

Land West of Gatesmead Consultation Responses, 20 July 2026

Key

	No further action
--	-------------------

Statutory Consultee	Crest Response
Southern Water Manhole reference for the proposed PoC for the foul drainage, so the consultation can be progressed.	Southern Water Sewer Record sent on 10 July 2026
MSDC Urban Design 1. Landscape: Provide a lighting strategy for the scheme at this stage. 2. Facing materials: Specify window frame colours. 3. Facing materials: Increase the variation of red brick and mortar colours to reduce uniformity and enhance visual interest. 4. Facing material plan: Update the diagram to include secondary facing materials, with clear indication of how these wrap around the building façades (they seem to be 'peeling of' at the edges, which is unacceptable)	1. Being drafted 2.-6. Layout and materials being reconsidered. Will be sent asap

5. Plot 45: more fenestration is needed to the north elevation to improve passive surveillance of the car park

6. Plots 41 to 44 and 36-37:

- 'The Itchen' type: first floor maisonette: Replace the Living Room window with a Juliet balcony + redesign entrance lobby to provide a direct link from the accommodation to the private garden: these should not be disconnected.
- 'The Aire/Avon' type first floor maisonette: Replace the Living Room window with a Juliet balcony + redesign to provide a direct access from the accommodation to the private garden: these should not be separate.

Conditions:

- Details and samples of the facing materials.
- Separate facing material application plan (include roof coverings, cladding materials, brick choices together with mortar colour, RAL colours for windows/doors/any railings in the key, provide relevant images of the products used or specification sheets). Materials are expected to be consistently applied and not 'peeling off' at building corners or returns.
- Detailed soft landscape plans.
- Detailed hard landscape plans (include materials, finishes and locations of any proposed lighting, street lighting, benches and any other street furniture together with separate close ups of the play areas). Please ensure that material choices will result in securing a meaningful and context driven landscape design.

Conditions:

- Noted
- Noted
- DJA - Proposed benches, planting, close up of play areas are all included in the landscape pack. Materials choices for these elements are keyed in on drawing '3403-5-2-1-DR-0011-S4-P4 Hard Surface & Boundary Treatment Proposal' and shown in drawings '3403-5-2-1-DR-0012-S4-P1 Furniture Palette' and '3403-5-2-1-DR-0012-S4-P1 Furniture Palette'. 1:200s of the play proposal are on drawing '3403-5-2-1-DR-0002-S4-P5 Landscape Layout – Play'.

Details of the hard surface materials.	See submitted drawing 25714/5010C Materials, Hard Surfacing & boundary Strategy Plan (attached again for convenience)
West Sussex CC LLFA Object to this planning application in the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy relating to: - The development not complying with NPPF, PPG or National SUDs Standards and MSDC local policies. - The objection points outlined below. We will consider reviewing this objection if the following issues are adequately addressed. - The LLFA notes some testing has been completed however not to BRE 365 and in line with discharge hierarchy and infiltration has insufficient evidence to be ruled out. The scheme is required to also consider Reuse (Rainwater Harvesting?) prior to this. - The drainage layouts re shown as 'For information'. Whilst we appreciate that construction drawings cannot be provided at this stage, they should be confirmed at a sufficient level of detailed design. - Submission of hydraulic calculations have not used current parameters of FEH22, CV value of 1 and urban creep 10% allowance is required. The current calculation utilises old rainfall data and parameters. - Flood risk, surcharging is currently showing the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100. - Climate Change Allowances should be 45%.	See attached Technical Note, dated 1 July 2026, and updated Drainage Strategy Layout, . 5029426-RDGXX-XX-T-C-309950 rev (P04) addressing comments, with updated calculation's and drawings
WSCC Highways – PROW No objection, plus list of informatives	
MSDC Planning Policy Confirmed draft allocation and no 5 year land supply	
Place Services - Archaeology RECOMMENDATION: Archaeological trial trenching and excavation (1) No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until a programme of archaeological investigation has been secured in accordance	

