UK Remediation Ltd

Site Condition Report

Exeter Fixed Soil Treatment Facility
October 2025

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Report No:	E7555UK.SCR.01.R1
Issue:	02
Author:	Chris Baker
(Signature):	
Project Manager/Director:	Simon Hockin
(Signature):	
Date:	17/10/2025

Issue	Status	Date	Author	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
01	ISSUE	09/07/2025	CB	SH	
02	ISSUE	17/10/2025	CB		

SITE CONDITION REPORT TEMPLATE

For full details, see H5 *SCR guide for applicants* v2.0 4 August 2008

COMPLETE SECTIONS 1-3 AND SUBMIT WITH APPLICATION

DURING THE LIFE OF THE PERMIT: MAINTAIN SECTIONS 4-7

AT SURRENDER: ADD NEW DOC REFERENCE IN 1.0; COMPLETE SECTIONS 8-10; & SUBMIT WITH YOUR SURRENDER APPLICATION.

1.0 SITE DETAILS	
Name of the applicant	UK Remediation
Activity address	Hill Barton Business Centre Clyst St. Mary Exeter EX5 1DR
National grid reference	300533: 91045. Note this report details the conditions present at the current site and the planned extension as shown on drawing E7555UK.D01

Document reference and dates for Site Condition Report at permit application and surrender	E2776UK.010 E7555UK.SCR.02

Document references for site plans (including location and boundaries)	E7555UK.D01 – Slab Area E2776UK.D.003 – Site Condition site investigation locations E7555UK.D02.R4. – Proposed site layout E7555UK.D05 – Drainage Plan E7555UK.D06 – Drainage Plan (SSW) E7555UK.D07.R1 – Treatment Cell Layout E7555UK.D10 – Groundwater Monitoring Location E7555UK.D13 – Trial Pitting Locations

Note:
In Part A of the application form you must give us details of the site's location and provide us with a site plan. We need a detailed site plan (or plans) showing:

- Site location, the area covered by the site condition report, and the location and nature of the activities and/or waste facilities on the site.
- Locations of receptors, sources of emissions/releases, and monitoring points.
- Site drainage.
- Site surfacing.

If this information is not shown on the site plan required by Part A of the application form then you should submit the additional plan or plans with this site condition report.

2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue	
Environmental setting including: • geology • hydrogeology • surface waters	The anticipated geology includes an artificial/made ground stratum (0.5mbgl). A superficial, Exmouth mudstone & sandstone formation (1.5m to 1.0m thickness) is anticipated below the made ground. This stratum is described as stiff to very stiff brown to red brown, friable, silty clay with occasional fissures, with slightly fine sandy pockets. This is underlain by a hard red sandstone solid Exmouth mudstone & sandstone formation (10m +). Historical BGS borehole logs confirm that groundwater is encountered at 3mbgl.

	The River Exe is the closest major surface water, approximately 5km west of site.
Pollution history including: • pollution incidents that may have affected land • historical land-uses and associated contaminants • any visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination • evidence of damage to pollution prevention measures	It is currently understood that there have been no pollution incidents within site. Area B & Area C are proposed extension areas of site (ref drawing E7555UK.D01) , it is also understood that there have been no pollution incidents within these areas. Historically, the site extension area (area c) formed part of Stuarts inert landfill. The site extension area was recently used as a storage area for stockpiling material from the adjacent landfill. To the east of the area an operational screening plant that is used by the landfill the wash and segregate material. The above stated historical uses have the potential to act as a source for potential heavy metals and hydrocarbon contamination of the stockpiled materials. During the site investigation (ref E7555UK.SCR.02.R1) no visual or olfactory evidence of contamination was encountered. Pollution prevention measures, such as the existing concrete slab hardstanding in the existing slab appeared in good condition on the most recent site walkover (06/05/2025), thereby preventing leachate migrating into neighbouring soils. The proposed extension in Area C is proposed to contain a concrete slab hardstanding for pollution prevention.
Evidence of historic contamination, for example, historical site investigation, assessment, remediation and verification reports (where available)	No previous phases of site investigation were undertaken relating to the area of the proposed 2025 extension (Area B & Area C – E7555UK.D01). No evidence of historical contamination was encountered during the 2020 or 2025 site investigation.
Baseline soil and groundwater reference data	25-03478, 25-03578.1 20-01199.1, 25-09545, 25-10197, 25-10959
Supporting information	As above

