



Horsham District Council
Parkside
Horsham
West Sussex
RH12 1RL

Our ref: 16690
Date: 17 July 2026

For the attention of: Daniel Holmes

Application ref: DC/26/0509
Location: Land To The South of Lynwick Street Rudgwick Horsham
Proposal/Description: Permission in Principle for the erection of 2 - 4 dwellings along with open space, landscaping, parking and access from Lynwick Street

This letter sets out our landscape comments and observations based on the submitted documents and plans, whilst also looking to provide recommendations for how to proceed.

Summary

Not supportive on landscape grounds	☒
No landscape objection, subject to attached recommendations and/or conditions	☐
Further information required prior to determination	☐
No landscape comments / does not wish to comment	☐

1.0. Review of the submitted information

- 1.1. We have reviewed the submitted Landscape and Visual Statement (LVS) (Ref: HLA 684 S01) and associated 'Appendix I: Viewpoints 1 to 4 and a to e' (hla 684 R01) produced by Harper Landscape Architecture LLP. We acknowledge para 1.4 of the LVS which sets out the intention of the document and clearly identifies that the statement is not intended to be read as a Landscape and Visual Appraisal or a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. We accept that the level of information provided could be considered proportionate to the application. Notwithstanding this, the report includes judgements on landscape and visual effects without setting out a methodology or descriptions for each of the categories used. The absence of these makes it difficult to understand the basis of the judgements reached and the commentary provided.
- 1.2. We accept the Supporting Statement email from the agent which highlights the scope of Planning in Principle application is limited to location, land use and amount of development. We consider the effects on landscape character are covered under the location and land use element of this principle. We previously raised concerns regarding the loss of verdant character along Lynwick Street; the submitted Tree Constraints Plan



(Dwg. SJA TCP 26302-011) identifies 2no. English Oak trees on the access with some unclear graphics for what could be removals. The removal of these trees along Lynwick Street would have a negative impact on its verdant and rural character which we consider valuable.

- 1.3. The LVS states that the limited landscape value is *“based upon the absence of any recognised landscape designation together with the influence of adjacent residential development, traffic, lighting and other suburbanising features which limit the scenic quality, perceptual qualities, rarity and relative naturalness of the landscape.”* Positive landscape receptors are listed in para 4.6 of the LVS, in addition to these factors, we consider the sites’ functional value as a verdant rural settlement edge a positive contribution towards RNDP Policy RNP1.2. These positive receptors are followed by detractors in para 4.7; the overall value has been judged as medium.
- 1.4. Having reviewed the information provided, together with site photographs provided by the case officer and those provided within Appendix I, we consider that the positive landscape receptors contribute towards a distinctive and intimate landscape character, which forms an important component of the wider character of LW4 Low Weald Hills and LCA I1 Rowhook and Rudgwick Wooded Ridge. The influence of adjacent residential development, traffic, lighting and other suburbanising features is not evident within the images provided. Therefore, we do not consider that the detracting features listed in the LVS outweigh the site’s positive landscape characteristics. Based on our professional judgement and noting that no assessment methodology has been provided to justify the value judgement reached in the LVS, we consider the site to be of higher than medium landscape value. Notwithstanding the above, para 4.15 of the LVS concludes that overall effects for Area of Local Landscape Character at completion would be *“Moderate Adverse Landscape Effect which is considered Significant.”* Para 4.17 goes on to state that *“whilst the landscape effect is judged to be Moderate Adverse and Significant (reducing to Minor to Moderate/cusp of Significant and Not Significant Long Term), this does not necessarily indicate that the development is unacceptable in planning terms.”* and the Final Recommendation (para 8.1): *“The ultimate acceptability of the proposal would, however, depend upon the decision maker’s assessment of all material planning considerations and the overall planning balance.”*
- 1.5. Para 1.6 of the LVS states that *“The work has been undertaken with reference to the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd edition, 2013, by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment and the Landscape Institute (GLVIA3)”*. We draw attention to para 2(4) of LITGN-2024-01-GLVIA3-N&C which clarifies *“GLVIA3 paragraph 8.9 makes clear that LVIA should not include advocacy for the scheme (including in relation to the design). Conclusions on the planning balance should also not be made within LVIA as such judgements need to take account of the policy balance in relation to all aspects of the project, not just landscape matters.”*

- 1.6. Figure 1 of Appendix I identifies a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) with public viewpoint locations, of which, is a missed opportunity to understand visual impact from an identified area with potential view from PRow RUD/390 located away from the settlement edge within the countryside setting. See mark up plan below.



- 1.7. Further to the sensitivities identified, the proposals include garden boundaries facing the remaining wooded area of the parcel of land where we have concerns regarding domesticated encroachment and tree removals.

2.0. Summary

- 2.1. Notwithstanding the submission of a high-level Landscape and Visual Statement, professional judgement indicates that the site remains highly sensitive to development due to its settlement edge location, existing meadow and wetland character.
- 2.2. Concerns therefore remain regarding whether the maximum number of dwellings indicated can be successfully accommodate within the distinctive local landscape, particularly given the site's landscape constraints.
- 2.3. Should Permission in Principle be granted, any subsequent application should demonstrate how the proposed development has responded to the site's constraints and valued features, and how it would conserve and enhance local landscape character.

Please contact us if you have any queries in relation to this advice.

Place Services – Landscape Team

Email: landscape@essex.gov.uk



Place Services provide landscape advice on behalf of Horsham District Council.

Please note:

This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.

We are unable to respond directly to applicants/agents or other interested parties. Any additional information, queries or comments on this advice that the applicant/agent or other interested parties may have, must be directed to the Planning Officer at the relevant LPA, who will seek further advice from us where appropriate.