with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which has been submitted by the applicant, for approval by the Local Planning Authority. (2) No development or preliminary groundworks of any kind shall take place until the completion of the programme of archaeological investigation identified in the WSI defined in 1 above, and any subsequent mitigation has been agreed. (3) The applicant will submit a final archaeological report or (if appropriate) a Post Excavation Assessment report and/or an Updated Project Design for approval by the Local Planning Authority. This shall be submitted within 6 months of the date of completion of the archaeological fieldwork unless otherwise agreed in advance by the Local Planning Authority.	
MSDC EHO - Air Quality The calculated emissions damage cost of £14,311 submitted in the Air Quality Assessment produced by Aether dated May 2026 seems reasonable. The developer should however be made aware that costs involved with travel plans and EV charging points are regulated by other regimes and are therefore required in addition to the mitigation options costed in the air quality mitigation statement.	Noted
MSDC EHO – Noise Monitoring at the site was carried out 4 June to 5 June 2025 but no times are indicated to show the length of the survey, and the data has not been supplied. Can the developer please provide further information to demonstrate that the data is representative. It would be useful to know whether trains were running according to schedule during the monitoring period and that engineering works were not taking place at the time of the survey. The 3D noise monitoring information isn't clear, table 7 gives levels for the highest affected receiver for daytime dB, LAeq, 16hr, and for Nighttime dB, LAeq, 8hr and LAFMax however these values don't seem to correspond with the levels shown in figs 3, 4 and 5. Please the consultant could clarify this discrepancy. The report indicates that desirable internal noise levels for habitable rooms specified in BS8233:2014 will only be achieved at some of the properties with windows closed. Mitigation in the form of enhanced glazing and ventilators has been proposed however, in accordance with the Principles of Good Practice, this remedy should be considered only as a last resort following a comprehensive examination of other design strategies that would permit openable windows	This has been added into the attached amended Noise Report, dated 7 July 2026. The table has been updated to reflect the latest version of the 3D noise model The orientation of buildings and layout of rooms within the properties has been designed to meet the requirements of many different site technical disciplines to optimise site feasibility. Using barriers is not a practical method in this case for mitigating noise from the main noise source, as the height of the barrier would have to be approximately the height of the windows on first floor and above. This would likely result in a negative impact on other site disciplines.

while maintaining acceptable noise levels. This may involve assessing the orientation of buildings, the layout of rooms within a property and the possibility of using non-sensitive rooms or balconies as sound barriers. Currently, it appears that these alternatives have not been adequately explored as an Acoustic Design Statement has not been provided. So that I can comment further, please can the developer provide an Acoustic Design Statement showing how good acoustic design has been used to develop a scheme that addresses the issues of acoustics, ventilation and overheating at this proposed development. It is worth noting that the Environmental Noise Survey has concluded that to meet acceptable noise levels in some of the proposed garden areas, fences between 2.4m and 3m tall or a boundary barrier will be required. The Energy and Sustainability Statement submitted by Create dated April 2026 ref: PN/VL/P25-3535/02 Rev A states that ASHPs will be provided to the dwellings however, the noise from these units has not been assessed in the Environmental Noise Survey.	Layout and materials being reconsidered. Will be sent asap This assessment will be carried out
Network Rail Require early dialogue with Network Rail's Asset Protection and Optimisation team (ASPRO). The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion does not: • encroach onto Network Rail land • affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure • undermine its support zone • damage the company's infrastructure • place additional load on cuttings • adversely affect any railway land or structure • over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land • cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future	Noted

