



Mid Sussex District Council  
Oaklands Road  
Haywards Heath  
West Sussex  
RH16 1SS

Our ref: 15048  
Date: 5 March 2026

For the attention of: Stuart Malcolm

**Application ref:** DM/26/0454  
**Location:** Land Parcel At Bolney Road Ansty West Sussex  
**Proposal/Description:** Proposed erection of 34 new homes with access from Marwick Close, vehicle and cycle parking, landscaping, drainage, and associated infrastructure and highway works.

Thank you for consulting with Place Services on the above Full planning application. This letter sets out our consultation response on the landscape impact of the application and how the proposal relates and responds to the landscape setting and context of the site.

A Site Visit was undertaken on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2026.

## 1.0. Site Context

- 1.1. The Site is located to the south-west of Ansty village. Bolney Road A272 forms the north-western site boundary. Dwellings on Marwick Close form the north-eastern boundary. The site is an assarted grassland field, with the other boundaries defined by established hedgerows and trees separating the site from the wider countryside.
- 1.2. The High Weald National Landscape is located near to the north of the site. A Public Right of Way (PRoW) runs along the southern boundary of the site.

## 2.0. Planning Policy Context

### Mid Sussex District Plan (MSDP) (Adopted March 2018)

- 2.1. Policies considered relevant include [inter alia]:
  - Policy DP12 Protection and Enhancement of Countryside
  - Policy DP37 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
  - Policy DP38 Biodiversity

### Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street Neighbourhood Plan (2017)

- 2.2. Policies considered relevant include [inter alia]:
  - Policy AS1 New Housing Development
  - Policy AS3 High Weald AONB

### Emerging Mid Sussex District Plan (Reg 19)

- 2.3. The Site is identified as emerging Allocation DPA17. Relevant landscape policy requirements include:
- 1) *“Provide suitable access from Upton Drive and Marwick Close.*
  - 2) *Retain and enhance the trees and retain the ground levels along the A272 Bolney Road which forms the western boundary of the site.*
  - 3) *Particular attention should be given to trees and hedgerows on the southern boundary adjacent to the PRow and in the southwest of the site.*
  - 4) *Maintain the rural character of the PRow on the southern boundary of the site.*
  - 5) *The layout of the site should take into account the location of the trees and allow for their future retention and to prevent overshadowing into private gardens.*
  - 6) *The design and layout of the site should reflect a transition from the built environment to the rural countryside.*
  - 7) *The design and layout of the site should reflect the rural character of the settlement and avoid being urban or suburban in character.*
  - 8) *Integrate development with the site to the east (DPA16) by providing pedestrian and cycling connections and green infrastructure connectivity.*
  - 9) *Provide good acoustic design to address noise impacts associated with the A272 Bolney Road.*
  - 10) *Meet the requirements of other relevant development plan policies.”*

### **3.0. Review of the LVA:**

- 3.1. The application has been submitted by a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) undertaken by Land Management Services, dated February 2026.
- 3.2. Overall, we are largely satisfied with the submitted methodology included within the Appendices and judge it largely accords with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3).

### Landscape Character

- 3.3. The Mid Sussex Capacity Assessment (2014) identifies the site as being located in Landscape Character Area 77. The assessment judges that this LCA has moderate sensitivity, moderate/high value and low/medium capacity.
- 3.4. Table 3.4 of the 2014 assessment states: *“A Low/medium capacity rating indicates that development is likely to have an adverse effect on most of the character area and while smaller development may be possible in a very few locations within the character area, it will not be suitable for strategic scale development.”*
- 3.5. The Site is also located within LCA10 High Weald Fringes of the Landscape Character Assessment for Mid Sussex (2005).

- 3.6. Para 7.2.3 of the LVA judges that the Ecology, land management, land use and land cover has **low** magnitude of change and **minor adverse** overall landscape effects. Based on the submitted methodology and the complete change in land use from an assarted grassland field to developed residential, we judge that the effects on this receptor have been underassessed.
- 3.7. We would also have welcomed The Site as a separate landscape receptor, where the effects on the combination of features that make up the character of this specific site could be assessed. We judge that the assessed effects on The Site as a landscape receptor would exceed all other receptors, and would therefore have been a worthwhile inclusion. Based on the submitted methodology, we judge that the site would experience at least **moderate** adverse effects.
- 3.8. Overall, we judge that the LVA has underassessed the effects on one receptor, and would also have benefited from including The Site as a separate receptor. Notwithstanding this, we recognise the localised impacts on landscape character noted within the assessment and do not disagree with this overall conclusion.

