



Horsham
District
Council

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Development Control
FROM:	Environmental Health and Licensing
REFERENCE:	DISC/25/0320
LOCATION:	Woodfords, Shipley Road, Southwater, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 9BQ
DESCRIPTION:	Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 7 and 21 to approved application DC/21/2180
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION: Comments relating to below information: Leap Environmental Ltd Phase 1 Desk Study dated September 2021 Leap Environmental Ltd Phase II Site Investigation Report dated 8 th March 2022 Leap Environmental Letter Report dated 21 st April 2022 Leap Environmental Remediation Method Statement dated 24 th July 2025	

MAIN COMMENTS:

Environmental Health have reviewed the above-mentioned reports and undertaken a recent site visit and we have the following comments to make.

Leap Environmental Ltd Phase 1 Desk Study

1. We are satisfied with the preliminary assessment of the risks from contamination to future site users as presented in this report.

Leap Environmental Ltd Phase II Site Investigation

1. From reviewing Table 8 we note that eight samples were subject to chemical analysis and no elevated levels of contaminants were detected which is welcomed. However, given the size of the site we are of the view that eight samples does not provide the LPA with sufficient confidence that elevated levels of contaminants are not present on the site. With this in mind we note the comment in various points in the report that further investigations are required and whilst some further investigation has been undertaken, comments on which are provided below, further investigations in the open field areas do not appear to have been undertaken.
2. From reviewing the figures we note that some hatching has been drawn onto Figure 4 – we would be grateful for clarity on what this is indicating.
3. From reviewing the borehole logs it would appear that the location Bund 1 found topsoil to 0.15m and, in summary, clay with wood fragments to 0.45m. This material is not detailed as made ground on the log, however given the presence of wood fragments we assume this material is made ground and we would be grateful if this can be confirmed.
4. We also note that location Bund 2 found topsoil to 0.20 and clay to 0.35. Similar to the above we would be grateful for clarification as to whether the material encountered was made ground.
5. Whilst a plan has been provided of the locations on a proposed site plan, which is welcomed, we would also be grateful for a plan showing the locations on a proposed plan of the site.

Leap Environmental Letter Report dated 21st April 2022

6. From reviewing the table in Appendix E 'Chemical Test Results' we note that with the exception of arsenic in HP2 and benzo(a)pyrene in HP6 no elevated levels of contaminants were detected which is welcomed.
7. We note however that the made ground soils were not proven at locations HP1, HP3, HP5 or HP6. Ground conditions at these locations have therefore not been fully investigated which is a concern, in particular HP5 where 1.20m of made ground was detected.
8. We note that made ground soils in HP2 were subject to a degree of variability and whilst the log indicates that samples from both types of made ground soils were collected only the material present between surface and 0.55m was subject to chemical analysis.

Leap Environmental Remediation Method Statement dated 24th July 2025

1. We note that the main part of this report is detail on further testing as part of the ongoing verification works and I can confirm that we are happy for a degree of information on soil quality to be provided as part of the verification works. However, with our above comments in mind, in order for us to have sufficient confidence that soils on the site have been adequately characterised we are of

the view that some further investigations are required on the site before the RMS can be formally agreed.

2. We will have further comments to make on the RMS once the site has been subject to additional investigation and updated accordingly.

Given the above unfortunately we are not in a position to recommend the discharge of condition 4 as this time. We would however welcome dialogue with the applicant and/or their environmental consultant on the above matters.

NAME:	Kevin Beer
DEPARTMENT:	Environmental Health and Licensing
DATE:	16/01/2026