

**JTEC Environmental Ltd.**

# **Asbestos Survey for**

Hall & Woodhouse Ltd

**at**

The Huntsman  
Eridge Road  
Eridge Green  
Tunbridge Wells  
Kent  
TN3 9LE



Project Number: AS08054 - Huntsman

Printed: 18/03/2008 By: JTEC Environmental Ltd.. Using Multibase software.



# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Names and Addresses

---

Client Name:

**Hall & Woodhouse Ltd**

The Brewery  
Blandford St Mary  
Dorset  
DT11 9LS

Contact:

Phone: 01258 452141 Fax:

Instructing Party:

Contact:

Phone: Fax:

Site Full Name:

**The Huntsman**

Eridge Road  
Eridge Green  
Tunbridge Wells  
Kent  
TN3 9LE

Contact:

Phone: Fax:

Report Author:

**JTEC Environmental Ltd.**

Tansley Cottage, Shave Lane,  
Todber,  
Sturminster Newton,  
Dorset.  
DT10 1JA

Contact: John Chilvers  
Surveyor

Phone: 01258 821398 Fax: 01258 821398

<i>JTEC Environmental Ltd.</i>	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
	<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
	<b>Page:</b>	Page 1 of 1

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1	Site Description
SECTION 2	Survey Drawings
SECTION 3	Survey Objectives
SECTION 4	Survey Techniques
SECTION 5	Survey Caveat
SECTION 6	Survey Notes
SECTION 7	Survey Summary
SECTION 8	Survey Recommendations
SECTION 9	Material Assessment: Summary by Area
SECTION 10	Material Assessment (Photo)
SECTION 11	Pie Charts
SECTION 12	Priority Assessment: Summary by Area
SECTION 13	Priority Assessment (Photo)

# SECTION ONE

## SITE DESCRIPTION

# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Site Description

---

### General Information:

This building is estimated to be c.100-150 years old. It is of brick construction. The last known major refurbishment took place approximately 20 years ago and a minor works project was carried out recently.

---


Area	Comments	Accessed
Main building	No samples taken, asbestos materials presumed present.	Yes

---

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman. Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Site Description:</b>	Page 1 of 1

# SECTION TWO

## SURVEY DRAWINGS



Description of Drawing:  
Site layout

# SECTION THREE

## SURVEY OBJECTIVES



# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Survey Objectives

---

- 1 Produce a report, in a database format, indicating areas containing identified and suspected asbestos based materials, including photographic records of asbestos occurrences where possible.
- 2 To carry out a survey to ascertain the presence of asbestos based materials.
- 3 To include a risk assessment for each individual Sample.

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Survey Objectives:</b>	Page 1 of 1

# SECTION FOUR

## SURVEY TECHNIQUE

# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Survey Technique

---

- 1 Materials of a similar type were only occasionally sampled and it was assumed that other surfaces identical to where the sample was taken, was of a similar composition.
- 2 Photographs were taken at all of the sample locations (unless otherwise stated).
- 3 Samples were returned to the Main Laboratory for analysis.
- 4 Asbestos Bulk Sample Analysis is conducted by using Polarised Light and Dispersion Staining Techniques. Dispersion Staining is used to describe the colour effects produced when a transparent colourless particle or fibre is immersed in a liquid having a refractive index near to that of the particle or fibre, and is viewed under a microscope using transmitted white light (based on HSE Publication MDHS 77).

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Survey Technique:</b>	Page 1 of 1

# SECTION FIVE

## SURVEY CAVEAT

# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Survey Caveat

---

- 1 This report is based upon a non-destructive inspection of an unfamiliar site. During the course of the survey all reasonable efforts were made to identify the physical presence of materials containing asbestos within the areas of the building which are subject to future refurbishment works. It is known that asbestos materials are frequently concealed within the fabric of buildings or within sealed building voids so that it is not possible to regard the findings of any survey as being definitive. It must always remain a possibility that further asbestos containing materials may be found during refurbishment or demolition activities. For reasons set out in this report, the results cannot give an assurance that all asbestos materials have been found and must not be thought to do so. The nature of the survey was a non-destructive inspection at key locations of accessible voids and areas. From the evidence of the inspections and of the sampling and analysis undertaken, it is clear that asbestos containing materials are either present or within or associated with various areas as detailed in the report. We recommend that samples be taken of suspect materials which may be uncovered within the listed areas or within the areas of the site which were not included in this survey.
- 2 From mid 2005, sample analysing laboratories do not provide information on the amounts of asbestos fibre present within materials as their UKAS or equivalent accreditation does not permit this. Therefore any reference to the concentrations of fibres that appear in any survey report are only approximations and are intended for guidance only.

