



Project No:	31066
Project:	High Barn Farm
Document Ref:	31066TN1 High Barn Farm addendum
Version:	1
Date:	25/06/2025
Status	DRAFT

HIGH BARN FARM – ADDENDUM

H Fraser Consulting Ltd issued a report on 22 January 2025 under instruction from Jolliff Developments Ltd detailing the results of a Phase II site investigation at High Barn, Crays Lane, Goose Green RH20 2LR. This technical note has been prepared in response to comments by Horsham District Council to:

- Provide photographs of the siteworks
- Comment on the requirement for supervision of the works by a consultant
- Comment on the adequacy of the site investigation

PHOTOGRAPHS

Photographs of the site investigations are appended to this document. It can be seen that trial pits were excavated in a methodical manner and well documented photographically. The location, depth and spoil are all recorded for each trial pit. The photos indicate:

- TP01 light to mid brown clayey soil and stones with some brick inclusions possibly indicating reworked ground
- TP02 Dark to mid brown soil and stones with some inclusions from the overlying slab, an artefact of trial pitting
- TP03 light to mid brown clayey soil and stones
- TP04 light to mid brown clayey soil and stones
- TP05 Dark to mid brown soil and stones
- TP06 Dark to mid brown soil and stones

There is no visual indication of contamination in the trial pit arisings.

SUPERVISION

Site investigations were undertaken by CK Drilling Ltd, directed by Kris Sunderland who has 24 years of experience in ground investigation, having contributed to significant projects like the 2012 Olympic stadium, Network Rail slope stabilization, Rail South, Hinckley Point power station, and HS2. All the company's drillers are fully qualified to NVQ level 2 and possess relevant certifications such as 360 digger operation (NPORS), IPAF, and HSG47 cable avoidance. The firm has been operating for 5 years, and the team has extensive experience of investigations for environmental and contamination assessments.

Whilst it is acknowledged that it is preferable for site works to be supervised by contaminated land specialists, it is also acknowledged that data obtained without such supervision still have value,



particularly when undertaken by competent and experienced contractors. In this case, the data generated by the site investigation were considered sufficiently reliable as:

- Photographs and company reputation provide evidence of a methodical and informed approach to site investigation
- Former land uses indicate a low risk of significant land contamination at the site
- Previous investigations had indicated a low risk of land contamination at the site
- Site photographs confirm no visual evidence of contamination
- The data were used to complement an existing data set, and the results were broadly comparable
- There was no evidence to suggest that a complex sampling strategy, such as stratification with depth, was required to assess contaminant distribution
- Nothing in the trial pit photographs indicates that a field supervisor should have targeted a particular horizon or soil sub volume for soil sampling and analysis, i.e. that specialist knowledge and judgement was required due to specific conditions arising at the site.

ADEQUACY OF THE SITE INVESTIGATION DATA

The Phase II assessment relied on data from two phases of site investigation, giving a total of nine sampling locations across an area of 800 m², and 18 samples from depth of up to 2.1 m bgl. This is equivalent to 1 sample per 89 m², or an equivalent grid spacing of 9 m, and 1 sample per 93 m³. These sampling densities are considered to be well within best practice guidance. Specifically, BS 10175, Section 7.7.2.3.3 on Non-targeted sampling density states that:

'Typical densities of sampling grids can vary from 25 m to 50 m centres for exploratory investigations, and 10 m to 25 m centres for main investigations'.

There are three sampling locations in the front garden area of the three proposed properties, and six sampling locations in the rear garden area, with two samples per rear garden plot. Three sample locations were within the existing building, with samples taken from below the existing building slab. The spatial distribution of sampling locations is considered adequate for the proposed land use.

CONCLUSION

The site investigation data obtained is considered to be adequate for the purpose of assessing risks arising from land contamination for the proposed site uses, given the relatively low risk associated with the former land use and the photographic and sampling evidence provided by the most recent investigation.

PHOTOGRAPHS

TP01



TP02



TP03



TP04



TP05



TP06