3.0 Permitted activities	
Permitted activities	The current site (Area A – E7555UK.D.01) is permitted under EPR/LP3939TS. Current activities include bioremediation, soil washing and mechanical screening. Within the planned 2025 extension to site, it is proposed to undertake asbestos hanpicking treatment in Area B and soil washing treatment in Area C. Treatment of asbestos contaminated soils, in Area B as shown in

	drawing E7555UK.D02.R4 – Site Layout and E7555UK.D12.R1 – Asbestos Picking Layout). It is planned that this will be permitted under a variation to the existing permit (EPR/LP3939TS).
Non-permitted activities undertaken	None.
Document references for: • plan showing activity layout; and • environmental risk assessment.	E2776UK.D01 – shows current permit boundary and proposed extension. E2776UK.D02.R4 – showing activity layout. E7555UK.D12.R1 - Asbestos Picking Layout

Note:

In Part B of the application form you must tell us about the activities that you will undertake at the site. You must also give us an environmental risk assessment. This risk assessment must be based on our guidance (*Environmental Risk Assessment - EPR H1*) or use an equivalent approach.

It is essential that you identify in your environmental risk assessment all the substances used and produced that could pollute the soil or groundwater if there were an accident, or if measures to protect land fail.

These include substances that would be classified as 'dangerous' under the Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) regulations and also raw materials, fuels, intermediates, products, wastes and effluents.

If your submitted environmental risk assessment does not adequately address the risks to soil and groundwater we may need to request further information from you or even refuse your permit application.

4.0 Changes to the activity	
Have there been any changes to the activity boundary?	Planned changes within 2025 permit variation
Have there been any changes to the permitted activities?	Planned changed within 2025 permit variation
Have any 'dangerous substances' not identified in the Application Site Condition Report been used or produced as a result of the permitted activities?	
Checklist of supporting information	Planned boundary change illustrated in E7555UK.D01 Slab Area

5.0 Measures taken to protect land	
Water treatment plant monitoring; Impermeable concrete hardstanding; Treated and untreated soil in covered (quarantined) bays to prevent wind erosion and dust spread; Sumps installed to prevent water runoff; Land disturbance limited during operations; Contaminated soil segregated from clean soil to avoid cross-contamination; Spill kits stored onsite. All onsite staff trained in their use; Environmental audits & site inspections regularly undertaken; Dust Monitoring.	
Checklist of supporting information	Inspection records and summary of findings of inspections for all pollution prevention measures Records of maintenance, repair and replacement of pollution prevention measures

6.0 Pollution incidents that may have had an impact on land, and their remediation	
Checklist of supporting information	ETF WTP Monitoring Summary – Appendix 5; CR-8-023 – Environmental Checklist (completed example) – Appendix 5; Dust Monitoring – Data_P0272_1751645353827 – Appendix 5;

7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where undertaken)

Ground Investigation 2020 (E2776UK.010)

During the 2020 ground investigation relating to the planned extension (Area B), 5 boreholes were drilled using a windowless sampling rig. A targeted representative geochemical sample was taken from the Made Ground in each borehole, as well as one from the natural ground in BH02. The investigation was undertaken in the southern area of site (Area B). Borehole locations are included in Appendix 1 (E2776UK.D.003 – Site Condition site investigation locations).

