and no such report; plan or document may be reproduced, published or adapted without their written consent.

Complete copies of this report may be made and distributed by the Client as an expedient way in dealing with matters related to its commission.

Any risks identified in a Phase I Desk Study Report are perceived risks. Actual risks can only be assessed following a physical investigation of the site.

The findings of this report are based on finite information obtained from research and consultations. Martin Environmental Solutions cannot guarantee the reliability of all such information and the searches should not be considered exhaustive. The findings of the report may need to be reviewed as any future exploratory investigations progress and in the event that additional archive information becomes available.

Notwithstanding the findings of this study (and any subsequent investigations), if any indication of contaminated soil (visual or olfactory) is encountered at any stage of the development further investigation may be required.

Arboricultural Survey and advice on arboricultural issues are considered to be outside the scope of this report except for their effect on the foundations to the proposed buildings.

Where identification of any species is made, especially invasive plants such as Japanese Knotweed, Himalayan Balsam or Giant Hogweed, this should only be considered as a preliminary assessment and subject to confirmation by a professional Arboriculturist. Martin Environmental Solutions takes no responsibility for failing to identify, or the incorrect identification of, any tree or plant species on site.

Our investigations exclude surveys to identify the presence or indeed absence of asbestos in buildings/infrastructure on site. If asbestos is suspected to be present, we recommend specialists in the identification and control / disposal of asbestos are appointed prior to commencement of any works on site or, if appropriate, purchase of the site. The presence of asbestos on site may have considerable effects on the cost / timescale in developing the site. There is good guidance in relation to Asbestos available on the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) web site.

Whilst a site walkover has been undertaken as part of this report, the survey does not constitute either an asbestos or structural survey and all areas of the site may not have been visited / inspected.