

15th January 2026



Sent via email

Nicola Pettifer
Senior Planning Officer
Horsham District Council
Albery House,
Springfield Road,
Horsham,
West Sussex
RH12 2GB

Robert Steele MRTPI

E: rsteele@savills.com
M: +447812249345

244 – 246 High Street
Guildford
Surrey
GU1 3JF
savills.com

Dear Nicola,

WOODFORDS, SHIPLEY ROAD, SOUTHWATER, HORSHAM, RH13 9BQ

SUBMISSION OF AMENDED PLANS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

LPA REF. DC/25/1658

We write on behalf of our client Bellway Homes Limited, in respect of LPA ref. DC/25/1658 which seeks reserved matters approval ('RMA') for the following:

"Reserved matters application for the erection of up to 73no. dwellings, open space and child play provision, residential parking facilities and associated infrastructure, including access arrangements following outline application DC/21/2180, relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping."

Further to recent correspondence and dialogue with you please find enclosed amended documentation and additional information responding to consultation comments raised by statutory consultees and local stakeholders on the submitted application.

This letter is accompanied by the following documents:

- Amended Drawings, prepared by DHA Architects;
 - Includes a Drawing Register prepared by DHA Architects
- Drainage Technical Note, prepared by Ardent;
- Landscape Drawings, prepared by Allen Pyke;
 - Illustrative Landscape Masterplan – 3424-APA-ZZ-XX-LA-L-1001 (Rev P03)
 - Planting Schedule and Horticultural Notes – 3424-APA-ZZ-XX-PP-L-2000 (Rev P05)
 - Planting Plan 1 – 3424-APA-ZZ-XX-PP-L-2001 (Rev P04)
 - Planting Plan 2 – 3424-APA-ZZ-XX-PP-L-2002 (Rev P04)
 - Planting Plan 3 – 3424-APA-ZZ-XX-PP-L-2003 (Rev P04)
- Arboriculture Technical Note, prepared by Keen Consultants;
 - Technical Note 001 Rev B
 - Tree Protection Plan – 2463-KC-XX-YTREE-TTP01RevE
- Ecology reports, prepared by Ecology Solutions
 - Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy
 - Landscape Ecological Management Plan

The remainder of this letter provides an overview of the key consultation comments that had been received during the determination period and how they have been addressed through amended documentation.

Site Layout and Design Amendments

In response to the consultation comments received on the application and following your feedback, a modification has been made to the layout to switch the position of the apartment block and the terrace of dwelling houses (Plots 55-59) and the associated parking facilities. This change will achieve a softening of the built form on the southern edge of the parcel and respond to the comments about ensuring an appropriate transition to the rural context beyond the site boundary.

In response to comments on the appearance of the apartment block refinements have been made to the massing and articulation of the building. The block has been redesigned to a two and a half storey building, with the third floor accommodation within the roof treatment. Barn hip roofs have been incorporated and the ridge height reduced compared to the original drawings. The updated drawings prepared by DHA enclosed within this submission of additional information provide finer detail on proposed modifications.

Alongside feedback from HDC Development Control and Urban Design minor comments had been received from Place Services Landscape team on the proposed scheme. The main points are addressed in turn in the table below:

Place Services Comment	Response
<i>Detailed comments pertaining to the composition of the layout. It was noted that the residential density should soften on the southern portion of the site reflecting the rural edge on the southern boundary. It was noted that taller elements shall be located on the northern portion of the site.</i>	<p>The illustrative masterplan submitted with the OPP should be treated as a guide on how the development could be brought forward. It was not drawn based on detailed technical information for construction requirements. This is not an approved drawing and does not fix the layout.</p> <p>The layout had been refined from outline stage to move the apartment building away from the woodland which adjoins the northern boundary and RPAs along the northern edge of the site. There is also a technical requirement for a SUDs basin in this area and so it is necessary to relocate the apartment building / development edge compared with the illustrative masterplan submitted at the outline stage.</p> <p>The apartment building is arranged over two and a half storeys, with the third floor accommodation within the roof. The location of the apartment building has been adjusted compared to that originally submitted with this application to help address the comments about the rural edge of the site.. The southern boundary of the site is characterised by two storey dwelling houses. This arrangement aligns with the design intent from OPP stage.</p> <p>As illustrated on the landscape masterplan, the vegetated buffer on the southern portion of the site had been strengthened and enhanced.</p>
<i>Applicant should address the discrepancy between the planting shown on illustrative perspective 03 and</i>	As illustrated on the revised planting plans, additional planting is now shown around the sides of

<i>Planting Plans for the SuDS area to the north-east corner of the site. Planting around basins should be supplemented with other shrubs and planting beyond meadow mix proposed.</i>	the basins adjacent to the site boundaries as well as introducing native shrub planting to the headwalls.
<i>Remove Viburnum tinus spp. from the planting palette.</i> <i>Common elder (Sambucus nigra) should not be specified as part of the hedge mix.</i> <i>Additional planting such as hedgerow or trellis climbers should be proposed around the substation, to soften this feature within the POS.</i>	All instances of Viburnum tinus have been removed. Common elder has been removed and supplemented with other native scrub species. A hedge has been added to the sub-station.
<i>Reduce the reliance on knee rails (including the POS shown in Illustrative Perspective 02) around the eastern greenspace and introduce soft landscaping including shrub planting. The low knee rail around the POS is advised to be removed</i>	Knee rails along the eastern POS have been reduced and supplemented for timber bollards alongside sections of carriageway.

