# HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

| | |
|---|---|
| **TO:** | Horsham District Council – Planning Dept |
| **LOCATION:** | Bowood, Bashurst Copse, Itchingfield |
| **DESCRIPTION:** | Demolition of existing dwelling and garage. Construction of replacement dwelling with detached garage/garden store. |
| **REFERENCE:** | DC-25-0642 |
| **RECOMMENDATION:** | Advice |

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:**

The development does not incur any direct impacts on the designated extent of Ancient Woodland (AW) in the rear amenity area. Arboricultural impacts are restricted to management of woody vegetation to the site frontage and proposals for engineering and associated levels alterations adjacent to the hornbeam trees situated on the NW boundary of the property.

**MAIN COMMENTS:**

As previously discussed, the property is sub-divided by the boundary of the remaining Northern Section of the Bashurst Copse Ancient woodland (AW). Minor incursion into the minimum recommended buffer to AW is proposed, within an area of formal garden close to the existing house footprint. This in itself is not of undue concern in respect of direct or future impacts on the AW resource, the associated levels changes and hardstanding proposals not directly affecting the remaining trees within the AW.

The re-submitted ecology survey makes recommendations for both mitigation measures and ecological enhancements in respect of the proposed development. The third mitigation recommendation is for segregation of the main residential garden from the ancient woodland buffer to ensure there is no long-term encroachment of the residential garden into the ancient woodland and to promote the vegetative restoration of the woodland understory.

Whilst I would concur that this would enable appropriate conservation of the remaining resource, as formerly highlighted, within the current residential context this is not a reasonable proposition based on the current Natural England AW boundary demarcation and associated minimum 15m buffer, due to their proximity to the existing house.

If the remaining AW is to be appropriately protected from the proposed development its re-survey and a re-delineation may be considered fundamentally necessary. Without a

more detailed ecological assessment of the extent of viable remaining habitat/indicator species in the non-treed areas to the rear of the dwelling this remains a conundrum.

Direct arboricultural impacts of the proposed development as shown are restricted to those trees to the frontage and NW boundary.

Some of the current laneside screening vegetation will be removed opening up the currently restricted view into the site.

The hornbeam trees identified as T7 – T11 in the accompanying arboricultural report will have some engineering operations undertaken partially within their minimum recommended root protection areas, including new garage foundations and earthworks to raise and marry levels. This is a negative aspect of the design that could impact upon the future health of the trees, recognised as being of A grade. Being set back from the lane, they are not of high visual amenity value, however they are remnants of the once wider spreading AW.

No details of services requirements/connections have been detailed. Viable working space for both demolition and construction would be very limited by proposed tree protection measures for a development of the scale proposed.

**ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:**

Yes if minded to approve – Standard conditions – 3.7 – Underground utilities; 3.8 Tree Protection – INSERT "Barry Holdsworth TPP dated 14/04/25"; Arboricultural method statement implementation – INSERT "Barry Holdsworth AMS and TPP dated 10/04/25".

| | |
|---|---|
| **NAME:** | ANDY CLOUT – ASST. ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER |
| **DEPARTMENT:** | STRATEGIC PLANNING - SPECIALISTS |
| **DATE:** | 14/05/25 |