

- 1.1. A letter from Barratt Redrow dated 13th July 2026 provides detail on the amendments made to the submitted documents and plans. Overall, we have no concerns regarding the proposed amendments from a landscape perspective.**

Noted.

- 1.2. Based on our previous comments dated 15th April 2026, we have the following comments.**

Barratt Redrow Southern Counties responses noted below.

- 1.3. We welcome the inclusion of brick walls to surround parking courts throughout the scheme.**

Noted.

- 1.4. We reiterate our previous comment:**

Where roadways abut areas of public open space (POS), these should be proposed as block paving as opposed to tarmac. This will enhance the visual amenity of the roads adjacent to public recreation spaces, provide an opportunity for SuDS, and also reduce traffic speed on these dead-end roads. For example, this includes the road serving Plots 338-344.

Whilst we note that all Adopted Street are proposed as tarmac, we advise that additional tertiary streets in prominent locations adjacent to public open space (POS) would benefit from block paving surface treatment.

Where roads are being used by refuse and fire vehicles regularly (i.e. loop roads and turning heads) we have retained as tarmac. All private drives and shared surfaces are block paving. We are happy to look at having this conditioned and confirmed under the formal S38 Road Adoption process.

- 1.5. Based on the Landscape Strategy Plans (Rev. P05), we welcome the inclusion of root protection areas (RPA) although advise that no-dig surface solutions are included in any hard landscaping plans submitted under the recommended Conditions.**

Noted, we are happy for this and this is also covered under the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment/Method Statement (Ref. BDWSC24849aia_amsB), Paragraph 4.14.

- 1.6. We reiterate our previous comment (Para 2.5) regarding the overuse of hard surfaced paths throughout the POS and the opportunity for some of these to be replaced with mown paths.**

We are consistently seeking to have accessible paths that are usable by all. We are happy to amend these to be mown paths but are conscious that this will reduce the overall accessibility of the scheme.

1.7. The amended Boundary Treatment Plan (Dwg no. PL004_14 Rev E) still does not address the concern regarding no boundary to the 1.5-3m retaining wall which runs alongside the access to Plots 34 and 35, as per Para 2.7 of our previous response.

The retaining wall alongside the access to Plots 34 and 35 has a 1.8m closeboard timber fence along the access that will sit on top of the retaining wall. For areas around the road serving Plots 34-35, this is secured via 600mm railings.

KEY

-  1800mm Redrow Brick Wall 01
(Brick wall to match with adjacent House Material)
-  1800mm Baratt/David Wilson Brick Wall Type 3
(Brick wall to match with adjacent House Material)
-  600mm Vertical Metal Railing
-  600mm Redrow 600m High Wall with 600mm High Railings (TBC)
-  600mm Knee Railing around SUDS (TBC)
-  1800mm Close Board Timber Fence



1.8. We reiterate our comment in Para 2.8 of our previous response requiring additional soft landscaping alongside the wall between Plots 21 and 31, as well as a number of other locations.

The landscape masterplan shows general areas of planting on the basis that the detailed landscaping will be conditioned under the Reserved Matters planning consent. We are happy to accept conditions similar to that imposed on our nearby site: Crawley Down Road, Felbridge (Ref. DM/23/0810):

“No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme of soft landscaping for the site drawn to a scale of not less than 1:200 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The soft landscaping details shall include:

i) planting plans;

ii) written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);

iii) schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/ densities.

The approved scheme of soft landscaping works shall be implemented not later than the first planting season following commencement of the relevant part of the development (or within such extended period as may first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority). Any planting removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the first available planting season thereafter with planting of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any variation.”

1.9. As per Para 2.9 in our previous response, we do not consider it imperative to fence off the two existing ponds located in the centre of the scheme, which already benefit from established trees and surrounding vegetation which provides a buffer to the waterbody.

This is often requested by Parish Council's as a safety feature. We are happy to remove if it is not required.

1.10. We welcome the submission of Cross Sections across the SuDS basins and the pond.

However, the gradient (i.e. 1:3, 1:4) should be included on the drawings to demonstrate the bank gradients for the accessible basins.

Gradients are not indicated on detailed engineering drawings to avoid complication when reading as it can often overwhelm the plan. Gradients can be ascertained by reading and measuring the plan to scale.

1.10. As per Para 2.11, the Tree Protection Plan is still required.

This has been provided within the AIA under Ref. BDWSC24849-03B and is available on Mid Sussex DC's Planning Portal. This was all uploaded on the 12th August 2026.

1.12. Overall, a large number of our previous comments have not been addressed within the amended proposals. We advise that these are considered and reflected within the submission.

1.13. We advise the Conditions included within our previous response dated 15th April 2026 are considered