



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Land West of Ifield Charlwood Road Ifield West Sussex
DESCRIPTION:	Hybrid planning application (part outline and part full planning application) for a phased, mixed use development comprising: A full element covering enabling infrastructure including the Crawley Western Multi-Modal Corridor (Phase 1, including access from Charlwood Road and crossing points) and access infrastructure to enable servicing and delivery of secondary school site and future development, including access to Rusper Road, supported by associated infrastructure, utilities and works, alongside: An outline element (with all matters reserved) including up to 3,000 residential homes (Class C2 and C3), commercial, business and service (Class E), general industrial (Class B2), storage or distribution (Class B8), hotel (Class C1), community and education facilities (Use Classes F1 and F2), gypsy and traveller pitches (sui generis), public open space with sports pitches, recreation, play and ancillary facilities, landscaping, water abstraction boreholes and associated infrastructure, utilities and works, including pedestrian and cycle routes and enabling demolition. This hybrid planning application is for a phased development intended to be capable of coming forward in distinct and separable phases and/or plots in a separable way.
REFERENCE:	DC/25/1312 (ES-LVIA)
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice / More Information / Modification-
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:	
<p>1. Please note this is the second set of comments (V02), but further comments may follow once further information/documents have been reviewed. Comments at this stage relate to the documents listed below, although where needed, other documents have been cross referenced to fully understand the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ES Chapter 4 – Proposed Development Description• ES Chapter 5 – Demolition and Construction Description• ES Chapter 11 – Landscape and Visual (and associated appendixes)• Earthworks Strategy• ES Chapter 17 – Residual Effects & Mitigation	

ES chapter 11 – Landscape and Visual – Summary Conclusions

2. Overall, a development of this scale will unsurprisingly give rise to a number of significant adverse effects at both construction and completion stages (Year 1) which are Significant in the context of the EIA. Nevertheless, many of the embedded design mitigation measures reduce some of these effects on identified receptors to non-significant and these have been listed within para 11.12, Summary of Residual Effects, see tables 11-7.
3. There are however additional residual effects identified on the Completed development, Year 15, that in our judgment remain either Moderate or Major adverse and therefore **Significant**. These are listed below:

Table 1.0 Residual Landscape Effects – Completed Development

Receptor	Gillespies Scale and Significance of Residual Effects (Year 15)	HDC Scale and Significance of Residual Effects (Year 15)
LLCA 4: River Mole	Minor adverse (non-significant)	Moderate adverse (significant)
Individual elements (eg fields, hedgerows, trees, boundary vegetation, watercourses)	Although not included within the summary table 11-7, it is assessed as Minor neutral (not significant), within table 11-4	Moderate adverse (significant)
Recreational users of PRoW on the edge or within the northern parts of the Site (VPs 5, 6, 9,36)	Minor adverse (non-significant)	VP 5 – Minor adverse at Year (non-significant) VP 36 – Moderate Adverse (significant) VP 9, 6 – Major Adverse (significant)

4. As identified on the table above, while not all judgements on the individual receptors are agreed with, the overall conclusion set at para 11.14.9 of the assessment is nevertheless concurred with in that the additional residual effects identified by HDC, remain limited to receptors within the site or its immediate setting. Para 11.14.9 copied below for ease:
11.14.9 Overall, it is considered that the completed Proposed Development would result in some significant effects on the landscape and identified receptors, and as such would give rise to significant effects for landscape and visual. However, these effects are constrained to receptors within and immediately adjacent the Site and for a Proposed Development of this scale are limited.
5. The assessment confirms that residual effects for construction and demolition have been assessed as 'worst case scenario'. While this approach is adequate, given most of the effects are identified as Significant, we request that advance planting is considered at the beginning of each phase and added to the proposals as part of the additional mitigation measures. This includes identifying appropriate locations to be delivered at phase 1, which must also take into account the location of the site compound and associated enabling works.

MAIN COMMENTS:

ES chapter 4 – Proposed Development Description

6. A different table (from that provided on the DAS and discussed in the previous set of comments) setting out the open space commitment is shown at para 4.7.6, table 4.6 copied below for ease:

4.7.6 Table 4.6 summarises the minimum commitments for landscape and open space standards that the Proposed Development would deliver.

Table 4.6: Landscape and Public Realm Provisions		
Typology	Minimum Requirements	Estimated Requirement (based on population of 6, 725 ⁴) in Ha
Strategic Green Infrastructure		
Natural and Semi Natural Green Space	24.3 m ² per resident	16.34
Amenity Greenspace	5.8 m ² per resident	3.9
Parks and Gardens (includes outdoor sports ⁵)	13.8 m ² per resident	9.28
Allotment	1.8 m ² per resident	1.21
Children Playparks (playgrounds/landscaped areas of play)	0.5 m ² per resident	0.33
Youth Areas and Facilities	0.4 m ² per resident	0.27
Additional Green Infrastructure Types Not Included within Above Categories⁶		
Provision within illustrative Masterplan (ha)		Commentary

⁴ Indicative population number based on up to 3,000 homes, provided to Ramboll by Prior and Partners.

