## PAYNES HEATH FARM WORCESTER

# AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION

## **DECEMBER 1998**

Resource Planning Team FRCA Worcester Western Region Job Number 83/98 MAFF Reference EL 17/10554



# PAYNES HEATH FARM WORCESTER

# AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION SURVEY

CONTENTS		Page
INTRODUCTIO	N	1
SUMMARY		2
CLIMATE		2
RELIEF		4
GEOLOGY ANI	D SOILS	4
AGRICULTURA	AL LAND CLASSIFICATION AND MAP	4
REFERENCES		
APPENDIX I	Description of the Grades and Subgrades	7
APPENDIX II	Definition of Soil Wetness Classes	9
APPENDIX III	Survey Data	10
	Sample Point Location Map	
	Pit Descriptions	
	Boring Profile Data	
	Boring Horizon Data	
	Abbreviations and Terms used in	Survey Data

#### PAYNES HEATH FARM WORCESTER

#### AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION SURVEY

#### INTRODUCTION

- 1 This report presents the findings of a semi-detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey of 81 7ha of land at Paynes Heath Farm to the north west of Worcester Field survey was based on 38 auger borings and 3 soil profile pits and was completed in December 1998
- 2 The survey was conducted by the Resource Planning Team of FRCA Western Region on behalf of MAFF in its statutory role in the preparation of the Worcestershire Structure Plan
- 3 Information on climate geology and soils and from previous ALC surveys was considered and is presented in the relevant section Apart from the published regional ALC map (MAFF 1977) which shows the site at a reconnaissance scale as mainly Grade 2 with Grade 3 land being found across the southern part of the site and along the eastern boundary An area of Grade 3 land is also mapped around Paynes Heath farm The site had not been surveyed previously However the current survey uses the Revised Guidelines and Criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land (MAFF 1988) and supersedes any previous ALC survey Grade descriptions are summarised in Appendix I
- 4 A detailed ALC survey was carried out on land to the west of the site in 1994 at a scale of 1 10000 (ADAS 1994) This survey uses the Revised Guidelines and criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land (MAFF 1988)
- 5 At the time of survey land cover was arable permanent grassland and horticultural crops Other land included farm buildings stables lakes and streams An area of land was not surveyed as access could not be obtained
- 6 The distribution of ALC grades is shown on the accompanying 1 10000 scale ALC map The detail of information shown at this scale is appropriate to the intensity of field survey but could be misleading if enlarged or applied to small areas Areas are summarised in the Table 1

#### **SUMMARY**

Grade	Area (ha)	% Surveyed Area (66 ha)
2	51 7	78 3
3a	99	150
3b	44	67
Agricultural land not surveyed	12 8	
Other land	29	
Total site area	81 7	100

 Table 1
 Distribution of ALC gradesPaynes Heath Farm Worcester

7 Best and most versatile land occurs across the majority of the site Grade 2 quality land occurs over the northern and southern part of the site These soils have a slight droughtiness limitation Subgrade 3a land occurs over the central part of the site These soils have a droughtiness limitation Subgrade 3b land occurs in the central eastern and central part of the site on the lower land These soils have a wetness limitation

## CLIMATE

- 8 Estimates of climatic variables for this site were derived from the published agricultural climate dataset Climatological Data for Agricultural Land Classification (Meteorological Office 1989) using standard interpolation procedures Data for key points around the site are given in Table 2 below
- 9 Since the ALC grade of land is determined by the most limiting factor present overall climate is considered first because it can have an overriding influence by restricting land to a lower grade despite more favourable site and soil conditions Parameters used for assessing overall climate are accumulated temperature a measure of relative warmth and average annual rainfall a measure of overall wetness The results shown in Table 2 indicate that there is no overall climatic limitation
- 10 Climatic variables also affect ALC grade through interactions with soil conditions The most important interactive variables are Field Capacity Days (FCD) which are used in assessing soil wetness and potential Moisture Deficits calculated for wheat and potatoes which are compared with the moisture available in each profile in assessing soil droughtiness limitations These are described in later sections

Grid Reference		SO 829 555	SO 828 559	SO 825 562
Altıtude (m)		21	30	40
Accumulated Temperature (day C)		1484	1473	1462
Average Annual Rainfal	ll (mm)	638	643	650
Overall Climatic Grade		1	1	1
Field Capacity Days		137	138	139
Moisture deficit (mm)	Wheat	111	110	108
	Potatoes	105	103	101