NatureSpace Further information Required The Applicant must either: • Submit a NatureSpace Report or Certificate to demonstrate that the impacts of the proposed development can be addressed through Mid Sussex District Council's District Licence. This method of licensing often removes the need for survey work and onsite mitigation for great crested newts as it provides compensation habitats off site. (more details can be found at www.naturespaceuk.com); or • Provide further information (information on ponds with ecological connectivity to the site), in line with Natural England's Standing Advice, to rule out impacts to great crested newts*, or demonstrate how any impacts can be addressed through appropriate mitigation/compensation proposals**; or • If through further survey work, it is determined that there is no suitable habitat impacted on site and the likelihood of great crested newts is very low, then a precautionary working statement in the form of Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs)/Non-Licensed Method Statement (NLMS) strategy documents completed by a suitably qualified ecologist may be acceptable for the development. *i.e., to show that any ponds within 500m are not suitable for great crested newts and/or show how any potential impacts can be avoided. *To do so, surveys to determine presence/likely absence and population size class assessments may need to be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist in accordance with Natural England's Standing (Great Crested Newts: advice for making planning decisions – GOV.UK) (and if using eDNA surveys, the Great Crested Newt Environmental eDNA Technical Advice Note (Natural England 2014)). If GCN are identified, appropriate mitigation and compensatory measures will need to be identified to satisfy planning requirements and a site-based mitigation licence may be required. Surveys are seasonally constrained.	Response from Ecology Consultant: The developable area within the site is located entirely in what NatureSpace have identified as a 'green' zone (<i>As per NatureSpaces own definition 'Moderate Habitat Suitability - Great Crested Newts may be present'</i>), with the 'amber' zone that they refer the site falls within comprising of an already established residential development with no to minimal works proposed to take place within the amber zone (with the established residential development acting as a further barrier to dispersal). Both of the waterbodies located to the east of the proposed redline are also situated within urbanised areas which is also considered likely to impact potential dispersal opportunities. As such, given the above limitations and that onsite habitats that will impacted by the proposed development are situated within a green zone as identified by NatureSpace, it is still considered the proposed PWMS (with sensitive methods to be implemented for reptiles on site in addition) as outlined within the EclA to be appropriate.

WSCC Minerals & Waste Minerals No objection subject to the LPA being satisfied that the information provided is sufficient to demonstrate that (M9 b) (iii)) the overriding need for the development outweighs the safeguarding of the mineral and it has been demonstrated that prior extraction is not practicable or environmentally feasible when considering onsite environmental constraints as outlined by the applicant. If the LPA does not consider this demonstrable at this stage then we would request the submission of further information, including an updated MAR with evidence of any underlying mineral resource, to be demonstrated through the undertaking and assessment of first-hand investigative data (e.g. boreholes, trial pits etc.). Any updated assessment should provide an estimate quantity of the underlying resource as well as details of its quality and potential users should the resource be found to be economically valuable. Any such update should be informed by the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Guidance. West Sussex Waste Local Plan (April 2014) The decision maker should be satisfied that the proposals minimise waste generation, maximise opportunities for re-using and recycling waste, and where necessary include waste management facilities of an appropriate type and scale (Policy W23).	
Historic England Recommend Refusal The proposal would cause harm to the significance of Wickham Farmhouse through the loss of a valuable piece of countryside that has a functional, visual and spatial connection to the Farmhouse. It provides an appreciation of its origins and historic rural setting. It would also cause some harm to the significance of Sunte House through the further erosion of its rural setting. We acknowledge that much of the land that would have originally formed part of Wickham Farmhouse and Sunte House's historic landholdings has already been reduced in size by suburban housing development and that both houses have large, landscaped gardens.	See attached Heritage Review from Smith Jenkins dated 15 July 2026. Please note the Heritage DBA submitted with the application is being updated and will be submitted asap

However, once arriving at the top of Wickham Way, there is a clear change in character of the surroundings from suburban to rural. The undeveloped character of the application site together with the landscape designed formal approach along Old Wickham Lane contribute positively to appreciation of entering former historic farm holdings and country estate.

We do not think the proposed mitigation of a landscape buffer significantly reduces the harm as the proposed housing on this site would represent a significant change to the setting of Wickham Farmhouse. This change in character would arise not just from the new houses themselves, but the suburbanising impact of roads, fences, lighting and a more managed landscape that appears as open space within a housing estate.

We also appreciate that it is proposed to supplement the boundaries around the site with additional planting. However, new planting would take time to properly establish and, even if to be actively managed for a long time, could not comprehensively disguise the introduction of residential development nor the associated pronounced domestication of much of the site that would inevitably prevail. It is also likely that the new residents of the housing estate would make access routes through the planting to use the adjacent footpaths.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight (paragraph 212); that any conflict between development proposals and the conservation of heritage assets should be avoided or minimised (paragraph 208); any harm to significance should be clearly and convincingly justified (paragraph 213); and that any *less than substantial harm* should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (paragraph 215).

As the proposal would affect two highly graded listed buildings, their conservation should be given considerable importance and great weight when undertaking the balancing exercise referred to in paragraph 215.

Recommendation

Historic England recommends that planning permission should be refused, given the harm that the proposed development would cause to the significance of Wickham Farmhouse and Sunte House unless your Council considers that this harm would be outweighed by public benefits secured by the development.

