

From: Oliver Benson <Oliver.Benson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 September 2026 17:28:16 UTC+01:00
To: "Joseph Swift" <Joseph.Swift@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/26/1945

Hi Joe,

Hope you are good. After a brief period of being able to make comments online again it seems to be down again. Please see comments for this below:

I have reviewed the Preliminary Risk Assessment and Site Investigation by Aviron Associates Limited, dated July 2026, ref: 26-186.01. Whilst the report satisfactorily addresses the requirements of Part (a) of the condition, I do not consider that Parts (b) and (c) have been adequately addressed at this stage.

The report includes a preliminary risk assessment, intrusive site investigation. However, the submitted assessment confirms that the single round of gas monitoring was not undertaken during worst-case conditions and explicitly recommends that further monitoring is required to complete the gas risk assessment. The report concludes that a prolonged period of gas monitoring should be undertaken to complete the assessment and determine whether any gas protection measures are required.

As the consultant has identified the need for further monitoring before the gas risk assessment can be finalised, I am not satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to complete the detailed assessment of risk required by Part (b) of the condition. Consequently, the requirements of Part (c) have also not been met, as any remediation or gas protection measures cannot be fully determined until the gas risk assessment has been completed.

Should the applicant's consultant consider, in light of the site history, conceptual site model and available guidance, that further ground gas monitoring is not necessary, a revised technical justification should be submitted explaining why the gas risk assessment can be considered complete without additional monitoring. This is a matter for the applicant's consultant to justify and demonstrate.

In addition, whilst the report concludes that asbestos was not detected within the samples tested, the laboratory certificates record sample deviations for all asbestos analyses, noting "incorrect container/insufficient material provided". The submitted report does not discuss these limitations or provide confirmation that the laboratory considered the asbestos results to remain valid despite the recorded deviations. Clarification should therefore be provided to demonstrate that the asbestos assessment is sufficiently robust.

The condition should therefore not be discharged at this time. Further ground gas monitoring should be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the

submitted report, or alternatively a revised technical justification provided demonstrating why additional monitoring is not required. The results, together with a final contamination risk assessment and any necessary remediation strategy, should then be submitted for review. Clarification should also be provided regarding the validity of the asbestos analysis results.

All the best,

Ollie

Oliver Benson
Senior Environmental Health Officer
Environmental Protection Team
Tel: 01444 477 059
Email: oliver.benson@midsussex.gov.uk
Website: www.midsussex.gov.uk



“Working together for a better Mid Sussex”

From: Joseph Swift <Joseph.Swift@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 September 2026 09:59
To: Oliver Benson <Oliver.Benson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/1945

Good morning Ollie,

Hope you are well.

RE: Discharge of condition no 4 relating planning application DM/23/3250

AT: Land West Of Selsfield Road, Ardingly, West Sussex

REFERENCE: DM/26/1945

Can I just check that you have the consultation request for the above mentioned application?

Thought I should check as I know there has been a few issues with Uniform recently and you are normally very quick to responds.

Many thanks

Joe

Joseph Swift BA (Hons) MPLAN
Senior Planning Officer (Brookleigh)
01444 477319
Mid Sussex District Council
joseph.swift@midsussex.gov.uk
www.midsussex.gov.uk



Working together for a better Mid Sussex