# Table 2 Climatic Interpolations Paynes Heath Farm, Worcester

#### RELIEF

11 Altitude ranges from 21 metres at Ambrose Farm in the South East corner of the site to 40 metres along the western edge of the site with only gentle slopes of less than 7° being found over the site

#### **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

- 12 The underlying geology of the site is shown on the published geology map (BGS 1993) as mudstone over the northern and eastern part of the site Aluvium drift deposits are found along the stream which passes across the southern part of the site and along the eastern edge The majority of the site is covered with terrace deposits of the River Severn
- 13 Soils were mapped by the Soil Survey of England and Wales at a reconnaissance scale of 1 250 000 (SSEW 1983) as Wick 1 association More detailed soils information is also available in the 1 25000 scale survey of the Hereford and Worcester area (SSEW 1982)
- 14 The SSEW show a complex pattern of soil types over the site with the sandier soils of the Wick, Salwick and Arrow associations over the majority of the site which ties in well with the location of river terrace deposits according to the geology map The heavier clay soils of Whimple Compton and Dunnington Heath associations are found along the stream and in a band to the north east of Paynes Heath Farm which follows the mudstone as shown on the geology map

#### AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION

15 The distribution of ALC grades found by the current survey is shown on the accompanying 1 10000 scale map and areas are summarised in Table 1 The detail of information shown at this scale is appropriate to the intensity of field survey but could be misleading if enlarged or applied to small areas

#### 16 **Grade 2**

The majority of the site was found to be of very good quality This is found across the northern and southern part of the site The soils were described as having clay loam or sandy loam topsoil overlying sandy clay loam or heavy clay loam onto clay to depth Although the soils were in Wetness Class I (see Appendix II) their sandy nature together with the low number of field capacity days resulted in a droughtiness limitation A soil profile pit confirmed this

#### 17 Subgrade 3a

The Subgrade 3a land is found over the central part of the site The soils were described as having sandy loam topsoil over stony loamy sand to depth A soil profile pit enabled an assessment of the stone content to be made Although the soils were in

Wetness Class I their sandy and stony nature together with the low number of field capacity days resulted in a droughtiness limitation

#### 18 Subgrade 3b

The Subgrade 3b land is found in the central and central eastern part of the site generally on the lower land The soils were described as having clay loam topsoil over clay to depth A soil profile pit confirmed that the clay was slowly permeable which placed the soils in Wetness Class IV Subgrade 3b

## 19 Other Land

An area of 12 8ha was classed as other land This included farm buildings stables lakes and streams

S KANGH Resource Planning Team FRCA Worcester December 1998

#### REFERENCES

ADAS RESOURCE PLANNING TEAM (1994) Agricultural Land Classification Survey of Lower Broadheath Worcester Scale 1 10000 Reference 40/94 ADAS Bristol

BRITISH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (1993) Sheet 199 Worcester 1 50 000 series Solid and Drift edition [BGS] London

HODGSON J M (Ed) (1997) Soil Survey Field Handbook Soil Survey Technical Monograph No 5 Silsoe

MAFF (1977) 1 250 000 series Agricultural Land Classification South West Region MAFF Publications Alnwick

MAFF (1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales Revised Guidelines and Criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land MAFF Publications Alnwick

METEOROLOGICAL OFFICE (1989) Climatological Data for Agricultural Land Classification Meteorological Office Bracknell

SOIL SURVEY OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1983) Sheet 3 Soils of Midland and Western England 1 250 000 scale SSEW Harpenden

SOIL SURVEY OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1984) Soils and Their Use in Midland and Western England Bulletin No 12 SSEW Harpenden

SOIL SURVEY OF ENGLAND AND WALES (1982) Sheet SO 85/95 Hereford and Worcester I 1 25000 scale SSEW Harpenden

## **APPENDIX I**

## **DESCRIPTION OF GRADES AND SUBGRADES**

#### Grade 1 excellent quality agricultural land

Land with no or very minor limitations to agricultural use A very wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can be grown and commonly include top fruit soft fruit salad crops and winter harvested vegetables Yields are high and less variable than on land of lower quality

