



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Land To The South of Broadbridge Way Broadbridge Heath West Sussex (Wickhurst green)
DESCRIPTION:	Full Planning Application for the erection of 89no. residential dwellings comprising dwellings (54no.) and apartments (35no.), 36% affordable homes, creation of new vehicular access on to Sergeant Way, provision of public open space, landscaping and drainage solutions
REFERENCE:	DC/25/0894
RECOMMENDATION:	No Objection/Advice
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION: 3rd set of comments The removal of the cycle route from the rpa's of trees T31 and T19 is welcomed and resolves point 3c below. The remaining points remain to be covered by condition as previously requested. 2nd set of comments Some of the previous concerns and comments have been addressed with thanks. With regards to those comments that haven't been addressed, where appropriate it is recommended that details are secured by condition. However, please note points 3c (avoid encroachment to existing trees rpa's), 5 (land budget) and 30 (surfacing material) are recommended to be addressed prior to determination. Point 13 is also recommend as being addressed prior to determination for clarity and given there are other issues to resolve, however we are fairly confident that landscape strategy can be delivered and this element of the proposal could be conditioned if needed. Further consideration of the layout needs to be given to safeguard the retention of existing landscape features as well as secure the delivery and establishment of landscape proposals. In addition, we advise that SuDS proposals are revised to be landscape-led and address the unmet design criteria, which will additionally enhance the overall drainage strategy. The current proposals present various issues and concerns which are discussed in detail below as well as recommendations to enhance the landscape and visual resources.	
MAIN COMMENTS: <u>Layout & open space strategy</u>	

1. In order to mitigate adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity, and to comply with HDPF Policies 25, 26, 31 and 33 (6), existing vegetation must be protected, conserved and enhanced. In order to safeguard the existing mature trees, proposals must:
 - a. Avoid development within root protection areas (RPAs) and demonstrate compliance with BS 5837:2012 5.3.1.
 - b. Avoid existing trees and vegetation backing onto garden plots or being enclosed within residential curtilage whenever possible, to secure their long-term retention and sympathetic relationship with future occupants of the site.
2. We echo comments made by HDC's Arboriculturalist in regard to there being no 'overriding justification' for development within the RPAs, the accuracy of the RPAs plotted and concerns with the relationship with future residents in relation to felling/pruning pressure and shading.
3. As a result, it is recommended the layout is revised within the following areas:
 - a. Alongside the stream to the west – Plots 50, 51, 52 & 55 should be removed to prevent an unsympathetic relationship with future residents and the treeline comprising T39-T44 which would be at risk of felling and lopping. [Closed, thanks.](#)
 - i. We also concur with concerns raised by the LLFA and advise that the ditch and stream are not within the ownership of future residents or within the watercourse easement. [closed](#)
 - ii. Please note that the provision of these lost dwellings could be accommodated within the eastern parcel where there is scope to increase the density.
 - b. Plot 64 and the footpath should be relocated to prevent shading concerns, risk of felling and lopping, and avoid encroachment of the RPA of T39, T40 & T41. [Closed, thanks](#)
 - c. Footpath and road to the south of T31 and T19 should be adjusted further south. [Not addressed and the comments of the tree officer are noted and supported. We recommend that the cycle path and road become shared surface in this short section to reduce the impact and potential loss of the trees. This must be addressed prior to determination. Closed](#)
4. We note that the pump station has been removed from the location originally indicated in the Pre-Application Layout, however it appears to be absent from plans. Please confirm its location to prevent further modification to the layout and to safeguard the retention of existing landscape features. [We note there is a pump station adjacent to the site's western boundary but outside of the red line. It is assumed there is no need for an additional location to be provided within the plan. Closed.](#)
5. Proposals must demonstrate compliance with Horsham District Council's Open Space, Sports & Recreation Review 2021 (OSSR) through the submission of a detailed land budget plan, as highlighted by HDC Parks and Countryside. The plan must identify the location and extent allocated for each typology, as well as a table quantifying the area allocated to each typology. [Not addressed, please secure prior to determination](#)
6. Based on the OSSR, we note that Broadbridge Heath has a deficit in Natural/Semi-Natural space and Parks, therefore we recommend that these typologies are provided on-site with other typologies to be delivered off-site, through contributions to existing local facilities as per HDC's Parks and Countryside consultation response. Please refer to the OSSR for design standards.
7. There is opportunity to increase the open space provision within the area near the existing tree corridor, as per recommendations under point 3a, to satisfy requirements of the OSSR. [Closed](#)
8. We recommend that not all open spaces are designated for meadow, and that there should be provision of amenity grassland area managed with a regular mowing regime. This is to