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Survey Caveat:</b>	Page 1 of 1

# SECTION SIX

## SURVEY NOTES

# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Survey Notes

---

- 1 Whilst every effort was made to locate the ceiling panels, wall partitions and other panels, which may have been constructed from asbestos boarding, none other than those detailed were found. Some may have been missed due to repairs, alterations etc, where false and other finishes have been applied or where different specifications (including a possible mixture of asbestos and non-asbestos) panels have been used in the same area. Only by sampling each panel would the composition of all the materials be known. This was clearly not practical in terms of cost or time.
- 2 No air monitoring was carried out whilst the survey was undertaken and therefore care was taken not to cause disturbance of fibre or contamination of clean surfaces.
- 3 This report has been written with reference to the various Guidance Notes etc, issued, and current at the date of this report and describes circumstances at the site on the date the investigation took place.
- 4 Where similar items exist in the building, only one or two samples have been taken to ascertain the material content. It was assumed that similar products were of the same material. Only random sampling was carried out.
- 5 Any person undertaking work within the buildings should be told of the presence of asbestos. This briefing also applies to any other person associated with the site, including staff, sub-contractors and others.
- 6 The diagrams in the report are not to scale and are illustrative only to indicate approximate locations. The descriptions used are for location identification purposes
- 7 All the recommendations described in this report are based upon assumptions made after consideration of the type of material, condition of the material, its location, analysis result and type of use the area is thought to be subjected to. However, statutory authorities or others, could require amendments based on local knowledge, change in legislation, change in use or indeed, other conditions of criteria.
- 8 Equipment, machinery, ducting etc were not moved, opened up or examined for the purpose of this investigation except in the odd occasion where hatches were available.
- 9 It should be presumed that any firedoors contain asbestos unless otherwise indicated. It should also be presumed that structural firebreaks exist in the vicinity of a firedoor which are also likely to contain asbestos unless otherwise indicated.  
In the event of damage or exposure of fireproof material within any fire door, separate samples should be taken and identified accordingly.

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Survey Notes:</b>	Page 1 of 1

# SECTION SEVEN

## SURVEY SUMMARY



# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Survey Summary

---

- 1 For positive identification of asbestos bearing materials please refer to the individual sample data sheets.
- 2 Due to the nature of usage of the buildings surveyed, sampling was restricted / limited in certain areas for both health and safety reasons and food hygiene reasons. Consequently where items are reported as suspected asbestos materials, these items should be treated as such until otherwise identified.
- 3 All sample reference numbers and photograph reference numbers have been annotated on the accompanying plans, whether asbestos materials or not. This is for clarification where non-asbestos materials may be difficult to identify. However it must be stressed that if during refurbishment / maintenance work a suspect material is identified which is not included in this register, disturbance should be stopped prior to identification.
- 4 This register has been compiled so as to allow information to be updated with relative ease. Any work involving the removal of asbestos materials identified within this register should be recorded and the information updated accordingly.
- 5 Although work with asbestos cement does not necessarily require a licensed contractor it is recommended that all work involving the disturbance of any asbestos material is undertaken using contractors licensed by the HSE. Although asbestos cement is a relatively low risk material, it must not be interfered with in any way; e.g. cutting, drilling etc. as this may lead to raised airborne fibre levels. Where possible / practicable asbestos cement materials should be labelled appropriately. If asbestos cement materials are damaged or in areas where abrasion is likely, they should be encapsulated or removed.
- 6 All Asbestos Insulation Board should be encapsulated and labelled. Where insulation board is likely to sustain damage it should be removed. All work involving the disturbance of Asbestos insulation board must be undertaken by a licensed contractor, this includes drilling, cutting, encapsulating etc. Where debris has been identified, access to the area should be restricted prior to decontamination or removal.