## Grade 2 very good quality agricultural land

Land with minor limitations which affect crop yield cultivations or harvesting A wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can usually be grown but on some land in the grade there may be reduced flexibility due to difficulties with the production of the more demanding crops such as winter harvested vegetables and arable root crops The level of yield is generally high but may be lower or more variable than Grade 1

## Grade 3 good to moderate quality agricultural land

Land with moderate limitations which affect the choice of crops timing and type of cultivation harvesting or the level of yield Where more demanding crops are grown yields are generally lower or more variable than on land in Grades 1 and 2

#### Subgrade 3a good quality agricultural land

Land capable of consistently producing moderate to high yields of a narrow range of arable crops especially cereals or moderate yields of a wide range of crops including cereals grass oilseed rape potatoes sugar beet and the less demanding horticultural crops

#### Subgrade 3b moderate quality agricultural land

Land capable of producing moderate yields of a narrow range of crops principally cereals and grass or lower yields of a wider range of crops or high yields of grass which can be grazed or harvested over most of the year

#### Grade 4 poor quality agricultural land

Land with severe limitations which significantly restrict the range of crops and/or level of yields. It is mainly suited to grass with occasional arable crops (eg cereals and forage crops) the yields of which are variable. In most climates yields of grass may be moderate to high but there may be difficulties in utilisation. The grade also includes very droughty arable land.

# Grade 5 very poor quality agricultural land

Land with very severe limitations which restrict use to permanent pasture or rough grazing except for occasional pioneer forage crops

Source MAFF (1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales Revised Guidelines and Criteria for Grading the Quality of Agricultural Land MAFF Publications Alnwick

#### **APPENDIX II**

#### **DEFINITION OF SOIL WETNESS CLASSES**

Soil wetness is classified according to the depth and duration of waterlogging in the soil profile

#### Wetness Class I

The soil profile is not wet within 70 cm depth for more than 30 days in most years

#### Wetness Class II

The soil profile is wet within 70 cm depth for 31 90 days in most years or if there is no slowly permeable layer within 80 cm depth it is wet within 70 cm for more than 90 days but not wet within 40 cm depth for more than 30 days in most years

#### Wetness Class III

The soil profile is wet within 70 cm depth for 91 180 days in most years or if there is no slowly permeable layer within 80 cm depth it is wet within 70 cm for more than 180 days but only wet within 40 cm depth for between 31 and 90 days in most years

## Wetness Class IV

The soil profile is wet within 70 cm depth for more than 180 days but not within 40 cm depth for more than 210 days in most years or if there is no slowly permeable layer within 80 cm depth, it is wet within 40 cm depth for 91 210 days in most years

#### Wetness Class V

The soil profile is wet within 40 cm depth for 211 335 days in most years

#### Wetness Class VI

The soil profile is wet within 40 cm depth for more than 335 days in most years

Notes The number of days specified is not necessarily a continuous period

In most years is defined as more than 10 out of 20 years

Source Hodgson J M (Ed) (1997) Soil Survey Field Handbook Soil Survey Technical Monograph No 5 Silsoe

## **APPENDIX III**

#### ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS USED IN SURVEY DATA

Soil pit and auger boring information collected during ALC survey is held on a computer database and is reproduced in this report Terms used and abbreviations are set out below These conform to definitions contained in the Soil Survey Field Handbook (Hodgson, 1997)

## 1 Terms used on computer database in order of occurrence

GRID REF National 100 km grid square and 8 figure grid reference

LAND USE At the time of survey

WHT	Wheat	SBT	Sugar Beet	HTH	Heathland
BAR	Barley	BRA	Brassicas	BOG	Bog or Marsh
OAT	Oats	FCD	Fodder Crops	DCW	Deciduous Wood
CER	Cereals	FRT	Soft and Top Fruit	CFW	Coniferous Woodland
MZE	Maize	HRT	Horticultural Crops	PLO	Ploughed
OSR	Oilseed Rape	LEY	Ley Grass	FLW	Fallow (inc Set aside)
POT	Potatoes	PGR	Permanent Pasture	SAS	Set Aside (where known)
LIN	Linseed	RGR	Rough Grazing	ОТН	Other
BEN	Field Beans	SCR	Scrub		

