

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 August 2025 10:54:08 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2070

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 19/08/2025 10:54 AM from Oliver Benson on behalf of Contaminated Land.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/25/2070
Address:	The Lodge Bennetts Rise Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Discharge of condition 1 relating to planning reference DM/23/2831.
Case Officer:	Joanne Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments:	I have reviewed the submitted contamination assessment by W.K. Elson, dated August 2025, along with the supporting trial pit logs and laboratory analysis (Chemtech Environmental Report 25-07342). The assessment has been undertaken in line with Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) guidance and provides a general overview of the site's historical use and ground conditions. The site lies within the grounds of the former St. Frances Hospital and has no history of industrial or commercial use. Soil samples from four trial pits were analysed for a range of metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), with all results below relevant screening values for residential use with plant uptake. The laboratory testing was carried out by a UKAS and MCERTS accredited facility and is considered reliable. However, there are some concerns that need to be addressed before the report can be accepted. The laboratory report does not
-----------	---

specify the depths at which samples were taken, and the trial pit logs indicate that three of the four samples (TP1, TP2, and TP4) were recovered from topsoil. Only TP3 appears to have been taken from fill, which may represent made ground. Given the site's history as part of a hospital estate, it is reasonable to expect that made ground may be present close to the surface in certain areas. If the investigation did not target these areas more systematically, it may have missed zones where contamination is most likely to be present. This raises questions about the rationale for the sampling strategy and the representativeness of the results.

A site plan showing the location of trial pits TP1–TP4 would help assess spatial coverage and whether sampling was undertaken in areas of potential risk or future residential use. This plan is referenced as Appendix A in the report but does not appear to have been provided. Further detail is also needed to explain how the trial pit locations were selected in relation to the conceptual site model and anticipated exposure pathways, particularly where future residents are likely to come into contact with soil.

Hopefully once this information has been submitted, I will be in position to recommend discharge of condition 1.

Kind regards