Environment Agency Proposed Condition The development shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (ref 5029426-RDG-ZZ-XX-T-FR-0002, version 4.0 dated 14.05.2026). and the following mitigation measures it details: As per section 6 all residential development shall be in Flood Zone 1. Reason(s) To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants and to ensure Environment Agency access to the watercourse to the north of the site. + Informatives	Noted
MSDC Tree Officer I note the loss of 2 no. of category B oak trees, which are a constraint to development. Also, the loss of 17 Tree in total, as well as 3 groups and partial removal of 3 groups of trees. However, the main arboricultural features of the site have been retained, and the scheme has been designed around them. As many of these trees are category C, they are not a constraint to development. However, if plot 2 and plot 14 were removed as housing, then the two category B oaks could be retained. Is this not possible?	The adopted MSDP does not reference tree categories in terms of the BS5837, so the fact these trees are category 'B' should not in itself require their retention. The relevant district plan policy states <i>"Development that will damage or lead to the loss of trees, woodland or hedgerows that contribute, either individually or as part of a group, to the visual amenity value or character of an area, and/ or that have landscape, historic or wildlife importance, will not normally be permitted."</i> As both trees are well enclosed within the site, they do not make a significant contribution to the visual amenity value or character of the area. Whilst they are specimens of moderate quality, they are of no particular landscape, historic or wildlife importance. The loss of these two trees will not materially alter the arboricultural character of the site and as 97% of the existing canopy cover along with trees of landscape, historical or wildlife importance and all veteran and notable trees. As shown in the Conclusions section of the Planning Statement this has been accounted for in the planning balance

There are incursions within the root protection areas (RPA's) of 22 trees, but the method suggested within the Outline Arboricultural Method Statement should ensure that there is minimal damage to these trees. However, should this application be approved, a Full Arboricultural Method Statement would be required. From the species selection for the Planting Proposals, I note that most trees selected are native and include 4 no. of oaks. However, most of the formal hedging is comprised of non-native species. It would be preferable if the native were in the majority. I also question the use of <i>Pyrus calleryana</i> 'Chanticleer' as the fruit that drops from these trees has a particularly unpleasant odour. Could these be replaced for something else, perhaps a native tree?	Noted Being considered as part of layout reconsideration. Will be sent asap
Contaminated Land Further clarification is required with regards to the justification for the additional investigation recommended, including clarification of the specific areas where further investigation is considered necessary (for example, is this in relation to the railway boundary), identification of the pollutant linkages or risks this additional work is intended to address, and confirmation as to whether any residual uncertainty could instead be adequately managed through a watching brief during development.	The Ridge Ground Condition Assessment recommended further ground investigation. The reasons for this are that the initial investigation was carried out at a time when the finalised site layout was unknown. The recommendation for further work is to infill gaps in the data set, primarily to provide further geotechnical data for foundation and floor slab design (Section 11.2.6). This approach is fairly common with a preliminary investigation carried out early in the scheme development and more detailed work when the final layout has been agreed. There are no specific areas of concern in terms of contamination and no remaining pollutant linkages. The further works are only required to prove ground conditions are consistent across the site. We are happy that contamination issues have been addressed.
Highways Further information is required, summarised below: • TP updates now or to be secured by legal agreement along with the monitoring fee.	Response to be sent asap

• RSA further information as set out above and amend Designers Response accordingly. • Check tactile paving at uncontrolled crossing east of build out is sufficient dimensions for compliance • Internal Layout – review locations within site that require uncontrolled crossings (dropped kerb/tactile paving) and demonstrate these. • Review spine road (straight section) build out location. • Review internal footpaths that connect to PROW and Old Wickham Lane to ensure suitable width/LTN1/20 compliant. • Additional access aisle hatching/markings for some disabled/accessible parking bays.	
Landscape (Place Services) The development on the Site will result in suburbanisation of a valuable recreational resource and experience, in its role in an accessible green space and countryside edge to Haywards Heath.	The site is being included as a proposed allocation in the emerging local plan Main Modifications, so the principle of site's development has been accepted. See below for detailed response from Landscape Consultant, DJA:

