



# PHYSICAL TESTING ANALYSIS REPORT

Description:	Determination of Frost Resistance				
Test Method:	EN 539-2:2013				
Lucideon Reference:	(174161)-31389				
Client:	Tudor Roof Tile Company Limited Denge Marsh Road Lydd Kent TN29 9JH				
For the Attention of:	Mr. Paul Lythgoe				
Date Logged:	12-Sep-2017				
Date of Tests:	21-Sep-2017 to 17-Nov-2017				
Report Date:	20-Nov-2017				
Purchase Order No.:	PJL 140917				

Please find attached the results for the sample(s) recently submitted for analysis. Opinions and interpretations expressed herein are outside the scope of UKAS Accreditation.



Miss Zoe Kinally Manager

This report is issued in accordance with the Conditions of Business of Lucideon Limited and relates only to the sample(s) tested. No responsibility is taken for the accuracy of the sampling unless this is done under our own supervision. This report shall not be reproduced in part without the written approval of Lucideon Limited, nor used in any way as to lead to misrepresentation of the results or their implications.

# Page 1 of 3

T +44 (0)1782 764428 enquiries@lucideon.com www.lucideon.com

#### CLAY ROOFING TILES – TEST FOR FROST RESISTANCE FOR DISCONTINUOUS LAYING DETERMINATION OF PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS BS EN 539 Part 2 Test for Frost Resistance 2013

#### 1 SAMPLES RECEIVED

6 x plain tiles with nominal dimensions 260 x 165 mm. As sampled by client.

## 2 TEST PROCEDURE

### 2.1 Saturation of Tiles

The samples were dried at 110°C, weighed and examined for existing defects, then progressively immersed in water over a period of 5 days. After the tiles are fully immersed they are then left to soak for a further 72 hours, then they are removed and weighed. The water absorption results are given in Table 2.

### 2.2 Freeze/Thaw Tests

The tiles were tested according to the method described in BS EN 539-2: 2013 European Single Test Method using the apparatus illustrated in that standard. The tiles were examined at 30, 90 and 150 cycles.

#### 2.3 Results

The tiles are assessed for damage using the criteria stated in Table 1.

#### Table 1 - Interpretation of the Result

		Front	Back			
1	Pit	-	-			
2	Hair Crack	-	-			
3	Nascent Crack	-	-			
4	Surface Crack	Х	Xa			
5	Surface Damage (chip, peeling, flaking)	Х	Xa			
6	Structural	Х	Х			
7	Loss of Interlocking ribs	Х	Х			
8	Break	Х	Х			
9	Delamination	Х	Х			
10	Loss of all Nibs		Х			
X = unacceptable / - = acceptable Note: the degree of damaging can be demonstrated through a change in the impermeability and/or flexural strength of the product						
<sup>a</sup> Where the degree of damage indicates that the functional performance of the product would not be assured.						

# Table 2

Tile No:	% Water	Frost Damage						
	Absorption	30 Cycles (Front)	30 Cycles (Back)	90 Cycles (Front)	90 Cycles (Back)	150 Cycles (Front)	150 Cycles (Back)	
1	4.8	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	
2	4.7	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	
3	5.3	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	
4	4.8	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	
5	5.0	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	
6	3.8	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	No Damage	
Mean	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	

The tiles were examined after 150 cycles for signs of damage due to the action of frost.

### 3 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The samples meet the criteria for level 1, minimum 150 cycles in the above standard.

# NOTE: The results given in this report apply only to the samples that have been tested.

### END OF TEST REPORT