

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Development Control
FROM:	Environmental Health and Licensing
REFERENCE:	DISC/26/0222
LOCATION:	Land To The North of High Bar Lane, Thakeham, West Sussex
DESCRIPTION:	Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 3 (demolition and construction details), 5 (updated Arboricultural Method Statement), 6 (updated Tree Protection Plan), 7 (underground services), 8 (means of foul water disposal), 9 (contamination), 10 (CEMP: Biodiversity), 11 (surface water drainage), 12 (materials and finishes) and 16 (maintenance and management of drainage scheme) to approved application DC/26/0209 (Variation of Condition 1 and Removal of Conditions of previously approved application DC/23/2152 (28 dwellings and associated engineering operations and works) relating to water neutrality, and to allow use of HEMSPAN as a construction method; and replace flats with terraced houses and other amendments as part of an amended housing (market and affordable) mix).
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION: Comments relating to below information: D&M Planning Covering Letter dated 16.07.26 Albury S.I. Ltd Phase 2 Report on a Site Investigation dated January 2026	

MAIN COMMENTS:Condition 9

Environmental Health have reviewed the above information and we have the following comments to make:

1. From reviewing the covering letter and, in the context of the potential risks from contamination, we note the comment 'This is consistent with the historic uses on the site which were separate from the commercial mushroom farm to the north'. From reviewing historic maps from c.1970 there does not however appear to a boundary between the two sites. From undertaking a recent site it is also apparent that the application site is only separated from the Mushroom Farm to the north by a temporary fence. Given this and the presence of made ground soils on the current application site we consider it reasonable to assume that the application site was, at one time, part of the wider Mushroom Farm site. The investigation and sampling strategy should therefore be based on this historic land use.
2. We note that when compared to UK generic assessment criteria no elevated levels of contaminants were detected which is welcomed. With reference to the guidance in section 9.7.2.3.3 of BS10175:2026 (Investigation of potentially contaminated sites – Code of practice) it is however not clear what sampling strategy and density of sampling grid have been adopted for this site – we would be grateful if this can be clarified.
3. From the information submitted to date it is also not clear if the locations in the residential part of the site adequately target the garden areas and whether the areas that will be communal landscaping areas have been subject to adequate investigation. In order for us to form a view on this and understand the relationship between trial pit locations and proposed site layout we would be grateful for the locations plotted on a proposed site plan.
4. From revising the desk study submitted in support of the parent permission we also note that this identified a number of potential sources of contamination including 'Potential ACM within existing fabric of the pump house' and 'Potential contamination from lead-arsenate based pesticides used in orchards pre-1950s' it is however not clear if either of these sources of contamination have been assessed as part of this investigation.
5. From reviewing the trial pit logs we note that CBR1 and CBR5 encountered deeper pockets of made ground soils, the material encountered at these locations was not however subject to any chemical testing which is a concern.
6. We also note that location TP6 targeted the bund located in the northern part of the site. Experience from other similar sites has shown that bunds are unlikely to be homogenous and whilst the fact that no elevated levels of contamination were found is welcomed we are of the view that one trial pit does not provide us with sufficient confidence that the made ground soils in the bund have been adequately characterised.

Given the above unfortunately we are not currently in a position to recommend the discharge of condition 9.

NAME:	Kevin Beer
DEPARTMENT:	Environmental Health and Licensing
DATE:	19/08/2026