⁵ Includes Grass Pitches and Artificial Pitches, Tennis and Bowling

⁶ As shown on the Landscape and Public Realm Parameter Plan (Parameter Plan 3: WOI-HPA-PLAN-PP03-01)

Table 4.6: Landscape and Public Realm Provisions		
Area Identified for Natural Conservation and Management	11.2	These areas, when added to the other figures above, cover the full open space set out in the Parameter Plans. Further details on the exact scale of these areas will be refined at the RMA stage.
Areas within the Ecology Buffers	8.23	
Secondary School Open Space ⁷	6.9	

7. The quantity requirements shown on the table above varies from the table we added at para 2 of our previous comments (dated 10/11/2025). The calculation should assume 2.4 occupants per dwelling x 3000= 7,200. The table above bases the calculations on a population of 6,725 which is not correct.
8. We continue to recommend that a land budget plan is submitted to demonstrate that the open space requirements generated by the development, can be secured in the right locations within the proposed parameter plan prior to determination as this is considered a risk element if found not compliant with the OSSR.

ES chapter 5 – Demolition and Construction Description

9. Section 5.8 External/Landscape Works, states that '*Installation of the proposed soft landscaping within a given phase would only commence upon substantial completion of associated construction and fit out works to minimise potential plant material loss*'.
10. As part of the mitigation measures, works within buffers zones are expected to be delivered as advance planting as part of the enabling works at the commencement of each phase. The risk of plant loss will not apply given these areas are being excluded from incursion during construction works due to their ecological sensitivity. Please add to the mitigation section and update detail plans for phase 1 where this can be delivered.

ES chapter 11 – Landscape and Visual

11. page 11-21, para 11.10.5, refers to a tree parameter plan – I was unable to find this, please could this be provided? Although the report may be refereeing to the Tree Removal Plan (WOI-APP-PP06). Please confirm for clarity.

Assessment of effects

Demolition and Construction Stage Effects

12. While CEMP provides the principles in which the site compound will be set up and mitigation measures to reduce effects during construction, there is no detailed location indicated within the phase 1 information (applied in full) for location of site access and haulage routes, scale, location and nature of any temporary parking areas, scale and height of office and other on-site accommodation, etc. Therefore, it is queried how was this considered within the LVIA and more importantly if suitable mitigation measures have been added to the plans given there are a number of sensitive landscape features and sensitive visual receptors crossing the area. We recommend that the location of the compound for phase 1 is indicated and assessed accordingly.

Completed Development Effects

13. Para 11.10.5 – Based on the information provided in the earthworks strategy and general understanding of the existing site levels and proposals, it is disagreed that the topography of the site will be largely retained. This difference in interpretation of the baseline is likely to result in differences in judgement later on in the assessment.

Assessment of Landscape Effects

14. Para 11.10.9, refers to the assumption of landscape proposals being implemented as early as possible. This is in contradiction with para 5.8.1 of the ES, Chapter 5, where the installation of landscape is expected at substantial completion of works. Given most construction effects are found to be Major significant within the assessment, this is considered inadequate. Advance planting is therefore requested to be included as part of the mitigation measures and delivered where practical within each phase of the development.
15. Landscape effects – LLCA 4 & Gillespie's LCA: River Mole – the assessment judges the landscape effects within this area to be Moderate adverse at Completion (Year1) and Minor adverse at Year 15. These conclusions are disagreed with and the effects considered Major adverse at Completion and **Moderate Adverse at Year 15**. The proposals within this section are clearly at odds with the local landform and introduce incongruous features into the landscape, result in a partial loss of key attributes including a veteran tree, are visually intrusive with the instruction of uncharacteristic bunds, give rise to a noticeable reduction in the current level of tranquillity, introduce prominent new elements that are not characteristic and are in conflict with local landscape character area guidelines. The embedded mitigation measures are incapable of full mitigation.
16. Individual landscape elements within the Site – assessed as Minor Adverse effect at completion (Year 1) and Minor Neutral (Year 15). While much of the vegetation is to be

retained, the loss of irreplaceable habitat such as the veteran tree, and changes to topography such as development platforms, introduction of bunds and attenuation basins. This is a significant change to the baseline and therefore we consider that the effect should be Moderate adverse at Year 1 (Significant) and would reduce slightly at **Year 15** but remain **Moderate adverse** (Significant) as there are elements which are irreplaceable and incapable of being mitigated.

Assessment of Visual effects

1. *Residents and the wider community using and living along Rusper Road, at Lower Barn and within the Maples development to the north and north-east of the golf course (VP 29A, 34, 35)* – while the conclusions of effects are agreed with, a buffer zone adjacent to these receptors must be identified for delivery as advance planting and added to the additional mitigation measures section.
2. Recreational users of PRow close to the River Mole close to the north-west of the site (VPs 13, 15) – effects identified during construction are judged as being Major adverse, which is agreed with. However, it is considered that more can be done to meliorate the identified effects on these sensitive receptors by identifying areas where advanced planting can be delivered as part of the enabling works for each phase of the development. For the users of these footpaths, this would likely be for Phases 1 and 2.
3. *Recreational users of PRow on the edge or within the northern parts of the Site (VPs 5, 6, 9, 36)* - It is disagreed that the impact would reduce to Moderate Adverse at Year 1 across the area, given the significant change with the introduction of the bund, basins, road infrastructure and increased level of activity. The effects are judged to remain **Major Adverse at Year 1** and assessed as **Major/Moderate at Year 15** depending on the receptors position within the PRow. Although VP 36 and 5 may reduce to moderate adverse and minor respectively, with the proximity of the view the effect on receptors worsens and VP 9 and 6 is assessed as remaining Major adverse.

ES Volume 2 Technical Appendix 11.4: Visualisations

4. The methodology for visualisations produced by AVR London seem absent from the submitted documents. Please provide.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: N/A

NAME:	Inês Watson CMLI Specialists Team Leader (Landscape Architect)
DEPARTMENT:	Specialists Team - Strategic Planning
DATE:	14/11/2025