HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council – Planning Dept
LOCATION:	15- 18 Fairfield Cottages Cowfold Horsham West Sussex
DESCRIPTION:	Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Condition 4, 5, 10, 11 and 17 to approved application DC/22/2010
REFERENCE:	DISC/25/0046
RE-CONSULT:	1st set of comments in black 2nd set of comments in blue
RECOMMENDATION:	No Objection

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATION:

2nd set of comments

We are satisfied with the information provided in order to discharge Condition 17.

1st set of comments

Modification is requested prior to recommending the discharge of Condition 17. See details below.

We do not wish to comment on Condition 10 as it should be discharged to the satisfaction of the Ecologist, however we have checked the coordination of these details against the landscape proposals.

We are satisfied with the information provided in order to discharge Conditions 4 and 5.

We have no comments to offer on the requirements of Condition 11.

MAIN COMMENTS:

Condition 17

1. **Details of all proposed trees and planting, including schedules specifying species, planting size, densities and plant numbers and tree pit details**
    a. We note details in the DAS under DC/22/2010 and previous advice from HDC's Arboriculturist that an extra heavy standard or heavy standard 'Acer Platanoides Crimson King' or 'Metasequoia Glyptostroboides' would be a suitable replacement in

regard to the previously removed TPO'd Oak under DC/21/1108. Closed, with thanks.

i. Justification is requested as to why 1no. Crataegus monogyna is proposed as an alternative and why the other proposed tree has been relocated. Closed.

ii. As previously mentioned by HDC's Arboriculturist, the tree's viable rooting area is constrained by the engineered highway, as well as the proposed hardscaping, therefore in order to achieve impact demonstrable to the removed TPO'd Oak, we recommend moving the Acer campestre back to where previously proposed and changing the Hawthorn to a more suitable species, as previously recommended, that reaches a larger size at maturity. Closed, with thanks.



b. Landscape and Arboriculture comments under DC/22/2010 state the following, respectively: 'We would expect a range of tree stock sizes to be used across the site. As a minimum and as provided, 10-12cm should be used, however a number of trees should also be larger where the location allows to provide a sense of maturity to the scheme. Selected trees would also be preferably long-life expectancy species.' and 'In order to attempt to replace longer term public visual amenity, I recommend that either trees on the frontage include one or two species of larger future stature'. With that in mind, please amend the scheme to reflect larger specimens, especially within plot frontages. Closed, with thanks.

c. Previous landscape comments also recommend that a predominance of one tree species or variety should be avoided with preference to native or naturalised species. Therefore, we recommend that Prunus 'Spire' is replaced by a combination of trees suitable for the conditions, preferably listed within the Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy (BES). Closed, with thanks.

d. In the interest of visual amenity, we recommend that species rich grassland is applied to the plot frontages and/or alternatively incorporated with bulb planting, in line with landscape comments made under DC/22/2010. Closed, with thanks.

e. Please amend the tree pit backfill to reflect that, 'Backfill should replicate the existing soil profile by using soil excavated from planting pits, only amended with imported soils if necessary. No fertiliser should be used.' Closed, with thanks.

f. We welcome that no pesticides/herbicides are permitted to be used, however we recommend 'Application of herbicide' be amended or removed from the timetables in the Soft landscape establishment and maintenance document for clarity. Closed, with thanks.

2. Details of all hard surfacing materials and finishes

a. Satisfied with details.

3. **Details of all boundary treatments**
    a. Satisfied with details.
4. **Details of all external lighting**
    a. Lighting information not submitted. We note details under DISC/25/0048 and are satisfied with the information provided
5. **Ecological enhancement measures set out in the Bat Survey Report (The Ecology Co-op, October 2022) and Bat Scoping Report and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (The Ecology Co-op, July 2022).**
    a. We typically expect bird and bat boxes be added to plan, however we are satisfied that the details within the BES are sufficient.
    b. We note that the BES proposes the southern boundary hedgerow be enhanced by planting up with native hedgerow shrub and tree species, in line with recommendations set out in the PEA to rejoin the hedgerow. Please amend the landscaping proposals to reflect this. Closed, with thanks.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS: N/A

NAME:	Elly Hazael Trainee Landscape Architect (Planning)
DEPARTMENT:	Specialists Team - Strategic Planning
DATE:	07/03/2025 22/04/2025
SIGNED OFF BY:	Inês Watson CMLI Specialists Team Leader (Landscape Architect)
DATE:	10/03/2025 23/04/2025