Housing Mix and Affordable Housing

In November 2025, HDC Housing team requested clarification on the housing mix proposed in the RMA. The legal agreement attached to the Outline Planning Permission (OPP) outlined a prescriptive housing mix for the affordable housing component, as below:

- Affordable rent
 - 16 x 2bedroom (4person) units
 - 4 x 3bedroom (5person) units
- Intermediate
 - 4 x 2bedroom (4person) units
 - 5 x 3bedroom (5person) units

The housing mix within the submitted scheme aligns with the requirement from the OPP.

Within the open market housing element, the residential mix broadly aligns with the SHMA. It is understood that the residential mix proposed is acceptable to officers at HDC.

Arboriculture

In October 2025, HDCs Arboricultural Officer raised comments about the relationship between the proposed layout and the existing tree constraints across the site. An Arboriculture Technical Note and a revised Tree Protection Plan (Revision E) is enclosed.

The section below summarises the key points of clarification raised in this response.

Arboricultural Officer Comment	Response
--------------------------------	----------

<p><i>Drainage infrastructure has mostly been positioned outside RPAs, with shallow swale outfalls only touching the margins of rooting zones in locations where root presence is expected to be limited due to existing historical ditch features. Notwithstanding, the above, some amendments are needed with certain sections of the drainage system, please see Trees with RPAs Directly Affected below.</i></p> <p><i>Given the greenfield nature of the site, if amendments to the utilities or drainage infrastructure are considered to be unworkable, suitable root-friendly installation techniques, such as thrust boring or impact moling, MUST be used and secured by a planning condition.</i></p>	<p>An updated site layout plan shows that in order to avoid existing RPAs, the pumping station has been moved eastwards and the rising main drain has been moved further into the road. These changes are considered to respond to the officer's comments regarding avoiding existing RPAs of trees.</p>
<p><i>TPO trees in northeast corner – Drainage infrastructure sited in southern section of RPAs, given the protected status of the affected trees this should be moved and any drainage infrastructure should be located outside of RPAs, and the Pumping Station should also be moved at least 2m to the south, to allow for an appropriate amount of separation from the RPAs in the area, not only to protect the RPAs during the build process, but also form likely post development impacts. Whereby, new infrastructure often requires ongoing maintenance and occasional intrusive repair, posing additional long-term risks to the affected protected trees and their RPAs, should any underground services need to be reopened to allow for future repairs to the pipework post development.</i></p>	<p>In response to these comments, the pumping station in the north east corner of the site that the comments refer to has been relocated outside of the RPA of the retained trees (see the revised Tree Protection Plan Revision E). Its outer enclosure stands against the edge of the RPA but this structure is not likely to give rise to material harm to the tree.</p> <p>Drainage routes to the pumping station are outside of the RPA and can be implemented conventionally and not result in harm to the trees.</p> <p>The rising main is indicated to pass within the RPA. To avoid harm this will need to be installed using specialist measures, as advocated by BS5837. Suitable specialist measures include excavation with hand-held tools, air spade or vacuum. Alternatively, trenchless techniques such as thrust boring or directional drilling can be used. The Tree Protection Plan (Revision E) has been annotated to show this requirement.</p>
<p><i>T47 - It is apparent that drainage infrastructure sited with the RPA of T47, as with the section of drainage infrastructure in the northeast corner this should be removed from the RPA of the affected tree. Also there is no reference to no no-dig build methods where the RPA of T47 is sited under the accesses road.</i></p>	<p>Tree 47 has a foul drainage route passing within its RPA. To avoid harm to the trees, specialist installation as advocated by BS5837 will be deployed . The Tree Protection Plan Revision E has been annotated to show this requirement.</p>
<p><i>T53–T56 (English oaks along the internal tree line): Footpath alignment in the northern parcel crosses into their outer RPAs. A no-dig cellular confinement system is proposed to avoid root disturbance. However, confirmation should be sought on what this concrete base is shown in the RPA of T37</i></p>	<p>The concrete base that the Arboricultural Officer refers to is located within the RPA of T53, not T37 as is referred to.</p> <p>Tree 53 has an existing concrete base located to its north west. It will need to be removed to permit the soft landscape in that area. The Tree Protection Plan Revision E has been annotated with guidance on its removal.</p>

