



HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Land To The Rear of The Copse Worthing Road Horsham West Sussex
DESCRIPTION:	Construction of up to 23 residential dwellings, (including 9 affordable homes), including access, parking, landscaping and other associated infrastructure works.
REFERENCE:	DC/26/0355
RE-CONSULT:	1 st set of comments in black 2 nd set of comments in blue 3 rd set of comments in green
RECOMMENDATION:	Holding Objection / More Information / Modification Advice / Modification No Objection

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:

3rd set of comments

Most concerns have been sufficiently addressed and there are no further comments. Please note the recommended conditions below.

2nd set of comments

Many previous comments have been addressed and consistency is now broadly demonstrated across plans and documentation, with the exception of proposed woodland.

Modification to layout remains requested in order to safeguard boundary tree belts, highlighting aforementioned plots 5, 11, 12 and 23; 23 in particular, given its relationship with P2T92 which is afforded protection under TPO/1543.

Further amenity grassland suitable for informal play continues to be recommended in addition, given the limitations posed by the detention basin, ditch easement and woodland.

Please see previous and updated comments below.

1st set of comments

No concerns are raised to the proposed development in principle. The lower density of built form in combination with the undeveloped western portion of the scheme are welcome changes, providing a

softer transition to the countryside. However, modification and further information is requested to secure a high quality scheme that responds to the local landscape character.

For example, further consideration should be given to the site layout, particularly with regard to the retention and safeguarding of the existing boundary tree belts, which contribute significantly to the landscape character of the area. In order to mitigate adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity, buffers must be increased, and the inclusion of the root protection areas (RPAs) should be avoided within private garden space, in concurrence with previous Landscape, Arboriculture and Ecology comments.

Key concern is also raised with the lack of consistency across plans, particularly proposed trees, habitats and the pond, which must be reviewed. Please see details below.

Therefore, the following additional information is required:

- Plan demonstrating coordination of landscape strategy with underground services and location of tree root barriers to be indicated where required. See point 5.
- Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan.
- Indicative existing and proposed levels plans for all external earthworks. Such details to include cross sections where necessary. See points 2a and 9.

MAIN COMMENTS:

LVA

1. Please see previous comments under DC/23/1350 for descriptions of the landscape character and context.
2. While many changes to the scheme are welcomed, some conclusions and requests made in regard to the LVA under DC/23/1350 have not been addressed and are repeated here for ease:

- a. *[Mitigation Measure: Reduction of building height (through footprint contouring) to reduce potential for visibility in views above existing boundary vegetation]*
10. *Please provide levels and contours plan to include buildings finish floor levels but also external works levels and any other information that is deemed appropriate to demonstrate how this measure is achieved.*

This mitigation measure has been removed from the updated LVA, however remains relevant to proposals. An existing and proposed levels plans for all external earthworks continues to be requested.

Response dated 05/06 noted. Existing and proposed levels continue to be requested to ensure that the scheme is deliverable. This may, however, be secured via condition. Closed.

- b. *[Mitigation Measure: Retention and protection of the existing trees and waterbodies on Site through suitable buffer zones, in accordance with the Arboricultural and Ecological Reports provided with the Application]*
11. *Concern is raised...A plan demonstrating coordination of proposed layout (inc tree planting and playground design), tree protection plans, surface water proposals and other underground services needs to be provided.*

A coordinated plan to ensure no conflict between proposed strategies continues to be requested. See point 5 for more information.

Revision 5 of the Drainage Strategy (within the updated Flood Risk Assessment) has been coordinated with the landscape strategy, with thanks. Areas of proximity are noted between underground services and tree planting, however it is noted that details of root barriers and root cells are to be provided at a later stage. Closed.

- c. *[Mitigation Measure: Retention and protection of the existing trees and waterbodies on Site through suitable buffer zones, in accordance with the Arboricultural and Ecological Reports provided with the Application]*

12. *There is also concern that the layout arrangement shown for plots along the southern and western boundaries...will undermine this measure and existing vegetation will be at risk of post development pressure.*

While the buffer to the southeastern corner has increased, with thanks, concern remains with the northern, eastern and southern boundaries, highlighting plots 5, 11, 12 and 23 in particular, where the existing trees will be at risk of post development pressure. 11 and 23 are of key concern given that the private gardens fall almost entirely within the root protection area (RPA) of existing trees, particularly plot 23 and the RPA of P2T92 which is afforded protection under TPO/1543. The LVA should be used to inform any necessary changes to the proposal, thus reconsideration to the layout must be made and the advice of the Council's arboriculturist sought.