With exception of BH02 all boreholes were extended through a layer of concrete 200mm thick. The concrete had sparse 5mm rebar running through it as well as a membrane on the base. All boreholes extended through the concrete showed similar compositions.
Made Ground was encountered in all boreholes, with a similar composition and thickness across site. Beneath the concrete cap a layer of grey to dark grey sandy gravel was encountered, with numerous inclusions of crushed concrete and brick. This was ≈750mm thick across the investigated area. This unit included sandy lenses and pockets of ashy material.
Below the sandy gravelly Made Ground was a horizontally continuous Reworked brown sandy silt unit uniform across the investigated site area. This stratum contained sandier lenses, sometimes compositionally 100% sand. Throughout the unit occasional fragments of concrete and wood were encountered within the recovery. This unit was typically 2.5m thick.

Natural ground was encountered only in BH02 at a depth of 5.7mbgl, the boundary between Made Ground and natural ground was sharp. The natural ground was a firm to stiff red clay. Due to the rigs maximum extension being reached the complete unit thickness was not identified. This unit is matching the Exmouth Mudstone and Sandstone Formation superficial description.

Bedrock was not encountered in any boreholes.

It should be noted that BH05a. and BH05b both refused at 1.2mbgl, most probably due to underground obstructions associated with the adjacent building.

Groundwater was encountered in BH02 at a depth of 3mbgl. No odour was noticeable with the water.

The recovered core from BH03 became more saturated at 2.1mbgl, this was likely a pocket of perched water that contained no olfactory or physical evidence for contamination.

A sample (GW1 Water) was taken from BH02 on the 30th January 2020 following purging the borehole and allowing the water to settle. These were screened against the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) Inland Surface Waters values. Where an EQS value is not available The World Health Organisation (WHO) Drinking Water Standards were used instead, and for Selenium the Interdepartmental Committee on the Redevelopment of Contaminant Land (ICRL) 58/83 Trigger Concentrations are used.

Sample GW1 Water was obtained on 30th January 2020 following purging of the borehole and allowing the recharge to settle. The analysis (see report 20-01199) returned chemical concentrations that are below the site criteria, with Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH) being below the level of detection. This sample was taken proximally to the open water course to the north of the site, indicating no contamination run off is reaching the surface water receptor. See Table 4 for the screening analysis.

Drainage from the proposed site is contained directly into the local sewerage undertaker. There is an old drainage ditch adjacent to the west perimeter of the site. This appears to form part of the road drainage. Farringdon Brook is located to the north and the River Clyst is located to the west of the Hill Barton Business Park.

Ground investigation March 2025 (E7555UK.SCR.02)

A ground investigation commenced in March 2025 to geochemically characterise the ground conditions in the proposed extension, as illustrated in E7555UK.D01 Slab Area (Appendix 1).

During the March 2025 site investigation, seven intrusive trial pits were excavated to a maximum depth of 1.60mbgl. One borehole was drilled to 4.00mbgl using a windowless sampling rig. Trial pit locations are illustrated in drawing E7555UK.D13 – Trial Pit Locations (Appendix 1).

Made Ground was encountered in all trial pits. Firm dark reddish brown sandy gravelly clay was encountered in all trial pits to a depth of 0.75mbgl. Numerous inclusions of crushed concrete, bricks, plastic detritus, and tarmac was encountered within the stratum. A faint organic odour was encountered in TP3 (1.6mbgl) and TP6 (1.6mbgl). The water table was struck at 1.3mbgl during the excavation of TP7.

Reworked soft to firm reddish brown very sandy slightly gravelly clay was encountered at depths of 0.7mbgl – 1.6mbgl. This stratum contained sandier lenses, sometimes compositionally 100% sand (TP1 – 0.9mbgl). Occasional fragments of concrete and plastic were encountered within the clay.

During the drilling of WS01, firm reddish brown sandy gravelly clay was encountered from 0.0mgbgl to 1.10mbgl. Soft to reddish brown very sandy slightly gravelly clay was encountered from 1.10mbgl to 2.30mbgl. Firm to stiff dark brown slightly gravelly clay was encountered from 2.90mbgl to 3.75mbgl. Mercia mudstone (stiff reddish brown with occasional grey mottling slightly gravelly clay was encountered from 3.75mbgl to 4.00mgbgl. The exploratory hole was terminated at 4.00mbgl.