<i>T72–T76 (Mature oaks within the western hedgerow line): The proximity of pathways and potential garden edging intersects minor parts of their RPAs. Any new surfacing in these areas must be installed using a no-dig cellular confinement system above existing levels.</i>	Pathways proximate to trees 72 to 76 are remote from these RPAs and can be constructed conventionally.
<i>T5 (English oak near revised driveway access): Although the new access is sited to avoid the RPA, the existing track removal and reinstatement to soft ground occur within the RPA margins, this will require sensitive approach completed arboricultural monitoring.</i>	Removal of the existing driveway from within the RPA of tree 5 can be undertaken sympathetically. Notes have been added to the Tree Protection Plan Revision E to guide the demolition/construction team.
<i>Hedgerow Group 22: Localised RPA overlap occurs where drainage swales pass through the understorey. Impact is minimal but requires care during installation.</i>	Localised works are required for installation of drainage swales proximate to hedgerow number 22. These works can be undertaken with care to avoid material impact to the retained tree features.

Drainage

In November 2025, the LLFA raised minor comments concerning detail of the drainage strategy and conformity with guidance contained in the adopted development plan. A Drainage Technical Note has been prepared by Ardent which includes updated drainage strategy to reflect changes to the southern portion of the site along with clarifications to the technical matters that had been raised in the consultation response.

The section below summarises the key points of clarification raised in this response.

LLFA comment	Response
1. <i>There are several instances where the calculation labels/numbering does not match the drainage layout.</i>	All calculation labels and numbering have now been amended so that this now matches the drainage layout in the updated Drainage Technical Note, which has been submitted alongside this letter.
2. <i>Additional area 5 has been used. This is normally where 10% urban creep is added to calculations.</i>	We confirm that a 10% allowance for urban creep was correctly applied. We have clarified this in a revised Drainage Technical Note explaining the additional area allowed in the calculations.
3. <i>Appendix A doesn't match the site layout being used in the drainage strategy layout. The layouts need to match, to ensure there are no issues later.</i>	Appendix A of the updated Drainage Technical Note now matches the site layout being used in the drainage strategy layout.
4. <i>3m easements from the basins and watercourses need to be on drawings. This is for maintenance purposes.</i>	A 3m maintenance strip at the top of the basin in the south of the site is shown on the Drainage Plan (Ref: 2108061_B-ACE-XX-XX-DR-C-0501-D_Drainage Strategy).

5. <i>We'd suggest rainwater harvesting needs to be considered in more detail for this site, as West Sussex is water stressed.</i>	The storage of rainwater for re-use has been discussed further in part 3.2 of the updated Drainage Technical Note.
6. <i>It appears that the impermeable area stated in the report does not match the calculations (doesn't match with or without urban creep allowance).</i>	All figures and calculations have been checked for consistency in the updated Drainage Technical Note.
7. <i>An exceedance plan needs to be provided.</i>	An exceedance plan has been appended to the updated Drainage Technical Note at Appendix N.
8. <i>As discussed in pre-app, we asked for construction drawings of the outfall, to determine whether OWC for the headwall is required.</i>	A Ditch Construction Details Plan has been produced and appended to the updated Drainage Technical Note at Appendix J.

Southern Water

The Southern Water consultation response has raised comments about the adoption of the onsite sustainable drainage infrastructure and pumping station for adoption; along with commentary on offset distance for residential dwellings from the pumping station. The layout has been designed to maintain a minimum separation distance of 15m. The applicant would be content to consider appropriately worded conditions if required, but would seek to avoid duplication of any conditions imposed on the OPP. Final details of the pumping station could be secured by condition but the applicant would request that the trigger is framed as prior to relevant works, rather than a pre-commencement condition.

In respect of wider foul water capacity in the network, Bellway undertook a pre development enquiry with Southern Water in June 2025 and that confirmed there will be upgrades implemented by Southern Water in the vicinity and at the appropriate time to enable suitable services ahead of occupations at the development.

Other Matters

It is noted that WSCC Highways and Police departments have indicated no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions, where appropriate. The applicant is content with the suggested Highways conditions.

With regard to the comments from WSCC Police Department it should be noted that the scheme has been designed in line with the Secure By Design Principles. The applicant would be content to engage with WSCC DOCO officer at the post planning stage to address any remaining comments.

WSCC Fire and Rescue Department had made reference to additional conditions on the RMA relating to details of the siting and installation of hydrants. This item is covered by Condition 18 on the OPP. It is understood that officers at HDC are content that existing conditions on the consent are sufficient and a duplication of conditions are not required.

The Environmental Health Officer sought clarification on the air quality mitigation strategy for the development. A condition is proposed to be imposed on the RMA requiring final details of the air quality mitigation plan to be approved prior to first occupation of the development. The applicant would note that detail has been submitted under Condition 13 and would query the need for duplication of conditions.

Summary

Further to recent correspondence we trust that the information enclosed with this submission is sufficient to address the comments and will enable the application to progress favourably to Planning Committee. We look forward to working with officers to take this application forward to determination.

If you require any further information to enable you to assess the application, please contact either myself or James Greene.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Steele".

Robert Steele
Director