



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Land West of Shoreham Road, Henfield
DESCRIPTION:	Erection of a complex of 4no. buildings comprising of 12no. light industrial units for employment use (office, industrial, storage and distribution uses (B2, B8 & E(g) use)) with associated car parking, access and landscaping
REFERENCE:	DC-26-0556
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice / Modification
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:	
The layout of the proposed buildings is not landscape led as it requires removal of a section of the historic field hedgerow network and oak trees within it (NW boundary) and pruning of surrounding trees to create reasonable separation to new development in the countryside. In addition, the access cannot be constructed at such close proximity to the nearest principal remaining mature oak tree without foreseeable negative impact on its minimum recommended root protection area, contrary to industry standard (BS5837) design recommendations in this respect. I recommend that if the quantum of development is acceptable in other planning terms that re-design is requested to overcome the design failures in terms of retention and protection of key landscape features in accordance with the relevant Local Plan Policy.	
MAIN COMMENTS:	
The application is accompanied by a tree survey and AIA undertaken by Broad Oak Tree Consultants Ltd. The survey is a fair assessment of the species, size and position of trees and woody vegetation present at and immediately adjacent to the site. The AIA states that the levels changes required to site the desired build footprints, services runs and associated hardstandings in the N sector of the site prohibit the retention of the historic bounding hedgerow line and oak trees within it (identified as G1).	

Additional retaining wall features are proposed to limit impacts on the recommended minimum root protection areas of the open grown trees shown for retention.

The access engineering proposed requires excavations and engineering within the minimum recommended root protection area (RPA) of the adjacent dominant oak tree (ref: T69), contrary to the recommendations of the relevant design standard. This would be foreseeably harmful to the future health of the tree. I do not concur with the authors downplayed statement on impact in this respect.

No services runs are indicated. The adjacent commercial units to the South have drain runs external to the buildings along the hedgerow elevations. This would be damaging to the roots of adjacent trees if a similar form of engineering were required as the minimum recommended root protection areas of some of the oak trees are tight against the proposed areas of build and hardstanding. I recommend details of proposed services requirements are garnered prior to a decision to ensure this is a matter than can be shown to be viably implemented without further landscape impact/tree rooting damage.

The extent of tree pruning works proposed to enable construction is indicative of the close proximity of the buildings to the hedgerow/tree lines and the requirements for ongoing future pruning to maintain separation at the proximities proposed. I recommend that a re-design moves the buildings further away from existing tree branching to give improved natural clearance to new buildings/development in the countryside in accordance with the recommendations of the BS5837 design standard (section 5).

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

If minded to approve recognising the impacts of the development on the principal landscape features of the countryside, standard conditions for pre-emptive tree protection measures (3.8) and requirement for submission and agreement of an Arboricultural method Statement (3.9) are recommended to limit indirect impacts on trees and hedgerows proposed for retention.

NAME:	ANDY CLOUT – ASST. ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER
DEPARTMENT:	STRATEGIC PLANNING - SPECIALISTS
DATE:	03/06/26