#### Visual Amenity

- 3.9. Based on Figure 3 within the Appendices, we agree with the selection of viewpoint provided to represent the surrounding visual receptors.
- 3.10. Viewpoint photography was undertaken in September 2025 when vegetation was in full-leaf cover and does not represent the worst-case scenario. The submitted LVA does not acknowledge this as a constraint, nor does the Descriptions within Table 3 provide judgements based on winter views. We therefore judge that the effects assessed may be generally underassessed, owed to their basis on summer views.
- 3.11. From A272 Bolney Road, views are available into the site through the vegetated boundary of the site. Whilst the submitted Viewpoint Photographs 1 and 8 do not represent the views through the winter vegetation, we also note that Table 3 refers only to views through the “break in vegetation”, referring to the gateway, as opposed to the number of views through vegetation that occur during winter months. The A272 receptor is assessed to have **low** sensitivity and **very low** magnitude of change, resulting in a **negligible** effect at Year 1.
- 3.12. Based on a site visit, we judge that given the raised elevation of the site above Bolney Road and the location of proposed dwellings along the north-western site edge, that the magnitude of change has been underassessed. Receptors using Bolney Road would note a perceptible change in the built character of this road through the vegetation in winter months, however this is not reflected in the LVA.

- 3.13. PRow 70CR runs along the southern boundary of the site, providing views into the site. Viewpoints 2 and 3 within the LVA assesses a **low/medium** sensitivity. As per GLVIA3, PRows are highly susceptible receptors, and therefore we judge that the sensitivity has been underassessed.
- 3.14. PRow 70CR is also assessed as a **low** magnitude of change and a **minor adverse** overall effect. At present, views of an undeveloped parcel of grassland surrounding by established vegetation are available to users of PRow 70CR. Some views are available towards the development on Marwick Close, however the character of the site remains of the characteristic assarted village edge field. We therefore judge that the overall effects on this receptor would be no less than moderate adverse, and therefore we judge that the LVA has underassessed the effects on PRow 70CR.
- 3.15. We also judge that the **minor adverse** effects judged from Viewpoint 4 (Marwick Close) have been underassessed, and would judge that from this view, that the proposals would constitute a moderate change to the current undeveloped view, and would bring development in close proximity to the receptors on Marwick Close, completely changing the view.
- 3.16. For receptors located away from the edges of the site, the visual effects assessed within Table 3 are more representative. We do not disagree with the neutral effects assessed for most of these receptors.
- 3.17. We acknowledge that the visual effects experienced are limited to the immediate site boundaries, namely Bolney Road, PRow 70CR and Marwick Close. Whilst we judge that the submitted LVA underassesses the effects on each of these close-distance receptors within the assessment, we note that visual effects associated with the scheme are considered minimal.

#### **4.0. Review of Submitted Proposals:**

- 4.1. Overall, we judge that there is capacity for development within this site, owed to its general sense of enclosure and clearly defined vegetated boundaries, and proximity to the edge of Ansty. We do however have the following comments and recommendations:
- 4.2. We support the proposed layout that positions the built frontages along Bolney Road. Given the site's raised level relative to the road, we consider that placing rear gardens along this edge would have been an unsuitable design approach and would have negatively altered the character of Bolney Road, with views through the vegetation.
- 4.3. An additional link to the PRow should be provided in the south-west corner of the site, to provide a small circular route and also provide access from the public open space (POS)

directly to the PRow network in this location.