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Survey Summary:</b>	Page 1 of 1

# SECTION EIGHT

## SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS

## Survey Recommendations

---

### 1 Material Assessment and Algorithm

The material assessment is an assessment of the condition of the ACM, or the presumed ACM, and the likelihood of it releasing fibres in the event of it being disturbed in some way. This material assessment will give a good initial guide to the priority for management, as it will identify the materials, which will most readily release airborne fibres if disturbed. However, there are other factors to take into account when prioritising action.

MDHS100 recommends the use of an algorithm to carry out the material assessment, and contains an example. The algorithm is a numerical way of taking into account several influencing factors, giving each factor considered a score. These scores can then be totaled to give a material assessment score. The use of algorithms is not infallible, but the assessment process is clear for all to see, so if discrepancies arise, it should be possible to track back through the assessment process to find the root of the error. The algorithm shown in MDHS100 considers four parameters that determine the risk from ACM: that is the ability to release fibres if disturbed. These four parameters are:

Product type;  
Extent of damage;  
Surface treatment; and  
Asbestos type

Each of the parameters is scored and added to give a total score between 2 and 12:

Materials with scores of 10 or more should be regarded as high risk with a significant potential to release fibres if disturbed;

Those with a score between 7 and 9 are regarded as medium risk;

Materials with a score between 5 and 6 are low risk; and

Scores of 4 or less are very low risk.

NADIS indicates a sample that having been analysed at the laboratory shows no sign of asbestos fibres being present within the sample (No Asbestos Discovered In Sample).

### PRIORITY ASSESSMENT AND ALGORITHM

The material assessment identifies the high-risk materials, that is, those which will most readily release airborne fibres if disturbed. It does not automatically follow that those materials assigned the highest score in the material assessment will be the materials that should be given priority for remedial action. Management priority must be determined by carrying out a risk assessment which will also take into account factors such as:

Maintenance activity;  
Occupant activity;  
Likelihood of disturbance;  
Human exposure potential.

THE RISK ASSESSMENT INCLUDES A MATERIAL ASSESSMENT AND A PRIORITY ASSESSMENT.

THE MATERIAL ASSESSMENT LOOKS AT THE TYPE AND CONDITION OF THE ACM AND THE EASE

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Recommendation:</b>	Page 1 of 3

## Survey Recommendations

---

WITH WHICH IT WILL RELEASE FIBRES IF DISTURBED.

THE PRIORITY ASSESSMENT LOOKS AT THE LIKELIHOOD OF SOMEONE DISTURBING THE ACM.

The risk assessment can only be carried out with detailed knowledge of all the above. Although a surveyor may have some of the information which will contribute to the risk assessment and may be part of an assessment team, you, as the duty holder under the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2006, are required to make the risk assessment, using the information given in the survey report and your detailed knowledge of the activities carried out within your premises. The risk assessment will form the basis of the management plan, so it is important that it is accurate.

### MAINTENANCE ACTIVITY

The first and most important factor which must be taken into consideration is the level of maintenance activity likely to be taking place in an area. Maintenance trades such as plumbers and electricians are the group who the duty to manage is primarily trying to protect. There are two types of maintenance activity, planned and unplanned. Planned work can be assessed and carried out using procedures and controls to reduce exposure to asbestos. Unplanned work requires the situation to be dealt with as found and the controls that can be applied may be more limited. The frequency of maintenance activities also need to be taken into account in deciding what management action is appropriate.

### OCCUPANT ACTIVITY

The activities carried out in an area will have an impact on the risk assessment. When carrying out a risk assessment the main type of use of an area and the activities taking place within it should be taken into account. For example a little used storeroom or an attic will rarely be accessed and so any asbestos is unlikely to be disturbed. At the other end of the scale, in a warehouse lined with asbestos insulating board panels, with frequent vehicular movements, the potential for disturbance of ACMs is reasonably high and this would be a significant factor in the risk assessment. As well as the normal everyday activities taking place in an area, any secondary activities will need to be taken into account.

