

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 January 2026 16:32:05 UTC+00:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0184

Consultee comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

A consultee has commented on a Planning Application. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 28/01/2026 4:32 PM from Oliver Benson on behalf of Environmental Protection.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/26/0184
Address:	Former Site Of Unit A Consort Way Burgess Hill West Sussex
Proposal:	Discharge of planning conditions No's: 7,8,12,13 and 14 relating to planning application DM/24/2970
Case Officer:	Joanne Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments:	I have reviewed the Phase II Site Investigation Report submitted in support of the discharge of the contaminated land conditions, prepared by Onyx Geo Consulting Ltd, reference 251002-ON-XX-XX-RP-G-713-C01 and dated 5 March 2025.
	Soil samples have been collected from across the site and analysed for a full suite of contaminants, including heavy metals, PAHs, TPH, VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs and asbestos. None of the contaminants tested were recorded at concentrations exceeding the relevant generic assessment criteria for a commercial end use, and no asbestos was detected in soils or in the tested suspect tile. No visual or olfactory evidence of contamination was noted during the investigation. I am therefore satisfied that the report demonstrates that no significant risk to human health remains and that no remediation is required.
	With regard to ground gas, although only one of the three

monitoring wells ultimately produced useable data due to flooding of the response zones in the other two wells, the results obtained show extremely low gas concentrations and no measurable gas flow. The report shows that based on this limited testing the site falls within Characteristic Situation 1. This conclusion is supported by the conceptual model, which identifies no significant gas-generating sources, low organic content within the alluvial soils, an absence of deep made ground and a shallow, waterlogged profile that would inhibit gas production. In light of this, and given that all available monitoring results were negligible, I am satisfied with the ground gas risk assessment for the site.

The groundwater sampling recorded some exceedances of Environmental Quality Standards for certain metals. However, these have been discussed in a clear and proportionate manner. The soil on the site does not contain raised levels of these metals, which shows that the higher readings in the water are not caused by contamination in the soil. The type of quick "grab sampling" used can also sometimes give higher readings, especially in heavy clays like those on this site, where water does not move easily. The report also explains that the groundwater here sits in small, isolated pockets and does not properly connect to the nearby culverted stream. The underlying clay makes the ground almost impermeable, and the groundwater levels recorded show very little movement, meaning there is no realistic route for any pollutants to reach surface water. Taking all of this into account, I am satisfied that the consultant has adequately explained why the recorded exceedances do not indicate a significant pollutant linkage, and that no remedial measures or further investigation are required in respect of controlled waters.

The report also includes a clear watching brief and discovery strategy, as required by condition 9, to ensure that any unidentified contamination encountered during construction is appropriately dealt with.

On this basis, the submitted Phase II Site Investigation fulfils the requirements of Conditions 7, and as no further investigation or remediation are required, also condition 8, and therefore I can recommend that these conditions be discharged.

Kind regards