- 4.4. Passive surveillance of the southern PRow is weak, with no houses orientated to overlook this dark and enclosed space along the rear boundaries of the garden fences. The submission should address how passive surveillance is considered for PRow 70CR.
- 4.5. A small number of trees/groups are proposed for removal within the Tree Removals Plan (Dwg no. Viewport 1A). This is generally acceptable in combination with the extent of tree planting proposed throughout the scheme.
- 4.6. No-dig surface solutions are required where surfaces cross through the root protection areas (RPA) of existing trees. Where rear garden boundaries are proposed, these should be constructed with avoidance of impacting any of the existing tree roots on the site boundaries.
- 4.7. The Proposed Site Layout (Dwg no. 22129 P101) indicates that no hard rear garden boundaries are proposed for the plots on the eastern edge of the scheme (Plots 1-7). This approach is welcomed to allow for wildlife movement.
- 4.8. Additional vegetation should be proposed alongside Plot 15 to soften this hard boundary within the POS.
- 4.9. Climbers or other soft landscaping should be proposed adjacent to the existing fence for Number 4 Bolney Road, to provide a buffer between the proposed parking bays and this existing boundary fence.
- 4.10. The arrangement of Plots 24-27 feels cramped, where the rear garden for Plot 26 is disconnected from the building, and also requires access alongside the parked cars for adjacent Plot 27. We advise this layout is reconsidered.
- 4.11. The proposed SuDS are separated from the development scheme, located in an adjacent field parcel to the south. Construction access will likely occur from a different route, owed to restricted access between the main development parcel and the SuDS basin. Details of this should be submitted.
- 4.12. Details of whether the SuDS basin will be publicly accessible is required. It is not clear if there will be access from the PRow or whether this will be inaccessible.
- 4.13. Proposed tree guards should be removed once the tree has established. This should be included within the Landscape Management Plan.

## 5.0. Summary

- 5.1. Overall, we judge that the submitted LVA has underassessed some of the landscape and visual effects associated with the development. Notwithstanding this, we acknowledge that the effects on receptors are localised to the site and immediate boundaries.
- 5.2. We judge that there is capacity for development within the application site. We advise that the above recommendations are considered within the submitted proposals.

## 6.0. Recommended Condition(s):

- 6.1. If minded for approval, we would recommend the following conditions for your consideration:

### **ACTION REQUIRED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT: HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING SCHEME.**

No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment for the site, which shall include any proposed changes in ground levels and also accurately identify spread, girth and species of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and indicate any to be retained, together with measures for their protection which shall comply with the recommendations set out in the British Standards Institute publication BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

The soft landscaping plan should include plant species, number, density, location and sizes of the proposed planting. The planting specification should provide details of tree planting pits, green roofs, planting preparation and establishment operations. We would recommend an alternative to plastic guards, such as the use of perimeter protective fencing where appropriate, or guards manufactured from 100% biodegradable materials.

The hard landscaping plan should include details of specific materials, colours and finishes of paved or otherwise hard surfaces, built features and street furniture. The plans should clearly show the position of any new fencing and hard surfaces in relation to existing and proposed planting.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area. This condition is required to be agreed prior to the commencement of any development to ensure matters of tree and hedgerow protection are secured early to ensure avoidance of damage or loss due to the development and/or its construction. If agreement was sought at any later stage, there is an unacceptable risk of loss and damage to important trees and hedgerow that would result in harm to amenity.

## **ACTION REQUIRED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT: LANDSCAPE MANAGEMENT PLAN (LMP)**

No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority a landscape management plan for a minimum of 5 years. This should include:

- a) Drawing/s showing the extent of the LMP i.e. only showing the areas to which the LMP applies, areas of private ownership should be excluded.
- b) Written Specification detailing:
  - All operation and procedures for soft landscape areas; inspection, watering, pruning, cutting, mowing, clearance and removal of arisings and litter, removal of temporary items (fencing, guards and stakes) and replacement of failed planting.
  - All operations and procedures for hard landscape areas; inspection, sweeping, clearing of accumulated vegetative material and litter, maintaining edges, and painted or finished surfaces.
  - Furniture (Bins, Benches and Signage) and Play Equipment.
  - All operations and procedures for soft landscaping to SuDS features; inspection of linear drains, basins and swales, removal of unwanted vegetative material and litter, including inlets and outlets.
- c) Maintenance task table which explains the maintenance duties across the site in both chronological and systematic order.
- d) Mechanism for monitoring and review of the management plan and operations.

Reason - To support plant establishment and ensure appropriate management is carried out and to maintain functionality and visual aesthetic.

Please contact us if you have any queries in relation to this advice.

### **Place Services – Landscape Team**

Email: [landscape@essex.gov.uk](mailto:landscape@essex.gov.uk)



Place Services provide landscape advice on behalf of Mid Sussex District Council

***Please note:***

*This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter.*

*We are unable to respond directly to applicants/agents or other interested parties. Any additional information, queries or comments on this advice that the applicant/agent or other interested parties may have, must be directed to the Planning Officer at the relevant LPA, who will seek further advice from us where appropriate.*