

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 May 2026 14:54:58 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application DM/26/1199

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 14/05/2026 2:54 PM from Oliver Benson on behalf of Environmental Protection.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/26/1199
Address:	Land South Of Leacroft London Road Hickstead West Sussex
Proposal:	Discharge of condition nos 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 relating to application DM/23/1339
Case Officer:	Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

I have reviewed the submitted Contamination Risk Assessment prepared by Environmental Assessment Services Ltd, Ref: 872/Ellisdon/Leacroft/CRA, and dated May 2026, in relation to discharging Condition 4 of planning permission DM/23/1339.

The report presents the findings of an intrusive site investigation. The investigation comprises trial pitting across the site, laboratory analysis of soil samples, and a qualitative risk assessment undertaken with reference to appropriate commercial land use screening criteria. Potential contaminant linkages have been identified and assessed, and risk rated. The findings are consistent with the presence of contamination within shallow made ground across the site. The submission is therefore considered to satisfy the requirements of Condition 4(a).

Whilst the report is acceptable, it would benefit from improved clarity in the presentation of ground conditions and sampling. In

particular, the inclusion of detailed trial pit logs and a clearer summary of soil strata and sampling depths would assist in supporting the interpretation of contaminant distribution and the conceptual site model. There is an impression that exceedances are only found within the made ground, and that this is approximately only 30cm in depth, but the lack of data provided makes this unclear. However, the conclusions of the report are still acceptable.

The report also includes a remediation strategy comprising removal of made ground within areas of proposed soft landscaping, placement of a geotextile membrane, and the importation of clean cover soils of up to 600 mm in planting areas. This approach is considered acceptable and would appropriately break identified pollutant linkages, ensuring the site is suitable for its proposed commercial end use, and therefore satisfies the requirements of Condition 4(b). The report also identifies the potential for contaminants to affect potable water infrastructure. The applicant should ensure that relevant contamination data is provided to the water undertaker to confirm whether barrier pipe or other protective measures are required. If not required, evidence of contact with the undertaken should be included within the verification process. If required, photos of the implemented protective measures should be included in the verification document.

I would note the proposed cover system is relatively conservative given the nature of the development, which will be commercial, predominantly covered by buildings and hardstanding, and the identified exceedances being largely confined to shallow made ground within limited areas. A more targeted or reduced remediation approach may be achievable through further delineation, testing or refinement of the risk assessment, although this would require additional justification. The applicant may wish to consider this, as while there may be added cost at this stage, the reduced scope of remediation may be more cost effective and sustainable.

The applicant is reminded that verification of the remediation scheme is required under Condition 17 of the planning permission.

On this basis, the submitted information is considered sufficient to discharge Condition 4 (parts a and b) of planning permission DM/23/1339.

Kind regards