Response dated 05/06 noted, which makes reference to the Arboricultural Consultant's response. While the HDC Arboriculturalist has raised no arboricultural concerns, concern remains on landscape grounds. These trees, particularly P2T92, are a key feature of the receiving landscape and positively contribute to its rural qualities. Their loss or deterioration would have an eroding effect on the local landscape character, thus alterations to the layout remain requested.

Minor alteration to plots 5, 11, 12 and 23, including additional landscape buffer and adjusted private garden boundaries is noted, with thanks. Closed.

- d. *[Mitigation Measure: Extensive tree planting along streets and within Public Open Spaces to retain the Site's outwardly wooded character, in accordance with Southwater Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy SNP18: Tree'd Landscape and to reinstate habitat which has been lost with the clearance of the Priority Habitat Woodland resulting from Ash die-back]*

16. *Please demonstrate that the number of tree planting meets the requirements of SNP18 and also is it feasible to deliver some of the trees shown in relation to proximity to dwellings? This is fundamentally dependent on the species proposed.*

Tree planting 'along streets' has been removed from this mitigation measure from the updated LVA. Tree lined streets remain desirable given the landscape context and it is therefore requested that this is addressed.

Further, the Planning Statement states that 69 new trees are in excess of the SNP18 requirement, however clarification and calculations are respectfully requested, given that 106 trees were required under DC/24/0622 and cannot be counted towards the requirement of this development.

Response dated 05/06 noted and the limited opportunity for street tree planting is acknowledged. Calculations have not been provided, however the level of provision is regarded as suitable for the scheme on landscape grounds. Closed.

- e. *[Mitigation Measure: Enhance the visual separation between the Site and existing residential properties to the south, southeast through the planting of boundary trees and hedgerows]*

20. *The current layout appears set too close to the RPA's of the boundaries as discussed at para 12 with no opportunity to enhance given proximity of dwellings and sizes of gardens? Please demonstrate how this measure is to be delivered.*

Not addressed; please see point 2c.

As per 2c, plots 11 and 23 remain too close/within the RPAs of boundaries with no scope to enhance separation. This has not been addressed. Please amend.

As per 2c, minor alterations have been made. While it is felt there remains scope to enhance separation, this is a positive improvement. Closed.

Design Considerations – Soft landscape


3. Multiple discrepancies are noted between the Illustrative Landscape Masterplan (ILS), Landscape Design Strategy, Site Layout Plans, Planning Statement, BNG Proposed Plan and Drainage Strategy within the Flood Risk Assessment
- a. Tree locations differ between documents
[Amended, with thanks. Closed.](#)
 - b. Tree quantities differ between documents:
 - i. 113 trees are indicated within the Phase 2 red line boundary (RLB) of the ILS
 - ii. 84 trees are indicated within the Phase 2 RLB of the Site Layouts
 - iii. 69 trees are indicated within the Phase 2 RLB of the Planning Statement
 - iv. 67 trees are indicated within the Phase 2 RLB of the Landscape Design Strategy[Amended, with thanks. Closed.](#)
 - c. Proposed hedgerow differs between documents
[Discrepancy remains within documents. See ILS \[below, left\] and Site Layout \[below, right\], the latter of which features only part of proposed hedgerow. Nonetheless, hedgerow as detailed within the ILS can be secured via condition. Closed.](#)
[Details are now coordinated, with thanks. Closed.](#)



- d. Trim trail location differs between ILS and Site Layout Plans
[Amended, with thanks. Closed.](#)
- e. Raingardens do not feature in the ILS and Landscape Design Strategy but are detailed within the Drainage Strategy and Planning Statement.
[Amended, with thanks. Closed.](#)
- f. The pond is indicated as having permanent water levels in some documents, but as a detention basin seeded with meadow mix in others. See point 11.
[Plans and CGI visuals now clearly indicate detention basin. Closed.](#)
- g. Proposed habitats within the BNG Proposed Plan, which include but are not limited to lowland mixed deciduous woodland, wet woodland and mixed scrub, are not clearly defined and/or located within the ILS or Site Layout Plans.
[Response dated 05/06 noted, however it continues to appear that BNG proposals have not been coordinated with the Site Layout. Lack of consistency notwithstanding, details of wet woodland and lowland mixed deciduous woodland can be secured by condition, provided point 15 regarding the provision of sufficient amenity grassland is addressed. Closed.](#)
- h. While minor at this stage, colour of hardscaped areas differs between documents. Details can be provided now or secured by condition if preferred.
[Not addressed. To be secured by condition. Closed.](#)

All plans must be amended to ensure consistency and avoid potential conflicts.