Paragraph	Comment	Response
3.5	Within Table 3.1, the recreational value for both the Site and the Study Area is assessed as medium. Given the presence of PROWs on the east site boundary, the long-distance Sussex Diamond Path on the southern boundary, and the informal recreational routes through the Site and to the north which has been utilised for many years, we would consider that the recreational value has been underassessed.	The PROWs, including the long-distance Sussex Diamond Path, form part of the recreational value of the Site and wider study area, see 3.41, 3.28-3.30 and Table 3.1 of the LVIA. These have been included when considering the contribution to the landscape value. Based on their value and capacity they have been deemed to have a medium contribution. The overall sensitivity of the study area the Site have taken this into account. The informal recreational routes have not been considered in our assessment of the recreational value of the site as the site is private land and no access permissions have been agreed with the public.
3.6	The effects on individual landscape features are not assessed within the submitted LVA. For example, the trees and the landform should have been included as individual landscape receptors within the submitted assessment. Given the extent of development proposed across this sloping site, and the fragmentation of the	Landscape value is assessed as an whole, individual elements contribute to the overall landscape value but are not assessed individually. While we understand elements such as trees contribute to the value of the overall landscape the assessment of individual trees would be set out in the arboricultural report, likewise the value of individual habitats would be set out in the ecological report. Landform and field patterns would fall within Landscape Character.

	internal field boundaries, these elements should have been assessed individually.	Descriptions of these elements are included in section 3 the baseline assessment and in Table 3.2 which sets out the contribution to the overall landscape value.
3.7	We recognise that Wickham Fields is not a formalised public open space; however, we highlight the important recreational value that is placed on this Site for residents who enjoy this space for dog walking and countryside access. We consider that the submitted LVA does little to acknowledge this recreational value, despite its strong contribution to residents and experience of the local landscape character of interconnected irregular shaped enclosed fields.	The site is not public land and any access by members of the public is unauthorised. We would at this point highlight the Inspector's report for appeal decision for Land North of Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, Application Ref: DM/15/3415, now known as Gatesmead, paragraph 105 of the inspector's report, dated 2016, states that <i>"while the site itself may have been used informally, anyone doing so is likely to have been trespassing and no weight should be given to the loss of views from land on which there was no right to be present".</i> It is our understanding that this has not changed and that Crest has not entered into an access agreement for the site, therefore any perceived recreational value of the Site itself, beyond the designated PROWs has not been taken into account as part of the LVIA.
3.12	Table App1.8 within the Methodology defines low magnitude of change as <i>"The proposed development would result in a small alteration to the identified view or visual amenity"</i> . Given the proximity of the Sussex Diamond Path to the site, with elevated views out across the countryside edge of Haywards Heath, we would consider that this assessment has underplayed the magnitude of change on this receptor and would be better assessed as medium. Based on the methodology provided, we would therefore consider the overall effects on the Sussex Diamond Path to be major/moderate adverse .	We would disagree with this comment. The development parcels would be set back from the southern boundary of the Site to accommodate the open space buffers, this, together with proposed hedge and tree planting to the south of the development parcels, and the existing beech hedgerow along the southern boundary, would screen effects from the Sussex Diamond Path/Old Wickham Lane would, resulting in a small alteration to the identified view. Additionally any effects need to be considered in context as the proposed development would only be visible from a limited section of each route. We specifically selected VP8 to use for a Photomontage in order to demonstrate this as this has the clearest view into site from Old Wickham Lane and represents a worst case scenario. Any views of the development would be glimpsed views. Resulting in a low magnitude of change and a moderate adverse effect.
3.13	The Site is currently utilised for recreational walking routes by residents, with informal routes running through and around the Site. We would therefore have expected these informal routes to be separate receptors and be represented by viewpoint photography.	As per our response to paragraph 3.7; the site is not public land and any access by members of the public is unauthorised. Recreational routes within the site have therefore not been assessed and Viewpoints from these locations have not been included.