**GRDNT** Gradient as estimated or measured by hand held optical clinometer

GLEY SPL Depth in centimetres to gleying or slowly permeable layer

**AP (WHEAT/POTS)** Crop adjusted available water capacity

MB (WHEAT/POTS) Moisture Balance (Crop adjusted AP crop potential MD)

**DRT** Best grade according to soil droughtiness

If any of the following factors are considered significant Y will be entered in the relevant column

MREL EXP CHEM	Microrelief limitation Exposure limitation Chemical limitation	FLOOD FROST	Flood risk Frost prone	EROSN DIST	Soil erosion risk Disturbed land
LIMIT	The main limitation used	n to land qu	ality The foll	owing abbro	eviations are

<b>OC</b>	Overall Climate	AE	Aspect	EX	Exposure
FR	Frost Risk	GR	Gradient	MR	Microrelief
FL	Flood Risk	ТХ	Topsoil Texture	DP	Soil Depth

СН	Chemical	WE	Wetness	WK	Workability
DR	Drought	ER	<b>Erosion Risk</b>	WD	Soil Wetness/Droughtiness
am	Tanaal Chammers				

ST Topsoil Stoniness

**TEXTURE** Soil texture classes are denoted by the following abbreviations

S	Sand	LS	Loamy Sand	SL	Sandy Loam
SZL	Sandy Silt Loam	CL	Clay Loam	ZCL	Silty Clay Loam
ZL	Silt Loam	SCL	Sandy Clay Loam	С	Clay
SC	Sandy clay	ZC	Silty clay	OL	Organic Loam
P	Peat	SP	Sandy Peat	LP	Loamy Peat
PL	Peaty Loam	PS	Peaty Sand	MZ	Marine Light Silts

For the sand loamy sand sandy loam and sandy silt loam classes the predominant size of sand fraction will be indicated by the use of the following prefixes

- **F** Fine (more than 66% of the sand less than 0 2mm)
- M Medium (less than 66% fine sand and less than 33% coarse sand)
- C Coarse (more than 33% of the sand larger than 0 6mm)

The clay loam and silty clay loam classes will be sub divided according to the clay content M Medium (< 27% clay) H heavy (27 35% clay)

MOTTLE COL Mottle colour using Munsell notation

**MOTTLE ABUN** Mottle abundance expressed as a percentage of the matrix or surface described

F few <2% C common 2 20% M many 20 40% VM very many 40%+

MOTTLE CONT Mottle contrast

- **F** faint indistinct mottles evident only on close inspection
- **D** distinct mottles are readily seen
- P Prominent mottling is conspicuous and one of the outstanding features of the horizon
- **PED COL** Ped face colour using Munsell notation
- GLEY If the soil horizon is gleyed a Y will appear in this column If slightly gleyed an S will appear

STONE LITH Stone Lithology One of the following is used

HR	All hard rocks and stones	SLST	Soft oolitic or dolimitic limestone
СН	Chalk	FSST	Soft fine grained sandstone
ZR	Soft argillaceous or silty rocks	GH	Gravel with non porous (hard) stones
MSST	Soft medium grained sandstone	GS	Gravel with porous (soft) stones

SI Soft weathered igneous or metamorphic rock

Stone contents are given in % by volume for sizes >2cm, >6cm and total stone >2mm

**STRUCT** The degree of development size and shape of soil peds are described using the following notation

Degree of development	WA Adher	Weakly developed rent	WK	Weakly developed
	MD develo	Moderately oped	ST	Strongly developed
Ped_size	F C	Fine Coarse	M VC	Medium Very coarse
<u>Ped Shape</u>	S GR SAB PL	Sıngle graın Granular Sub angular blocky Platy	M AB PR	Massive Angular blocky Prismatic

**CONSIST** Soil consistence is described using the following notation

L	Loose	VF	Very Friable	FR	Friable	FM	Fırm
VM	Very firm	EM	Extremely firm	EH	Extremely	/ Hard	

- SUBS STRSubsoil structural condition recorded for the purpose of calculating<br/>profile droughtinessG GoodM ModerateP Poor
- **POR** Soil porosity If a soil horizon has poor porosity with less than 0 5% biopores >0 5mm a Y will appear in this column
- **IMP** If the profile is impenetrable to rooting a Y will appear in this column at the appropriate horizon
- SPL Slowly permeable layer If the soil horizon is slowly permeable a Y will appear in this column
- CALC If the soil horizon is calcareous with naturally occurring calcium carbonate exceeding 1% a Y will appear this column