4. Further, the RLB has been altered to include areas within the RLB of DC/24/0622. The tree planting proposals approved under that application are expected to be adhered to however.
5. Conflict is noted between the drainage layout and the landscape proposals, resulting in service runs being located underneath, over or in very close proximity to proposed trees. As a result, these trees are unlikely to be delivered and/or retained in the long term, thus diluting the landscape strategy. This is indicated, for example, alongside the access road. Given the tight growing space for tree planting, please amend so that utilities runs are located within the road:



- a. Please provide a coordinated plan to ensure there is no conflict between proposed strategies, as per point 2b, and amend accordingly.
[Amended, with thanks. Closed.](#)
- b. The foul water rising main is recommended to correspond with the road, rather than the proposed treeline, ensuring that proposed trees are located outside the easement zone.
[Amended, with thanks. Closed.](#)
- c. In areas where proposed tree planting is in close proximity to underground services and hardscape, the inclusion of tree root barriers to mitigate the risk of root intrusion and root cells to increase the volume of rooting medium is requested. This will ensure the long-term integrity of both the drainage infrastructure and the planting scheme. Locations of all proposed root barriers and cells must be indicated in plan.
[Response dated 05/06 is noted. The location of root barriers and root cells to be detailed at a later stage is welcomed. Closed.](#)
6. The outline planting schedule proposes trees no greater than 12-14cm girth. Please revise the proposals to include a broader range of sizes, including 20-25cm girth trees at key strategic locations, such as along the access road and entrance to provide immediate structure.
[Response dated 05/06 is noted and it is acknowledged that the schedule is indicative at this stage. Nonetheless, the addition of Semi Mature trees to the outline plant schedule is welcomed. Closed.](#)
7. Further diversity in species is requested as a predominance of one species or variety should be avoided in order to minimise the risk of widespread biotic threats. Santamour's rule of 30:20:10 is recommended, where no more than 10% of proposed trees should be the same species, no more than 20% should be the same genus and no more than 30% should be the same family. While quantities have not yet been provided, please consider increasing the schedule diversity accordingly, noting that an overreliance on *Betula pendula* should be avoided in particular given its high water demand in relation to the changing climate.
[Response dated 05/06 noted and as above, full planting details are to be secured at a later stage. Closed.](#)
8. In addition to post and rail fence, it is requested that the riparian buffer includes the planting of *Salix* spp. as a softer treatment for public safety with higher biodiversity and amenity value.
[Response dated 05/06 is noted. To clarify, this recommendation is to plant *Salix* spp. as additional shrubs within the riparian buffer, as opposed to a living willow fence. However, the latter would be welcomed as an alternative to post and rail fence subject to appropriate maintenance measures.](#)
[Not addressed. To be secured via condition. Closed.](#)

Design Considerations – Hard Landscape

9. Landscape mounds, as indicated within the Planning Statement, do not feature within any plans. As per point 2a, a levels plans for all external earthworks is requested, and existing and proposed contour lines desired to understand effects on existing landscape features. Please note that existing RPAs should be left clear of mounding/earthworks as sufficient oxygen levels are essential for their long-term retention.

Response dated 05/06 is noted and no concerns are raised with the omission of landscape mounds. Closed.

10. The 'bridge typical detail' within the Flood Risk Assessment is noted to be a concrete structure. A softer treatment to the balustrade is expected however, please provide detail.

The Flood Risk Assessment has been amended to include footbridge detail with timber balustrade, with thanks. Closed.

Design Considerations – SuDS

11. Clarification is requested in regard to the SuDS pond, which is illustrated as having permanent levels of water in CGIs but described differently throughout the documents, such as 'retention basin', 'detention basin', 'attenuation area' and 'drainage pond'.

- a. Please confirm permanent water levels.

No permanent water levels confirmed. Closed.

- b. The adjacent M1 - Crabtree and Nuthurst Ridge and Ghyll Farmlands Landscape Character Area (LCA) as defined by the Horsham District Landscape Character Assessment (2003) is characterised by field ponds and small lakes. A pond with permanent levels of water would therefore be welcomed as a landscape feature, providing greater amenity than a basin and having further benefit in addressing the SuDS pillars of amenity, water quality and biodiversity.

