



Horsham District Council
Parkside
Horsham
West Sussex
RH12 1RL

Our ref: 22696
Date: 01 October 2026

For the attention of: Alice Johnson

Application ref: DC/26/1236
Location: Land South of Furze Common Road Thakeham West Sussex
Proposal/Description: Reserved matters application for up to 28 dwellings following approval of outline application DC/23/2146 relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Thank you for consulting with Place Services on the above Reserved Matters application. 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	☐

This review is based on a desktop study of the above-referenced application and its submitted documents. Our Landscape comments are as follows:

1.0. Review of the proposal/submitted information

- 1.1. This Reserved Matters application follows an appeal decision (ref: APP/Z3825/W/25/3365902) to grant consent to the outline planning consent (ref: DC/23/2146) and subsequent pre-application advice (ref: PE/26/0039). Appeal decision APP/Z3825/W/25/3365902 raised no issues regarding impact on landscape character.

Proposed layout

- 1.2. At previous applications, concerns were raised regarding the proximity of the proposed development to the existing vegetation on the western boundary. We welcome that the current proposals have excluded development on the western boundary adjacent to the TPO trees.



- 1.3. It is not clear if the existing vegetation buffer (G2) has been retained outside private garden areas, as no updated Tree Protection Plan has been submitted. This information is required prior to determination to enable a full review of the proposal.
- 1.4. Thakeham 6: Design from the Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Plan says that all development proposals “*should reflect any architectural or historic characteristics of particular merit in, and the scale of the surrounding buildings and in the wider area.*” Whilst the parking bays have been broken up by areas of soft landscaping and tree planting, parking remains a prominent feature within the street scene and public realm, with the proposed plots providing limited front garden space.
- 1.5. Fig 39 within the DAS for Plots 11-13 (Page 36) demonstrate the dominance of hard surfacing and the limited extent of front gardens and soft landscaping.
- 1.6. Plot 17 should be designed as dual frontage to provide natural surveillance to the green space.

Soft Landscaping

- 1.7. Softworks Plan (2607-300) shows the proposed planting strategy and outlines the planting schedule and planting palette. We are generally satisfied with the proposed indicative species, and we welcome the use of multi-stem tress. However, the plan lacks detailed information regarding the location of the proposed species. Detailed information showing the location of the proposed species should be submitted for review.
- 1.8. We note that the proposed planting (bulb and hedgerow planting) within the green space to the west of the site appears to limit access to the open space beyond (see below). We query whether this is the intended outcome. We consider the proposed green space to be a positive landscape feature, providing amenity value to future residents. We also acknowledge that unrestricted access may have implications for BNG delivery and the protection of the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of existing trees. Further clarification is required regarding the intended use and function of this area, and any access restrictions or protection measures should be agreed with the relevant LPA specialists.



Hardworks and Boundary Treatment

- 1.9. We are generally satisfied with the proposed hard surfacing materials.
- 1.10. The eastern boundary adjoins existing residential properties. The Hardworks Plan (2607-200) shows new closeboard fencing along this boundary. We query the need for this additionally fencing and whether the existing boundary treatment of neighbouring properties would be sufficient. A double fencing arrangement with an intervening gap should be avoided.
- 1.11. We note the proposed 1.8m high closeboard fencing along the southern and northern boundaries. We would recommend a more permeable boundary treatment, such as hit and miss timber fencing, in these locations.
- 1.12. Additionally, boundary treatments fronting the public realm should comprise brick walls. Locations where this would be appropriate include Plots 17, 20, 28, 8 and 1-2. Figure 44 of the Design and Access Statement (Page 40) demonstrates that closeboard fencing to Plots 1-2 would make a limited contribution to visual amenity and the quality of the public realm. The use of brick walls in these locations would result in a more successful design outcome.
- 1.13. The proposed closeboard fencing along the northern boundary adjacent to the proposed parking area is not considered appropriate in visual amenity terms. A softer boundary treatment, such as chestnut post & 3 rail fence, would be more appropriate and would allow views towards the existing green infrastructure.