### LIKELIHOOD OF DISTURBANCE

The two factors that will determine the likelihood of disturbance are the extent or amount of the ACM and its accessibility/vulnerability. For example, asbestos soffits outdoors are generally inaccessible without the use of ladders or scaffolding, are unlikely to be disturbed. The asbestos cement roof of a hospital ward is also unlikely to be disturbed, but its extent would need to be taken into account in any risk assessment. However if the same ward had asbestos panels on the walls they would be much more likely to be disturbed by trolley/bed movements.

### HUMAN EXPOSURE POTENTIAL

The human exposure potential depends on three factors: the number of occupants of an area, the frequency of use of the area, and the average time each area is in use. For example, a school boiler room is likely to be unoccupied, but may be visited daily for a few minutes. The potential for exposure is much less than say in a classroom lined with asbestos insulating board panelling, which is occupied daily for six hours by 30 pupils and a teacher.

### PRIORITY ASSESSMENT ALGORITHMS

Taking all these factors into account in a logical, consistent manner is difficult. Using an algorithm will help you to produce priority assessments that have taken the factors into account in a consistent way. The number of factors relevant at any one site needs to be carefully considered, as the more factors included in an

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Recommendation:</b>	Page 2 of 3

## Survey Recommendations

---

algorithm, the lower the influence of the most important risk factors becomes, and this may produce anomalies. For this reason it is recommended that the number of factors that are scored is limited to four, the same as the number of factors in the material assessment. There is no single set of factors that can be recommended that will apply equally to all types of premises. Therefore four general headings have been used and one or more factors can be taken into account and averaged under each heading to suit the circumstances. If you choose to use more than one factor under a general heading, then average the scores under that heading, rounding up where necessary.

The scores from the material assessment (i.e. the condition of the ACM or presumed ACM) are added to the scores of the priority assessment (the likelihood of disturbance), to give the overall risk assessment. Risk assessment scores for different ACMs can then be compared to develop your action plan. In many circumstances the scores will be similar, making decisions more difficult. For example a boiler house with asbestos pipe work insulation in poor condition may get the same or similar risk assessment score to an office with asbestos insulating board in reasonably good condition. This is simply because the ACM in the boiler house received a higher score than the ACM in the office because the ACM in the boiler house was in poor condition. However, the priority assessment for the office will get a higher score than the boiler house since the office is occupied more often. Add the scores together for the material and priority assessments, and you get similar scores. If this is the case then you may decide that the office needs doing first because it is used daily. On the other hand you may decide that the poor condition of the ACM in the boiler house means that it should be done first. If the office was a classroom, the young age of the occupants may be a deciding factor. Algorithms are provided to help you, but they are best guesses and will often require you to make your own additional judgements.

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Recommendation:</b>	Page 3 of 3

# SECTION NINE

## MATERIAL ASSESSMENT: SUMMARY BY AREA

# Material Assessment: Summary by Area

Site Name: 

The Huntsman
--------------

  
Project Number: 

AS08054 - Huntsman
--------------------

**Area:** Not Applicable

Sample Date	Location Ref	Location ID	Drawing Reference	Floor	Room	Asbestos Type	Product Name	Material Risk Score	Material Risk Band	Priority Risk Score	Comments	Action	Survey Type
23/01/08	2	9371	2	Ground floor	Bar area	Amosite	Beam cladding	5	Low Risk	5		Apply Warning Labels	T 2
23/01/08	1	9370	1	Ground floor	Kitchen	Chrysotile	Boiler	3	Very Low Risk	4		Apply Warning Labels	T 2
23/01/08	3	9372	3	Ground floor	WC - mens	Amosite	Cistern / Toilet seat	4	Very Low Risk	4		Apply Warning Labels	T 2
23/01/08	4	9373	4	Roof level	External	Amosite	Soffit	5	Low Risk	1		Apply Warning Labels	T 2