provide opportunity for informal play/picnics and safeguard the retention of meadow in the more sensitive areas of the site for biodiversity provision. [Closed](#)

9. Where meadow is proposed, please ensure mown paths are detailed for relevant pedestrian access where applicable. In addition, signage delivered to educate future residents on meadow appearance, management, and general need for meadows in landscapes is desirable. [Closed](#)

SuDS & Utilities

10. The Drainage Strategy is not consistent with the SuDS Assessment carried out within the Flood Risk and Drainage Report (FRDR). Filter strips are proposed, despite the SuDS Assessment reporting that they are not suitable '*due to space constraints*' and '*have potential for getting clogged*'. As such, we require construction details with cross sections, as well as specific maintenance measures. [Not addressed, secure by condition](#)

11. In addition to the above, we advise that rain gardens are delivered within filter strips, as opposed to WG2 throughout. This is in order to:

- a. Provide seasonal interest throughout the year, and therefore higher amenity benefits
- b. Increase drainage efficacy
- c. Deter trampling and use as thoroughfare

Rain garden species must be added to the Planting Schedule accordingly and include nectar rich plants, various grasses and variations in vegetation structure. [not addressed, please secure by condition](#)

12. The SuDS proposals do not meet the full design criteria listed under 6.7.1 within the FRDR, with Amenity and Biodiversity notably missing from the proposed solutions.


We note from the 'Technical Note Surface Water Drainage: Response to LLFA Comments' that, '*It has not been possible to provide SuDS across the site in order to intercept the first 5mm of rainfall for the majority of rainfall events due to development specific constraints*'. We do not concur with this statement and consider that there are further opportunities for SuDS that can be delivered on site, that also address the unmet design criteria of Amenity and Biodiversity. For example:

- a. Rain gardens, as noted under point 6
- b. Introducing blue green roofs to ancillary structures such as bin and cycle stores, which would be highly effective given their combined water collection area
- c. Wetland planting within the Open Space and/or alongside the stream and riparian buffer

If these opportunities are disagreed with, justification is sought as well as rationale for not meeting the full design criteria.

13. While we note that tree pit barriers are to be installed to all tree pits within 3m of any underground service routes, it is still recommended that trees remain outside the services easement zone. In order to avoid potential conflict and to ensure that both strategies can be delivered, slight adjustment to locations of trees and/or underground services is recommended. We additionally recommend using a single trench for services where possible. [It's unclear if these have been adjusted therefore for clarity a coordinated underground service plan and landscape strategy must be submitted. It is recommended that this is submitted prior to determination.](#)

Please see non-exhaustive examples of potential conflict below with trees indicated in blue:



Planting proposals

14. The current planting schedule proposes trees no greater than 14-16cm girth. Please revise the proposals to include a broader range of sizes, including 20-25cm girth trees at key strategic locations such as trees along the main access road, to improve the site's legibility and provide immediate structure. Please see suggestions below marked in orange: [Closed](#), [thanks](#).



15. Please provide quantities to the plant schedule. [Closed](#), [thanks](#)
16. Please specify hedgerow species within the hard and soft landscape plan. [Closed](#), [thanks](#)
17. Hedgerow planting should reflect 5 per linear metre, as opposed to 1. [Closed](#), [thank you](#)
18. We request that *Prunus laurocerasus* 'Otto Luyken' and *Lonicera nitida* is replaced with alternative species such as those already proposed or *Taxus baccata* and *Ligustrum vulgare*, for biodiversity and amenity value. [Closed](#)
19. We concur with comments made by HDC's Arboriculturalist in regard to the monolithed Ash trees. We recommend that these trees are removed and replaced with native, riparian species such as *Alnus glutinosa*, *Salix* spp, *Betula pubescens* or *Populus nigra* subsp.