#### 2 Additional terms and abbreviations used mainly in soil pit descriptions

#### **STONE ASSESSMENT**

VIS Visual S Sieve D Displacement

#### **MOTTLE SIZE**

EF	Extremely fine <1mm	Μ	Medium 5 15mm
VF	Very fine 1 2mm>	С	Coarse >15mm
F	Fine 2 5mm		

MOTTLE COLOURMay be described by Munsell notation or as ochreous<br/>(OM) or grey (GM)ROOT CHANNELSIn topsoil the presence of rusty root channels should<br/>also be noted

## MANGANESE CONCRETIONS Assessed by volume

Ν	None		Μ	Many	20 40%
F	Few	<2%	VM	Very Many	>40%
С	Common	2 20%			

#### POROSITY

P	Poor	less than 0 5% biopores at least 0 5mm in diameter
G	Good	more than 0 5% biopores at least 0 5mm in diameter

#### **ROOT ABUNDANCE**

The number o	f roots per 100cm <sup>2</sup>	Very Fine and Fine	Medium and Coarse
F	Few	1 10	1 or 2
С	Common	10 25	2 5
М	Many	25 200	>5
Α	Abundant	>200	

#### **ROOT SIZE**

VF	Very fine	<1mm	Μ	Medium	2 5mm
F	Fine	1 2mm	С	Coarse	>5mm

#### **HORIZON BOUNDARY DISTINCTNESS**

Sharp	<0 5cm	Gradual	6 13cm
Abrupt	05 25cm	Diffuse	>13cm
Clear	25 6cm		

HORIZON BOUNDARY FORM Smooth, wavy irregular or broken \* \* See Soil Survey Field Handbook (Hodgson 1997) for details

SITE NAME		PR	OFILE NO	SLOPE	AND A	SPECT	LAY	ND US	E	Av F	Rainfall	643 mm		PARENT MATE	ERIAL		
Paynes H	eath Farm	n Pit	1 (ASP26)	1 East			Cere	eals		ATC	)	1473 day	С	Terrace deposits (Drift)			
JOB NO		DA	TE	GRID R	EFERE	ENCE	DES	SCRIB	ED BY	FC I	Days	138		PSD SAMPLES	TAKEN		
83/98		3 1	2 98	SO 829:	549		SK/	SH		Clin Exp	natic Grade	1		None	one		
Horizon No	Lowest Av Depth (cm)	Texture	Matrix (Ped Face) Colours	Stonine Size Tyj and Fiel Method	ss pe Id	Mottling Abundance Contrast Siz and Colour	Mar ce Con	ngan Ics	Structure P Developmer Size and Sh	Ped nt nape	Consistence	Structural Condition	Pores (Fissures	Roots Abundance and Size	Calcium Carbonate Content	Horizon Boundary Distinctness and form	
1	24	MSL	75YR3/2	1∕t tal		none	n	one					Good	MF&VF		wavy abrupt	
2	45	MSL	75YR4/3	2 />> 25 / < (S& 27 / 1	2cm 2cm D) total	none	n	none MDCSA		В	VF	M	Good	CF&VF		smooth clear	
3	79	LMS	75YR4/4	35 %(S&D 1 tal	))	none	n	one	WKCSA	B	VF	м	Good	CF&VF		smooth gradua	
4	120	LMS	75YR4/4 4/6	35 %(S&E total	))	none	n	one	WKMSA	B	VF	M	Good	FVF	-		
Profile Gl	eyed From	Not g	leyed		Availa	ole Water V	Vheat	89 mn	n			Final ALC Gi	rade 3a			<b>I</b>	
Slowly Permeable Not slowly permeable Horizon From						Potatoes 76 mm					Main Limiting Factor(s) Droughtiness						
Wetness C	Class	I			Moistu	re Deficit V	Vheat	110 m	m			Remarks		·····		· · ·	
						F	otatoes	103 n	nm								
Wetness (	Grade	1			Moistu	re Balance V	Vheat	21 m	m								
					Drougi Grade	itiness F 3a	otatoes	27 m (Calcu	m ilated to 120 (	cm)							