# SECTION TEN

## MATERIAL ASSESSMENT (PHOTO)



# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Material Assessment Record

Site Address:

Client Name:

Project Number:

Location ID:	<input type="text" value="9370"/>	Survey Type:	<input type="text" value="T 2"/>
Location Ref:	<input type="text" value="1"/>	Product Type:	<input type="text" value="Gaskets"/>
Product:	<input type="text" value="Boiler"/>	Damage:	<input type="text" value="No visible damage"/>
Area:	<input type="text" value="Not Applicable"/>	Treatment:	<input type="text" value="Composite asbestos materials"/>
Floor:	<input type="text" value="Ground floor"/>	Asbestos Type:	<input type="text" value="Chrysotile"/>
Room:	<input type="text" value="Kitchen"/>	Identification:	<input type="text" value="Presumed"/>
Surveyor Name:	<input type="text" value="J D Chilvers"/>	Quantity:	<input type="text"/>
Drawing Ref:	<input type="text" value="1"/>	Accessibility:	<input type="text" value="Medium Accessibility"/>
Asbestos ?	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>		
Date:	<input type="text" value="23 January 2008"/>		
Next Inspection:	<input type="text" value="22 January 2009"/>		

Material Risk Score	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Material Risk Band:	<input type="text" value="Very Low Risk"/>
Priority Risk Score:	<input type="text" value="4"/>

Action:



Material Comments:

# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Material Assessment Record

Site Address:

Client Name:

Project Number:

Location ID:	<input type="text" value="9371"/>	Survey Type:	<input type="text" value="T 2"/>
Location Ref:	<input type="text" value="2"/>	Product Type:	<input type="text" value="Asbestos Insulating Board"/>
Product:	<input type="text" value="Beam cladding"/>	Damage:	<input type="text" value="No visible damage"/>
Area:	<input type="text" value="Not Applicable"/>	Treatment:	<input type="text" value="AIB painted or encapsulated"/>
Floor:	<input type="text" value="Ground floor"/>	Asbestos Type:	<input type="text" value="Amosite"/>
Room:	<input type="text" value="Bar area"/>	Identification:	<input type="text" value="Presumed"/>
Surveyor Name:	<input type="text" value="J D Chilvers"/>	Quantity:	<input type="text"/>
Drawing Ref:	<input type="text" value="2"/>	Accessibility:	<input type="text" value="Easy Accessibility"/>
Asbestos ?	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>		
Date:	<input type="text" value="23 January 2008"/>		
Next Inspection:	<input type="text" value="24 July 2008"/>		

Material Risk Score	<input type="text" value="5"/>
Material Risk Band:	<input type="text" value="Low Risk"/>
Priority Risk Score:	<input type="text" value="5"/>

Action:



Material Comments:

# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Material Assessment Record

Site Address:	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	Client Name:	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd
		Project Number:	AS08054 - Huntsman

Location ID:	9372	Survey Type:	T 2
Location Ref:	3	Product Type:	Plastics
Product:	Cistern / Toilet seat	Damage:	Low damage: Scratches or marks
Area:	Not Applicable	Treatment:	Reinforced plastics
Floor:	Ground floor	Asbestos Type:	Amosite
Room:	WC - mens	Identification:	Strongly Presumed
Surveyor Name:	J D Chivers	Quantity:	
Drawing Ref:	3	Accessibility:	Easy Accessibility
Asbestos ?	Yes		
Date:	23 January 2008		
Next Inspection:	22 January 2009		
		Material Risk Score:	4
		Material Risk Band:	Very Low Risk
		Priority Risk Score:	4
Action:	Apply Warning Labels		



Material Comments:

# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Material Assessment Record

Site Address:	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	Client Name:	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd
		Project Number:	AS08054 - Huntsman