betulifolia. This should be delivered as advance planting for the watercourse treeline to strengthen and establish during construction, delivered alongside the enabling operations/protection fencing to the existing trees. [Species added with thanks. Please condition for advance planting delivery.](#)

20. We request further tree provision to the south of the road, indicated in purple below, as per the pre application layout. [Not addressed or justification provided. To note, we would expect the dwelling to be moved back in alignment with the others to allow for the delivery of the trees.](#)



21. It is recommended that native hedgerow is proposed for the full length adjacent to Sargent Way, as indicated in purple below. [Closed with thanks.](#)



Planting notes & Landscape Management Plan (LMP) – Please note that this information can be secured via condition if necessary.

22. Please note that we recommend that backfill should replicate existing soil profile by using soil excavated from planting pits, only amended with imported soils if necessary. Please amend Planting Notes point 7 accordingly. [Closed](#)

23. While a minimum 75mm of mulch is to be applied to all planting beds as a general measure, please specify for tree planting that a 120mm collar should be left free of mulch around the stems/trunks to prevent rotting. [Closed](#)
24. Please provide information on watering regimes for successful establishment, as 'regularly' is not sufficient detail. A maintenance timetable within the LMP is recommended for clarity. [Not addressed](#)
25. We recommend that chemical fertilisers, pesticides and herbicides including glyphosate are not to be applied at any time due to impacts on waterbodies, ditches, hedgerows and the protection of their ecological features.
- a. Alternative methods for weeding should be considered such as electronic control systems, hot foam or hot water systems, steel brushing in combination with acetic acid spraying, or hand weeding alone by careful digging or selective scything. Please amend Planting Notes point 11 and LMP point 8 to reflect that no herbicides are to be used at any time and propose alternative methods such as the above. [Not addressed](#)
 - b. Please amend Planting Notes point 7 to remove mention of fertiliser when planting trees for the reasons listed above and as it limits root growth and slows establishment. [Not addressed](#)
26. Specific maintenance and management responsibilities for hard landscaped areas, roads, benches and SuDS features not yet included. [Not addressed. Also not included is a management and maintenance responsibilities plan. Please secure by condition](#)

Boundary treatments & ancillary structures


27. Please update the Boundary Treatments Plan (BTP) to reflect 'Landscaping buffer – hedges' as indicated in the key. [This has been added to the plans with thanks but are all the proposed hedges, including those in the front gardens to be 1.8m in height? This is not considered appropriate.](#)
28. Please provide specification for the brick boundary walls, noting that some level of brick detailing would be recommended for visual amenity and interest. [Not addressed, please secure by condition](#)
29. Post and rail fence should be added to the BTP for gardens alongside the central ditch, however this is not necessary if the layout is adjusted as per point 3. [Closed](#)

Combined hard and soft landscape plan:

30. It is noted that the surfacing adjacent to Carter drive is proposed as asphalt instead of extending the existing block paving. The sections of road marked up below were also indicated within a previous version of the illustrative masterplan. It is recommended that this is rectified and secured prior to determination.



31. The SuDS feature appears to be proposed as 650mm depth. It is therefore recommended that the post and rail fence surrounding it is removed so it's better integrated into the open space.
32. The area between the open space and plot 50 doesn't appear to detail what is the soft or hard landscape materials proposed. Please update plan.



33.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: If you're minded to recommend the application for approval without the concerns addressed above please get in touch as specific conditions will be required.

Please secure:

- advance planting delivery for tree planting within the watercourse.
- standard LMMP condition
- boundary wall details (brick wall detailing)
- hard and soft landscape details to also cover SuDS details and SuDS plant schedule (See points 10 & 11). For completeness, wildflower and amenity grass spec detail should also be added to the plant schedule.

NAME:	Elly Hazael Trainee Landscape Architect (Planning)
DEPARTMENT:	Specialists Team - Strategic Planning
DATE:	21/07/2025
SIGNED OFF BY:	Inês Watson CMLI Specialists Team Leader (Landscape Architect)
DATE:	22/07/2025 25/11/2025 05/12/2025