A pond with permanent levels of water continues to be recommended and may have additional benefits given the amended EIA. Nonetheless, closed.

- c. Oxygenating, aquatic and marginal species are requested to be included within the outline plant schedule and planting plans.

Closed.

12. If a detention basin is proposed however, the inaccurate CGI visuals should be noted, as they may lead to misunderstanding of the intended design and landscape strategy.

Amended, with thanks. Closed.

13. It is strongly recommended 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. Alternative methods for weeding should be considered, except for Schedule 9 species; please refer to pan-uk.org for guidance and [resources](#). As such, please remove 'Weed spray with environmentally friendly chemicals' within table 6.1 of the Flood Risk Assessment and amend accordingly.

Rain garden maintenance has been removed from table 6.1, as opposed to solely removing weed spray. Nonetheless, maintenance measures to be secured at a later stage. Closed.

Design Considerations – Open Space

14. SNP12 states that major development proposals must provide appropriate play areas and associated equipment on site, thus the provision of a trim trail is welcomed, notwithstanding the discrepancy in location (see point 3d). We recommend, however, that a more open area is associated with its location along the footpath, as opposed to woodland.

Amendments made, with thanks. Closed.

15. As above, it is recommended that not all open spaces be designated as woodland. To support the broader range of recreational opportunities, provision should include an area of amenity grassland suitable for informal play, picnics, etc.

Further amenity grassland provision is recommended given the limitations posed by the detention basin, ditch easement and woodland. Please amend.

Additional amenity grassland has been provided adjacent to the play area, with thanks.
Closed.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: If you're minded to recommend the application for approval without the concerns addressed above the following details must be secured by condition:

Finished Floor Levels

Pre-Commencement Condition: No development shall commence until precise details (to include details shown on a plan) of the existing and proposed finished floor levels and external ground levels of the development in relation to nearby datum points adjoining the application site have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity and visual impact and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Underground Services

Pre-Commencement Condition: No development shall commence until full details of underground services, including locations, dimensions and depths of all service facilities and required ground excavations, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The submitted details shall be coordinated with the landscaping proposals and Arboricultural Method Statement. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to the acceptable delivery of this permission, to ensure the underground services do not conflict with satisfactory landscaping in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Hard and Soft Landscape Scheme

Pre-Occupation Condition: Prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, full details of all hard and soft landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and measures addressing the following:

- Planting and seeding plans, including a schedule specifying plant numbers, sizes, densities, and species in Latin names
- ~~Hedgerow layout to accord with Illustrative Landscape Masterplan~~
- Planting of *Salix* spp. in addition to post and rail fencing within the riparian buffer zone
- Hard and soft written specifications (NBS compliant) including ground preparation, cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment
- Tree pit and staking/underground guying details, including details for sloping ground and position of root barriers if required
- Details of all hard surfacing materials and finishes, including layout, colour, size, texture, coursing and levels
- Details of all boundary treatments - such as walls, fencing and railings - including location, type, heights and materials
- Details of minor artefacts and structures - such as bin stores, cycle stores, street furniture and play equipment - including location, size, colour and specification
- Details of existing and proposed levels for all external earthworks associated with the landscape proposals - such as SuDS, play areas, retaining walls, banking etc - including cross sections where necessary

The approved landscaping scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following the first occupation of any part of the development. Unless otherwise agreed as part of the approved landscaping, no trees or hedges on the site shall be wilfully damaged or uprooted, felled/removed, topped or lopped without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority until 5 years after completion of the development. Any proposed planting, which within a period of 5 years, dies, is removed, or becomes seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development that is sympathetic to the landscape and townscape character and built form of the surroundings, and in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan

Pre-Occupation Condition: No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (LMMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details should apply to all communal hard and soft landscape areas and shall include:

- Long term design objectives
- Management responsibilities
- A description of landscape components
- Management prescriptions
- Maintenance schedules
- Accompanying plan delineating areas of responsibility

The landscape areas shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

NAME:	Elly Hazael Trainee Landscape Architect (Planning)
DEPARTMENT:	Specialists Team - Strategic Planning
DATE:	17/04/2026 20/07/2026 27/08/2026
SIGNED OFF BY:	Inês Watson CMLI Specialists Team Leader (Landscape Architect)
DATE:	22/04/2026 21/07/2026 27/08/2026