	Whilst we acknowledge that Wickham Fields is not a formalised public open space which may justify the omission of viewpoints within the site from the LVA photography, we note that Viewpoints 10, 12 and 13 are taken from informal walking routes outside of the Site. Given this context, we consider it important that the LVA includes visual receptors from within the Site.	Viewpoints 10, 12 and 13 have been accessed from outside the site. Here there is an open set of tracks that connected to the adjacent Public Right of Way and to the golf course to the north. There are no barriers or signage preventing access to these areas therefore they have been treated as permissive route.
3.14	Given the length of time that the Site has been used and valued by residents for recreational purposes, we raise concerns regarding the adverse visual impact that the proposed development will have on these users. In accordance with the methodology provided and Table App1.10, we judge that visual receptors within the Site would experience major adverse (significant) effects.	As per our response to paragraph 3.7; the site is not public land and any access by members of the public is unauthorised. We have not assessed the visual impact that the proposed development will have on these unauthorised users.
3.17	Overall, we have concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposals on recreational users of the site, which is not reflected in the submitted LVA. Visual effects on surrounding PRoWs, the Sussex Diamond Path and the informal walking routes connecting to the Site have been assessed, with only minor differences in professional judgement.	As per above; recreational value within the site itself has not been assessed, notwithstanding the designated PRoW, the site is private land and any public access has not been authorised. We consider the assessment of the surrounding PRoWs, the Sussex Diamond Path to be correct as the development would result in a small change and would only affect a short section of each public walking route.

Review of Proposals

4.4	The Site is considered as an informal open space with walking routes connecting to the Sussex Diamond Path, PRoW HAH-47BCU and the routes to the north. It is a well-used space which has important recreational value to the local residents of Haywards Heath. We consider that the LVA has underplayed the recreational importance of this Site, where the development would be a local loss for dog walkers and other users.	See response to 3.7; The site is not public land and any access by members of the public is unauthorised.
-----	--	---

4.5	Whilst we acknowledge that the development of the Site would introduce formalised walking routes through the centre of the scheme (Planning Layout, Dwg no. 25714/5000F), the character of these walking routes will be fundamentally changed from the enclosed countryside character currently experienced. The effects on changes on the function of the Site is a primary concern from a landscape perspective, in relation to both landscape character and visual amenity.	As set out above, existing walking routes within the site have not been considered as any public access to the Site is unauthorised. The proposals would provide a permeant public route through the Site providing a formal connection from the Sussex Diamond Path and open areas to the north.	
4.6	DMMO 3/22 is an ongoing request for the formalisation of a footpath towards the western edge of the Site, and follows an existing route used by locals. We note that the proposed footpath route through the Site is not reflected in the proposed development, nor is it referenced as a visual receptor within the LVA.	The current application for a designated Public Right of Way through the Site has not been ratified, therefore this has not been taken into consideration as there is not a designate PRoW along the western edge of the Site. Any walking routes within the Site are not authorised.	
4.10	The existing hedgerows within the Site are evident on historic mapping, forming part of the remnant medieval field pattern. The proposed development layout within the Landscape General Arrangement (3403-5-2-1 DR-0001 S4-P6) would fragment the existing strong field pattern, with housing and access routes replacing sections of existing hedgerows. This would disrupt both the physical structure and visual perception of the small, assarted fields, resulting in the erosion of the surviving medieval landscape field pattern.	The existing hedgerows within the site are very gappy and are considered scrub rather than hedgerow. The nature of the development is inevitably going to change the character of the Site, something that is reflected in the LVIA. The layout has been predominantly based on the site constraints, in particular respecting the southern landscape buffers, PRoW, the large trees in the centre of the site and the perimeter vegetation. Proposed hedge and tree planting to the south of the development areas has been included in part to help screen the new houses from views from the south but also to re-iterate that small field character within the southern open space with.	

		We could potentially look to introduce some further sections of native hedge within the central open space, between the retained mature Oak trees, which might provide some hint of the former field pattern, see mark-up. This would significantly fragment the central open space which is currently enclosed by small trees and separated by low level clipped native evergreen hedge. If we are to amend this area we'd need to consider the natural surveillance of the open space and in particular the play area as we need to avoid creating dark or enclosed areas (native hedge tends to be larger).	
4.11	From a landscape perspective, we consider that the scheme is not landscape-led and does not respect the existing field pattern through the Site. The proposed layout unduly affects the character of the Site by fragmenting the strong landscape structure, which would have benefitted from being further reinforced with planting as opposed to being partly removed to facilitate additional houses.	The layout has been predominantly based on the site constraints, in particular respecting the southern landscape buffers, PRoW, the large trees in the centre of the site and the perimeter vegetation. The nature of the development from rural to urban is inevitably going to change the character of the site. Something that is reflected in the LVIA.	

