



Horsham
District
Council

HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	Kilnwood Vale Sub-Phase 3DEFG Kilnwood Vale
DESCRIPTION:	RM approval sought for layout, appearance, landscaping, scale and access (in accordance with DC/15/2813) for Phase 3DEFG of the Kilnwood Vale Development, comprising 280 dwellings with associated landscaping, access and parking
REFERENCE:	DC/23/1787
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information / Modification
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION: Some concerns with layout proposals and observations noted below for review.	

MAIN COMMENTS:

Boundary treatments: Proposed feature fences to dwellings situated along the secondary road and major loop (sub-phase 3G) extending through the site (sub-phase 3E) to southern boundary to be replaced with brick walls. Also, boundary to plot 51, opposite open space.

Plots 102, 106, 112, 120, 235 and 246 to have boundary fence amended to Jacksons feature fence. [Thank you for changes that have been made to several of the boundary treatments. It would be appreciated if proposals to Plots 147 and 199 could be reviewed for consistency with treatment to opposite dwelling. Also parking court 237-240 to match parking court opposite.](#)

[Proposed Site Layout plans \(DC/23/0856\) showing some inconsistencies with proposed boundary treatments such as rear of Plots 247-249, Plots 200, 240, 241 and 260.](#)

Parking layout observations: Plot 51 – tight right turn from main axis road into parking bays. Unclear whether there is a raised table in this location too. [Amendment made to location of parking bays, closed.](#)

Parking court for plots 183-185 - spaces appear too close together to allow easy navigation in or out. Levels here mean a retaining wall will be facing cars entering to park giving a stark appearance. Hedge should be continued along to meet boundary of plot 183 to soften access. This may necessitate boundary to plot 196 being moved back. Note possibly only room for two new trees as opposed to three to ensure successful establishment. [Hedging continued, closed.](#)

Likewise check spacing for sub-station parking bay and visitor parking space (parking court for plots 86-89).

Boundary to plot 202 to be moved back to allow a planting bed adjacent to close board fence. [Change of boundary treatment to brick wall, closed.](#)

Levels: Levels to rear of plots 4, 42 and 43 appear extreme, necessitating boundary fencing to sit on 0.7m retaining wall. Consideration should be given to reconsider the layout in this location to provide an improved design. Similarly, plots 131-140 show a retaining wall at 1m with fencing on top.

See comment above regarding boundary to rear of plot 196/parking bays 183-185.

Please provide detail of finish to masonry retaining walls. Please note a higher quality finish will be expected to walls within parking courts. [Not addressed.](#)

[Note that a retaining wall is shown outside the red line boundary to the north of the site. Giles, is this still to come forward or has this been approved previously? Should the red line boundary be amended here so that proposals for the retaining wall can be considered whilst reviewing this phase? This is a sensitive location adjacent to Bewbush Brook and it is important to ensure there is no acceptance of a lesser quality proposal.](#)

Soft Landscape: No written plant specification, LMMP or services overlay plan provided [Written specification submitted. LMMP and services plan in coordination with landscape outstanding.](#)

Mulching prescription, please add to tree pit detail 'Leave a collar of 10-12 cm around stem clear of mulch to prevent trunk from rotting'. [Please add to tree pit details and written landscape specification.](#)

[Please clarify changes to Tree Retention Removal Plan.](#)

[Plots 57, 150, 190, and 224 – further opportunities for additional trees for consideration.](#)

Hard Landscape: Phase 3B adjacent provides for a combination of hard surfacing materials across the site which is a preferred design layout, particularly to parking courts and visitor parking bays. [Amended hard surfacing material to parking courts is appreciated. A request that further consideration is given to visitor parking bays given the same surfacing.](#)

ANY RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS:

NAME:	Karen Roberts Assistant Landscape Officer and Specialist Support On behalf of Inês Watson CMLI Specialist team leader (Landscape Architect)
DEPARTMENT:	Strategic Planning
DATE:	08/11/2023