Location ID:	9373	Survey Type:	T 2
Location Ref:	4	Product Type:	Asbestos Insulating Board
Product:	Soffit	Damage:	No visible damage
Area:	Not Applicable	Treatment:	AIB painted or encapsulated
Floor:	Roof level	Asbestos Type:	Amosite
Room:	External	Identification:	Presumed
Surveyor Name:	J D Chilvers	Quantity:	
Drawing Ref:	4	Accessibility:	Difficult Accessibility
Asbestos ?	Yes		
Date:	23 January 2008		
Next Inspection:	24 July 2008		
		Material Risk Score:	5
		Material Risk Band:	Low Risk
		Priority Risk Score:	1
Action:	Apply Warning Labels		




Material Comments:

# SECTION ELEVEN


## PIE CHARTS

## Analysis by Asbestos Type




■ Amosite     ■ Chrysotile

## Analysis by Risk Band



■ Low Risk  
■ Very Low Risk

## Analysis by Action



■ Apply Warning Labels

All charts show the latest Sample Inspection Data Only

<b>Client Name:</b>	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	<b>Project Number:</b>	AS08054 - Huntsman
		<b>Survey Date:</b>	23 January 2008
<b>Site Address:</b>	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	<b>Printed On:</b>	18 March 2008
		<b>Survey Charts:</b>	Page 1 of 1

# SECTION TWELVE

## PRIORITY ASSESSMENT: SUMMARY BY AREA

# Priority Assessment: Summary by Area

Site Name: 

The Huntsman
--------------

  
Project Number: 

AS08054 - Huntsman
--------------------

Area: Not Applicable

Sample Date	Location Ref	Location ID	Drawing Reference	Floor	Room	Comments	Normal Occupant Activity	Likelihood Of Disturbance	Human Exposure Potential	Maintenance Activity	Risk Score
23/01/08	2	9371	2	Ground floor	Bar area		1	1	2	1	5
23/01/08	1	9370	1	Ground floor	Kitchen		0	1	2	1	4
23/01/08	3	9372	3	Ground floor	WC - mens		1	1	1	1	4
23/01/08	4	9373	4	Roof level	External		0	0	0	1	1



# SECTION THIRTEEN

## PRIORITY ASSESSMENT RECORD

# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Priority Assessment Record

Site Address:	The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE	Client Name:	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd
		Project Number:	AS08054 - Huntsman

Location ID:	9370
Location Ref:	1
Product:	Boiler
Area:	Not Applicable
Floor:	Ground floor
Room:	Kitchen
Surveyor Name:	J D Chilvers
Drawing Ref:	1
Asbestos ?	Yes
Date:	23 January 2008



Priority Comments:

Priority Assessment Algorithm			
Assessment factor	Variable(s) selected	Score for each	Overall score
<b>Normal Occupant Activity:</b>			
Main type of activity in area:	Rare disturbance	0	average
Secondary activities for area:	Rare disturbance	0	0
<b>Likelihood Of Disturbance:</b>			
Location:	Rooms up to 100 m2	2	
Accessibility:	Usually inaccessible or unlikely to be disturbed	0	average
Extent/Amount:	Small items strings gaskets	0	1
<b>Human Exposure Potential:</b>			
Number of occupants:	1 to 3	1	
Frequency of use of area:	Daily	3	average
Average time area is in use:	>1 to <3 hours	1	2
<b>Maintenance Activity:</b>			
Type of maintenance activity:	Minor disturbance	0	average
Frequency of maintenance activity	<=1 per year	1	1

Total Priority Assessment Score:		4
Material Assessment Score (supplied by surveyor):	Very Low Risk	3
Total of Material and Priority Assessment Scores:		7



# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Priority Assessment Record

Site Address: <input style="width: 95%;" type="text" value="The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE"/>	Client Name: <input style="width: 95%;" type="text" value="Hall &amp; Woodhouse Ltd"/>
	Project Number: <input style="width: 95%;" type="text" value="AS08054 - Huntsman"/>

Location ID:	9371
Location Ref:	2
Product:	Beam cladding
Area:	Not Applicable
Floor:	Ground floor
Room:	Bar area
Surveyor Name:	J D Chilvers
Drawing Ref:	2
Asbestos ?	Yes
Date:	23 January 2008



Priority Comments:

Priority Assessment Algorithm			
Assessment factor	Variable(s) selected	Score for each	Overall score
<b>Normal Occupant Activity:</b>			
Main type of activity in area:	Low disturbance	1	average
Secondary activities for area:	Low disturbance	1	1
<b>Likelihood Of Disturbance:</b>			
Location:	Large rooms or well-ventilated areas	1	
Accessibility:	Usually inaccessible or unlikely to be disturbed	0	average
Extent/Amount:	<=10 m2 or <=10 m pipe run	1	1
<b>Human Exposure Potential:</b>			
Number of occupants:	>10	3	
Frequency of use of area:	Daily	3	average
Average time area is in use:	>1 to <3 hours	1	2
<b>Maintenance Activity:</b>			
Type of maintenance activity:	Minor disturbance	0	average
Frequency of maintenance activity	<=1 per year	1	1

Total Priority Assessment Score:	5
Material Assessment Score (supplied by surveyor):	Low Risk 5
Total of Material and Priority Assessment Scores:	10



# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Priority Assessment Record

Site Address: <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE</span>	Client Name: <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Hall &amp; Woodhouse Ltd</span>  Project Number: <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">AS08054 - Huntsman</span>
---	---

Location ID:	9372
Location Ref:	3
Product:	Cistern / Toilet seat
Area:	Not Applicable
Floor:	Ground floor
Room:	WC - mens
Surveyor Name:	J D Chilvers
Drawing Ref:	3
Asbestos ?	Yes
Date:	23 January 2008



Priority Comments:

Priority Assessment Algorithm	Variable(s) selected	Score for each	Overall score
<b>Normal Occupant Activity:</b>			
Main type of activity in area:	Low disturbance	1	average 1
Secondary activities for area:	Rare disturbance	0	
<b>Likelihood Of Disturbance:</b>			
Location:	Rooms up to 100 m2	2	average 1
Accessibility:	Usually inaccessible or unlikely to be disturbed	0	
Extent/Amount:	Small items strings gaskets	0	
<b>Human Exposure Potential:</b>			
Number of occupants:	1 to 3	1	average 1
Frequency of use of area:	Daily	3	
Average time area is in use:	<1 hour	0	
<b>Maintenance Activity:</b>			
Type of maintenance activity:	Minor disturbance	0	average 1
Frequency of maintenance activity	<=1 per year	1	

Total Priority Assessment Score:	4
Material Assessment Score (supplied by surveyor):	Very Low Risk 4
Total of Material and Priority Assessment Scores:	8



# JTEC Environmental Ltd.

## Priority Assessment Record

Site Address: <input style="width: 95%;" type="text" value="The Huntsman, Eridge Road, Eridge Green, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN3 9LE"/>	Client Name: <input style="width: 95%;" type="text" value="Hall &amp; Woodhouse Ltd"/>
	Project Number: <input style="width: 95%;" type="text" value="AS08054 - Huntsman"/>

Location ID:	9373
Location Ref:	4
Product:	Soffit
Area:	Not Applicable
Floor:	Roof level
Room:	External
Surveyor Name:	J D Chilvers
Drawing Ref:	4
Asbestos ?	Yes
Date:	23 January 2008



Priority Comments:

Priority Assessment Algorithm	Variable(s) selected	Score for each	Overall score
<b>Normal Occupant Activity:</b>			
Main type of activity in area:	Rare disturbance	0	average
Secondary activities for area:	Rare disturbance	0	0
<b>Likelihood Of Disturbance:</b>			
Location:	Outdoors	0	average
Accessibility:	Usually inaccessible or unlikely to be disturbed	0	
Extent/Amount:	<=10 m2 or <=10 m pipe run	1	
<b>Human Exposure Potential:</b>			
Number of occupants:	None	0	average
Frequency of use of area:	Infrequent	0	
Average time area is in use:	<1 hour	0	
<b>Maintenance Activity:</b>			
Type of maintenance activity:	Minor disturbance	0	average
Frequency of maintenance activity	<=1 per year	1	1

Total Priority Assessment Score:	1
Material Assessment Score (supplied by surveyor):	Low Risk 5
Total of Material and Priority Assessment Scores:	6