SITE NAME		PRO	PROFILE NO		SLOPE AND ASPECT		LAND USE		Av	Rainfall	643 mm		PARENT MATERIAL			
Paynes Heath Farm		Pit	Pit 2(ASP31) 2 East				Cereals	Cereals		)	1473 day C		Eldersfield mudstone			
JOB NO		DA	TE		GRID I	REFERE	ENCE	DESCRIBE	D BY	FC I	Days	138		PSD SAMPLES	TAKEN	
83/98		3 12 98 S0 827 548 SK/SH			Climatic Grade		1		None							
Horizon No	Lowest Av Depth (cm)	Texture	N () F	Matrix (Ped Face) Colours	Stoning Size Ty and Fig Method	ess /pe eld 1	Mottling Abundance Contrast Size and Colour	Mangan Concs	Structure Developm Size and S	Ped Ped nent Shape	Consistence	Structural Condition	Pores (Fissures)	Roots Abundance and Size	Calcium Carbonate Content	Horizon Boundary Distinctness and form
1	34	MCL/S		75YR 3/2	2/ HR		NONE	NONE						FF&VF		sharp smooth
2	100	C	5 ()	5YR 4/4 (5YR5/ 2)	NONE		NONE	common small concretions	MDCI	PR	FM	Poor	Low	FVF		
Profile Glo	eyed From	Not g	leyed			Availal	ble Water Wi	neat mm				Final ALC Gr	ade 3b			
Slowly Per Horizon Fi	meable rom	34	Re at	ed soil cla t 34 and co	ay starts ontinues		Ро	tatoes mm				Main Limiting	g Factor(s) V	Vetness		
Wetness C	lass	īV		, 100 <b>U</b> II		Moistu	re Deficit W	neat mm				Remarks			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
							Po	tatoes mm								
Wetness G	rade	3Ь				Moistu	re Balance W	heat mm								
						Drough Grade	ntiness Po	tatoes mm (Calcul	ated to cm	ı)						

SITE NAME Paynes Heath Farm		PRC Pit 3	FILE NO (ASP13)	SLOPE 2 East	E AND ASPECT LAND USE st Sugar beet		Av I ATC	Raınfall )	11 643mm 1473 day C		PARENT MATERIAL Head undifferentiated (Drift)				
JOB NO 83/98		DA1 8 12	DATE 8 12 98		GRID REFERENCE SO 825 552		DESCRIBED BY SH/SK		FC Days Climatic Grade		138 1		PSD SAMPLES TAKEN None		
Horizon No	Lowest Av Depth (cm)	Texture	Matrix (Ped Face) Colours	Stoning Size Ty and Fig Method	ess pe eld I	Mottling Abundance Contrast Size and Colour	Mangan Concs	Structure Developme Size and S	Ped ent hape	Consistence	Structural Condition	Pores (Fissures	Roots ) Abundance and Size	Calcium Carbonate Content	Horizon Boundary Distinctness and form
1	35	SCL	75YR3/2	21 /6 (S& 22 / T tr	D)HR d	none	none					Good	CF&VF		Clear
2	48	SCL	75YR4/3	21 / HR(	S&D)	none	none	MDCA	B	FR	moderate	Good	FVF		Smooth Clear
3	70 (59 70 sto	FSZL cm SZL ony)	10YR5/3 (10YR5/4)	St es in band th hosizon ii 21/HR (	ase f nto ly (S&D)	common fine distinct 75YR 5/6	none	MDCSA	ΔB	FR	moderate	Good			Smooth Abrupt
4	120	С	5YR4/4 (5YR5/3)	45/HR (	(S&D)	common fine distinct 5YR5/6-4/6	common	Too ston assess	y to s	FM					
Profile Gl	eyed From	48			Availat	ble Water Wh	ieat 117m	m			Final ALC Gra	nde 2			
Slowly Permeable now slowly permeable Horizon From				Potatoes 104mm						Main Limiting Factor(s) Droughtiness					
Wetness (	Class	I			Moistu	re Deficit Wh	leat 110m	m			Remarks	_			
Wetness (	Grade	I			Moistu Drough Grade	Pot re Balance Wr ntiness Pot 2	atoes 103m neat +7mm atoes +2mm (Calcu	um 1 1 1 alated to 12	20cm)		Horizon 4 cla Clay pulls awa	y is so stony y from arou	y that any attempt to nd stones	determine stru	cture 15 difficult