



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Development Control
FROM:	Environmental Health and Licensing
REFERENCE:	DC/25/2087
LOCATION:	Thakeham Tiles Ltd, Rock Road, Storrington, West Sussex, RH20 3AD
DESCRIPTION:	Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings, and the re-development of the site for up to 108no. dwellings (including a mix of private and affordable housing units), with associated infrastructure including vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access, parking, landscaping, open space and play provision, and sustainable drainage with all matters reserved except access.
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:	
Further information required in support of the application	

MAIN COMMENTS:

Noise

Environmental Health have reviewed the Ian Sharland Ltd Environmental Noise Assessment, dated 30.09.25, and the fact that a noise assessment has been provided in support of the application is welcomed. We do however have the following comments to make:

1. From our review of Section 3.2, we note that the monitoring was carried out between Tuesday 11th and Thursday 13th March 2025. Given the short duration of this monitoring period, we have concerns regarding whether it was sufficiently long to capture variations in road traffic noise between weekday and weekend conditions.
2. We assume that Thakeham Tiles were operational when the noise monitoring was undertaken and whilst we appreciate it would not have been reasonable to ask the business to stop operating when the monitoring was undertaken we would be grateful for some comments from acoustic consultant on what impact operational noise from Thakeham Tiles had on the noise monitoring results.
3. We note that the following is stated in section 7.3 of the report 'It has been shown that noise levels within a minority of the amenity areas can meet the WHO's guideline figure of 55 dB LAeq, to protect the majority of people from being seriously annoyed during the day-time, for a steady, continuous noise'. In order to validate these comments we have reviewed certain sections of the report, in particular Figure 4 – Daytime LAeq noise map, and whilst the fact that noise mapping has been provided is welcomed the resolution and level of detail used means that we have been unable to form a view on the acceptability of rear gardens in close proximity to the Rock Road. We therefore request that a detailed plan of this part of the site is provided, similar to the scale and detail provided in Figure 6.1, with noise contours overlain.
4. Section 6 of the report focusses on overheating mitigation with, as detailed in ADO, particular reference to night time noise levels and overheating risk. Whilst we appreciate that this is an important consideration, daytime noise levels with reference to BS8233 also need to be considered. With this comment in mind it is not clear from the report what daytime noise levels are expected to be in the living rooms which face Rock Road with windows and/or patio doors open. It is also not clear if the windows/patio doors to these rooms need to be closed to maintain internal noise levels whether they will be at risk of overheating.
5. Given the above comments we are not currently convinced that layout as currently proposed represents good acoustic design, as detailed in ProPG Planning and Noise. We will however have more comments to make on this once we are in receipt of a more detailed noise modelling plan for the northern part of the site, as requested in comment 3 above.

Land Contamination

We have reviewed the Hydrock Consultants Ltd Phase 1 Desk Study Report, dated 09.01.25, and the fact that report of this nature has been provided in support of the application is welcomed. We do however have the following comments to make.

1. We note that the site walkover was undertaken on 20 February 2018, which is now eight years old. The extent of the proposed development site has also changed since that time, including additional areas within the north-western and north-eastern sections. It is unclear whether these areas were included in the original walkover; however, regardless of their inclusion, the age of the previous assessment means it is no longer current. An up-to-date site walkover should therefore be undertaken to ensure an accurate understanding of present site conditions.
2. We note that a consequence versus probability matrix in accordance with current guidance has been provided in Table 7.2. We appreciate that a risk level for each

pollutant linkage has been provided, so it is clear how each risk level has been reached it would be useful however if the consequence and probability 'score' for each pollutant linkage can be provided in the appendices.

3. From reviewing the conclusions we note that further investigation is recommended in deciduous woodland area to the west and east along Rock Road. We appreciate that the site has been subject to a large amount of ground investigation works, which is welcomed, however from reviewing the exploratory hole location plans and taking into consideration the fact that buildings are still present on the site we are not currently convinced that certain parts of the site have not been subject to adequate investigation.
4. We note that section 3.2 of the report states that the maximum stated depth of made ground detected on the site was 5.55mgl, it is however not clear if this was the maximum proven depth. From reviewing the site investigation reports that we are in receipt of we also note that certain boreholes did not prove the made ground and the response zones did not extend the full length of the made ground which is a concern.
5. We also note the comment in Table 7.3 'based on the monitoring to date, CS1 conditions have been determined for the site where gas protections measures are not required'. Whilst we appreciate that in the monitoring to date the site has been classified as CS1, given the unproven made ground in certain parts of the site and, as detailed above, the presence of buildings on certain parts of site we are of the view the preliminary risk assessment should acknowledge that further investigation is required which may lead to re-classification of the site, or parts of the site, to a higher CS level.
6. To summarise comments 3, 4 and 5 above – we agree with the recommendations in the report that further ground investigations and generic quantitative risk assessment (GQRA) are required on the site. In our view it will however be necessary for the further ground investigations to extend beyond the areas recommend in the report and we would be grateful if the desk study can acknowledge this.

Construction Phase

1. During site clearance, preparation and construction there is the potential for local residents to experience adverse impacts from noise, dust and construction traffic movements. These should be minimised and controlled by the developer and a construction environmental management (CEMP) plan will be recommended as a condition, once the above matters have been addressed.

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

N/A

NAME:	Kevin Beer
DEPARTMENT:	Environmental Health and Licensing
DATE:	18/02/2026