11 soil samples were collected from the intrusive ground investigation. Including nine from trial pits (TP1 – TP7), and two from WS01. The results were screened against the commercial generic assessment criteria. Soil for reuse criteria (S4UL) and category 4 screening levels (C4SLs), the most conservative value was used when a determinant had criteria from S4ULs and C4SLs. An exceedance of TPH Aliphatic EC12-16 (101mg/kg) was observed in TP6 (1.6mbgl). No other soil exceedances were observed. Soil laboratory results are included in Appendix 2 (ref reports 25-03478.1 and 25-03578.1)

Following development of WS01, three groundwater monitoring rounds were undertaken. The groundwater monitoring location is illustrated in drawing E7555UK.D10 – Groundwater Monitoring Location (Appendix 1). These results were screened against EQS 'Other Surface Waters' and Groundwater standards as stated in the Water Framework Directive (2015). Where an EQS or groundwater standard value is not available The World Health Organisation (WHO) Drinking Water Standards were used instead.

Following the first monitoring round, an exceedance of lead was observed (1.7µg/l), exceeding the EQS and minimum groundwater threshold value (TV). Zinc exceeded groundwater TVs in each monitoring round, measuring 34µg/l (monitoring round 1), 90µg/l (monitoring round 2), and 92µg/l (monitoring round 3). Anthracene exceeded the minimum TV groundwater standard in the first (0.09µg/l) and third (0.07µg/l) monitoring rounds. Fluoranthene exceeded the EQS in all three monitoring rounds: 0.21µg/l (monitoring round 1), 0.09µg/l (monitoring round 2), and 0.27µg/l (monitoring round 3). Benzo(a)anthracene exceeded the minimum and maximum groundwater TVs in monitoring round 1 (0.09µg/l) and 3 (0.05µg/l). Benzo(k)fluoranthene exceeded the EQS in all three monitoring rounds (0.05µg/l, 0.02µg/l, 0.05µg/l). Benzo(a)pyrene exceeded the EQS, minimum and maximum groundwater standards in all monitoring rounds (0.07µg/l, 0.06µg/l, and 0.07µg/l). Benzo(ghi)perylene exceeded the EQS in all monitoring rounds (0.05µg/l, 0.04µg/l, and 0.08µg/l). There were no total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) or BTEX (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene) exceedances in any of the monitoring rounds. Groundwater laboratory reports are included in Appendix 3 (ref reports 25-09545, 25-10197, and 25-10959).

Checklist of supporting information	Description of soil gas and/or water monitoring undertaken Monitoring results (including graphs)

8.0 Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk	
Describe how the site was decommissioned. Demonstrate that all sources of pollution risk have been removed. Describe whether the decommissioning had any impact on the land. Outline how you investigated and remedied this.	
Checklist of supporting information	Site closure plan List of potential sources of pollution risk Investigation and remediation reports (where relevant)

9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)	
Say whether you had to collect land and/or groundwater data. Or say that you didn't need to because the information from sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Surrender Site Condition Report shows that the land has not deteriorated. If you did collect land and/or groundwater reference data, summarise what this entailed, and what your data found. Say whether the data shows that the condition of the land has deteriorated, or whether the land at the site is in a "satisfactory state". If it isn't, summarise what you did to remedy this. Confirm that the land is now in a "satisfactory state" at surrender.	
Checklist of supporting information	Land and/or groundwater data collected at application (if collected) Land and/or groundwater data collected at surrender (where needed) Assessment of satisfactory state Remediation and verification reports (where undertaken)

10.0 Statement of site condition
Using the information from sections 3 to 7, give a statement about the condition of the land at the site. This should confirm that: • the permitted activities have stopped • decommissioning is complete, and the pollution risk has been removed • the land is in a satisfactory condition.