Stantec

Consultee Comments/ Response: Village Centre RMA (DC/25/1018)

No.	Consultee Comment	Applicant Response
WSCC Lead Local Flood Authority (06/08)		
1.	The total volume in calculations for the crates does not match the volumes on the layout labels.	This is an oddity in how InfoDrainage models storage crates where the tank area is "closed" above the soffit level of the tank, therefore resulting in a slightly higher storage volume for each set of crates. The maximum water level does not reach the soffit level within each set of crates in the modelled events, and therefore this discrepancy does not have an impact on the storage volume actually modelled. The InfoDrainage model has been adjusted to match the Drainage Layout, contained within Appendix C of the Glanville Technical Note (21 August 2025)
2.	Require updated calculations to show that a 50% AEP event does not surcharge in the drainage network.	Updated calculations are provided in Appendix C of the Glanville Technical Note (21 August 2025). These results demonstrate that no surcharging occurs in the 1 in 2-year (50% AEP) event, except at the location of flow controls and storage structures, where surcharging must occur as water is held back in the system in the 1 in 2-year event. The Technical Note details at which manholes surcharging would occur.
HDC Environmental Health and Licensing (15/08)		
1.	We understand that the flexible retail, leisure, commercial, cafe and restaurant floorspace would now come under Class E. With the above mind and given the presence of residential dwellings over the retail units we have some concerns regarding to the potential impact on residential amenity should these the retail units be used for either Class E (d) (indoor sport recreation and fitness) or E g (iii) (industrial processes). Given the above we would be grateful for some detail from the applicant confirming that the structure of the building will provide sufficient protection from uses such as the ones detailed above.	Proposals will be technically designed in full compliance with building regulation Approved Document E – specifically E3 mitigating sound transmission. • This will be based on Robust Details suited to the stacked mixed uses as promoted in the planning application. • Structural design will likewise address the impact sound transmission based on the selected frame design. • All based on recognised construction practice, and all relevant, current regulations

No.	Consultee Comment	Applicant Response
2.	No information in relation to land contamination has been provided in support of the application. We assume that information on land quality will be provided as a discharge of condition application under the parent permission, we would however be grateful if the applicant can confirm this.	Condition 18 of the parent application relates to contamination. LPA ref. DISC/25/0065 granted partial discharge for matters of contamination relating to the plaza. Further details will be provided for the RM Area through further discharge of conditions at the appropriate time.
HDC Landscape (18/08)		
1.	We note and understand the rationale for the changes to the layout, however there are concerns that the size and flexibility of the public open space has been significantly diluted in the new proposals. Furthermore, the amount of 'natural green' space required within the area does not appear to be delivered in accordance with the approved parameter plans and the objectives set out in the DAS. Creating a strong landscape framework in the village centre is at the heart of the masterplan and we are of the view that the current layout has lost sight of this objective.	Natural Greenspace is shown in the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (2135A-105R), as amended by application DC/24/0876 via S.96A. This illustrates narrow sections of Natural Greenspace around the perimeter of the RM Area, and a narrow section crossing its centre. The proposed scheme offers substantial landscaping and planting around the perimeter of the site alongside the transitory routes. Equally, a pedestrianised and landscaped route has also been provided through the side, between the Community Centre and the Western Building. The scheme therefore demonstrates broad accordance with the approved parameters. The approved Phase 1 Design & Landscape Strategy required by C8 of the OPP developed the OPP DAS to provide detail for Phase 1. It included the redistribution of greenspace to focus on the existing green corridor to the south of the Village Centre to provide a significant public open space through the approved East-West Greenspace which is now complete. The Village Centre proposals align with the DLS but also include a large public plaza that connects to, and complements, the East-West Greenspace to create public areas with different roles and functions. As a whole, the scheme provides more public areas in this part of the Site than envisaged through the OPP DAS and DLS. The amended parameter plans reflect this approach.
2.	Approved proposals for this area under DC/22/2355 benefitted from areas of informal, recreation amenity grass framed by feature planting and trees. In addition, it had a more formal, secluded garden with seating provision to the west of the village centre building, as well a flexible hardscape space for events. Current proposals do not feature any useable green space and while it is accepted that it's appropriate for a civic square to be predominantly hardscaped for flexibility, a more inspiring, designed space that uses better quality materials must be explored.	This application supersedes the Community Building application DC/22/2355 in respect of the layout of the plaza. Soft landscaping is not generally suitable for use within civic centres in the interest of wear and tear, and accessibility, notably for the elderly and disabled. We maintain that the materials proposed are high quality and reflect those of Horsham Carfax. The small space to the west was a vehicle access to the plaza; this is no longer required as the access is now provided from the north. The need for a footpath