Landscape Management Plan

- 1.14. We are broadly satisfied with the information submitted within the Landscape Management Plan; however, additional information and amendments are required in relation to establishment operations, tree pit specifications, irrigation mechanism, mulch extents, and the management of retained vegetation.
- 1.15. While we acknowledge that post-completion compliance report is to be provided by an ecologist, we recommend the inclusion of cultivation operations within the Habitat Establishment Preparation stages to ensure the ground is not compacted and is appropriately prepared to receive the proposed planting and seeding. The depth of cultivation should be specified. These requirements should apply to all planting areas, including areas of turf within private rear gardens.
- 1.16. Limited information has been provided regarding the management of the existing retained vegetation. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (J20842_Arb_D REV D) submitted under application DC/23/2146 indicated that the vegetation along the southern boundary (G2) is up to 12m in height, and that a “*crown lift to clear 3 metres, site side only*” was proposed. It is not clear whether the same approach is proposed as part of the amended scheme, or whether any reduction in height is proposed. We also note the

proposed scrub planting along this boundary and query its likely effectiveness given the size of the existing vegetation and the potential for light competition.

- 1.17. Paragraph 2.28 states that “*All tree pits to be scarified at base to ensure free drainage, plus an aggregate drainage layer added to further facilitate this.*” The aggregate drainage layer should be omitted from the tree pit specification, and adequate soil volume, decompaction and suitable topsoil and subsoil profiles secured instead. The dimensions of the tree pits, together with depths of topsoil, subsoil and cultivation, should be specified.
- 1.18. The proposed use of irrigation tubes is noted. Consideration should be given to whether a slow release watering bag system would provide a more effective and easily monitored means of establishment watering. The use of watering bags is therefore recommended.
- 1.19. The extent of mulch around the new trees should be specified. Generally, 1m diameter works well.
- 1.20. It is not clear what the maintenance and management operations are for the existing trees and vegetation within the red line boundary. These should be clearly set out within the Landscape Management Plan and associated schedules.

Other matters

- 1.21. A revised Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan should be submitted prior to determination to reflect the amended layout scheme and ensure that appropriate tree protection measures are embedded within the scheme.
- 1.22. The precedent images included within the Design and Access Statement illustrate SuDS features incorporating incidental play elements such as logs and boulders, alongside images of swales and rain gardens; however, we have been unable to identify these features on the submitted plans and therefore seek clarification as to whether they form part of the proposal.

2.0. Summary

- 2.1. The proposed layout has gone a considerable way towards addressing previous concerns regarding the relationship of the development to the western boundary vegetation and the retention of the landscape buffer to the south outside private garden areas; however, we seek confirmation regarding the latter through the submission of relevant plans.
- 2.2. Concerns remain regarding the long-term protection and management of retained vegetation, the extent of information provided regarding arboricultural matters, the proposed boundary treatments, and aspects of the landscape design and public realm.
- 2.3. We recommend a review of the boundary treatment between the proposed residential plots and the existing properties along the eastern boundary.

- 2.4. Further information is required regarding the Tree Protection Plan, Arboricultural Report, management of retained vegetation and ecological buffers, and the detailed landscape proposals. Clarification is also required regarding the intended function of, and access arrangements to the western green space.
- 2.5. We recommend that the matters raised above are considered and addressed, and that the revised proposals are submitted for review prior to determination, alongside the requested arboricultural information.

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

Place Services – Landscape Team

Email: landscape@essex.gov.uk



This advice has been provided by Place Services 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.

Place Services have a policy relating to the use of AI. Unless otherwise stipulated, any AI use will be limited to basic proof-reading, grammar, and spelling correction. This response has been reviewed by the author(s). If you have any queries, please [contact us](#) for information about our AI guidance.

