

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 June 2026 15:23:16 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application DM/26/1315

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 04/06/2026 3:23 PM from Oliver Benson on behalf of Contaminated Land.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/26/1315
Address:	Land West Of Gatesmead Wickham Way Haywards Heath West Sussex
Proposal:	Proposed 49 new homes together with open space and associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Caroline Grist

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Comments:	The submitted Desktop Study by Ridge and Partners LLP, dated May 2026 and the Ground Condition Assessment by Ridge and Partners LLP, dated July 2025, have been reviewed.
	The Desktop Study identifies the site as historically undeveloped agricultural land, with no evidence of on-site contaminative uses. The only potentially significant source identified is the adjacent railway along the western boundary, which is recognised as a potential source of contaminants such as metals, hydrocarbons and ash. No landfill sites, significant industrial uses, or other notable contaminative sources are identified within or in close proximity to the site. Environmental database and Local Authority records do not identify any entries of concern, and a site walkover did not identify any visual or olfactory evidence of contamination.
	The subsequent intrusive Ground Condition Assessment broadly

confirms this preliminary understanding. No Made Ground was encountered, no visual or olfactory contamination was identified, and all soil and groundwater results fall below relevant generic assessment criteria. Ground gas monitoring indicates a Characteristic Situation 1, which is very low risk, and risks to controlled waters are assessed as very low. These findings are consistent with the low risk conceptual site model, with the only plausible pollutant linkage relating to the adjacent railway, assessed as low risk.

Notwithstanding these findings, the report recommends further investigation on the basis that the site has not been fully covered and that residual uncertainty remains. However, the justification for additional intrusive investigation is not clearly defined. In particular, the report does not identify specific areas of concern requiring further investigation, set out any remaining pollutant linkages that have not already been adequately assessed, or explain how further investigation would materially alter the conclusions of a low risk site.

Further clarification is therefore required with regards to the justification for the additional investigation recommended, including clarification of the specific areas where further investigation is considered necessary (for example, is this in relation to the railway boundary), identification of the pollutant linkages or risks this additional work is intended to address, and confirmation as to whether any residual uncertainty could instead be adequately managed through a watching brief during development.

Pending receipt of this information, the need for any planning condition relating to further contamination investigation can then be determined.

Kind regards