No.	Consultee Comment	Applicant Response
		connection to the west and the repositioning of the western building also renders the small space undeliverable. Of note, the Village Centre is situated adjacent to Moat Park (east-west greenspace) which offers formal recreation and open space just beyond the Community Centre to the south.
3.	Given the clear change to the positioning of the public square and relationship with soft landscape, the resin bond gravel material doesn't provide the high-quality finish and robustness that we would expect in this prominent and significant location, and therefore the use of the yorkstone and sandstone is requested.	This is the same specification as the resin bound gravel approved for the Community Centre application (DC/22/2355), which was deemed acceptable. The resin bound gravel provides permeability and flexibility of laying. The replacement of the gravel by either yorkstone or sandstone would therefore be detrimental to the overall flood risk and drainage capacity of the site. The proposed gravel would offer a sufficiently high-quality appearance when used on the site (see submitted "Materials and Furniture Palette" for reference). The cruciform arrangement of paths within the plaza is formed using Yorkstone slabs to provide variation and assist legibility.
4.	The yorkstone directional paths/surfacing is considered to over dominate the space, and in our opinion, results in an uninspiring public realm. The area between the community centre and western building appears visually and functionally disconnected from the main square, with fragmented planting beds and access paths contributing to the lack of cohesion. We request that this space is reviewed and redesigned to deliver a more integrated and engaging scheme, that clearly justifies the loss of open space previously approved.	This is disputed; the arrangement of the paving provides a clearly legible route linking the key parts of the Village Centre, and northwards toward Moat Road. Block paving is provided between the front of the community centre and a principal access to the dwellings within the western building, offering a clear legible link between the two buildings. The southern side of the western building offers access to three private dwellings and therefore seeks to maintain a degree of separation from the public use of the community centre. Any open space in this area, other than the narrow corridors mentioned above, is not governed by any parameter plan or requirement of the OPP as it is proposed in addition to the significant areas of greenspace immediately to the south.
5.	The location and provision of the undercroft parking is queried as these 2 parking spaces could be accommodated within the parking areas without the additional hardscape and loss green space along the footpath.	Each flat is offered one allocated parking space, and 32 non-residential spaces for visitors to the commercial uses. The proposed parking provision was agreed with WSCC prior to submission. We consider there is no other reasonable position within the site to accommodate the two spaces without impacting circulation or landscaping. Further, the undercroft provides screening of the two vehicles stored within, and for the vehicles parked under the western building, thereby offering mitigation against any potential visual impact.
6.	Clarification is requested in regard to the area to the south of the undercroft parking, bounded by fencing within the Site Layout and by hedgerow within the Landscape Proposals. We query if there is scope to connect this area to the	The space offers private amenity space as shown on "Western Building Ground, First and Second Floor Plans" (22177 P138).

No.	Consultee Comment	Applicant Response
	public realm or if it is intended as private space. In addition, fencing should be added to the landscape key, if proposed.	
7.	6.61 of the Planning Statement states the following, 'The plaza is designed to be used as a events space, paved with natural stone and resin bound gravel and framed by large liquidambar trees to create a civic environment and to provide year around interest in the central space'. We note, however, that Liquidambars are no longer proposed in this area. Please update the planting plans accordingly as we concur that Liquidambars would be preferable in this area.	Liquidambars are high water demand trees and so have been removed in the interest of water neutrality. Their replacements are less water intensive and offer similar amenity value to enhance the appearance of the Village Centre.
8.	We note a significant reduction in bulb planting compared to approved plans under DC/22/2355, reducing from 1980 to 545. While we acknowledge the variation in red line boundary and therefore do not expect the same quantity, we feel there is scope to deliver more bulb planting, particularly within strips alongside footpaths and Lancet Drive.	There is less shrub planting, see point 2 above, and therefore fewer bulbs. The central strip on Lancet Drive has a hedge running through it which would provide year-round benefit, with little space for bulb planting, which would only provide seasonal benefit.
9.	Please include a root barrier location for the tree indicated below:	The Landscape Proposal Plan will be amended to reflect this.
10.	We recommend that a 120mm collar should be left free of mulch to prevent the stems/trunks from rotting. Please amend the following sections of the Landscape Specification accordingly: 590, 845.	The relevant sections of the Landscape Specification will be amended to reflect this.
11.	We recommend that chemical fertilisers, pesticides and herbicides including glyphosate are not to be applied at any time due to impacts on existing and proposed ecological features, particularly the abutting treeline and waterway. We note mention of alternative methods for weeding throughout the Landscape Specification, such as hand weeding, hot foam or hot water systems, however, there remains a reliance on herbicide, which should ideally not be utilised. Please refer to pan-uk.org for guidance and resources, and amend the following sections accordingly: 168, 210, 212, 221, 300, 305, 340, 421, 675.	The wording used reflects HDC suggested amendments to previous documents, such as the approved Moat Road Extension (DC/24/0446). The comment from HDC dated 02/05/2024 read "*As above, please remove all mention of herbicides **and/or** specify methods to hand weeding alone by careful digging or selective scything unless dealing with noxious and invasive non-native plant species listed under government standard guidance*". We understand there to be no policy basis for this request. The approach has been adopted in the submitted Landscape Specification in accordance with previous HDC comments. There appears to be inconsistencies in the approach of HDC to these matters.