

Amendments made to address the LPA Comments

**Ann Rowland BA Hons BLD CMLI**

**Director, Landscape Perspective Ltd**

Place Services comments 28.7.25	Landscape Perspective responses 08.08.25	
LVIA: The application has been accompanied by the submission of a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) undertaken by Landscape Perspective Limited, dated June 2025. The LVA does not include any methodology and does not follow the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3). The submitted photography does not follow the TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of development proposals.	<i>We didn't produce a full LVIA, it was an appraisal, as we agreed we only needed a light touch LVA because it was an allocated site, so no it didn't follow the guidelines that a full LVIA would require. We are of the view that the conclusions and the scheme design would have been the same in any event.</i>	<i>no further action taken</i>
At application stage we would expect to see comprehensive landscape proposals that provide soft, hard and boundary landscape treatments provided. They have subsequently asked specifically for:	<i>we will update the overall landscape strategy drawing to include street lighting and street furniture such as benches and will label the play area</i>	<i>we have shown indicative street lighting but this will be designed by lighting consultant to discharge anticipated condition in due course</i>
Boundary Treatment Plan: showing materials and heights of all boundary treatments (brick walls, timber fencing, railing etc)	<i>a separate drawing will be produced by Fluid</i>	<i>refer to Fluid drawings</i>

Amendments made to address the LPA Comments

**Ann Rowland BA Hons BLD CMLI**

**Director, Landscape Perspective Ltd**

Soft Landscape Plan: showing any trees, shrubs, lighting.	<i>we will produce a species list and add this onto the drawing with protection measures and an outline spec and implementation timetable</i>	<i>done</i>
Hard Landscape Plan: showing materials and finishes and street lighting and street furniture and play areas	<i>a separate drawing will be produced by Fluid</i>	<i>refer to Fluid drawings</i>
The hard landscape plan should include details of all hard surface materials and boundary treatments to be used within the development with a timetable for implementation, including all means of enclosure and boundary treatments, such as walls and fences	<i>will be dealt with in the hard landscape plan</i>	<i>refer to Fluid drawings</i>
Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance of soft and hard landscape assets will also need to be provided in the form of a landscape management and maintenance plan. This should include a schedule of works and cover a minimum period of 5 years.	<i>The submission of the landscape management plan can be a condition of any consent.</i>	<i>no action required</i>

Amendments made to address the LPA Comments

**Ann Rowland BA Hons BLD CMLI**

**Director, Landscape Perspective Ltd**

Recommendations:		
Planting should be proposed along the southern boundary adjacent to Sussex Border Path and adjacent to Grade II listed Burleigh Cottage to bolster the gaps and provide additional screening. This should include hedgerow and tree planting.	<i>We have shown hedgerow and tree planting already but we will label it more clearly</i>	<i>done</i>
A field boundary that has been in place since before the 1960's is being removed to facilitate the development. A large part of this boundary is formed of Category B trees. We question whether any of the trees could be retained to reduce the number of losses across the scheme.	<i>we will discuss with the design team's arboricultural consultant, drainage consultant and ecologist to see if further trees could be retained</i>	<i>they need to be removed, no amendment made</i>
Two SuDS features are proposed at the north of the site. It is currently unknown whether these are wet or dry. We advise that any wet basins include a large amount of peripheral planting as a physical soft barrier and also a contribution to visual amenity and biodiversity. We advise that any dry basins are multi-functional, unfenced and allow public access with very low gradient edges, such as 1:4.	<i>they are labelled wet/dry, they will be seasonally wet and seasonally dry. We will discuss with the team, it may be necessary to fence them, but we will add peripheral planting and appropriate notes to the drawing</i>	<i>peripheral planting added to margins, no fencing added. Note on gradient added to key</i>

Amendments made to address the LPA Comments  
**Ann Rowland BA Hons BLD CMLI**  
**Director, Landscape Perspective Ltd**

It would be recommended that hedgerows are planted in double staggered rows, preferably 5 plants per linear metre. There should also not be equal numbers of each species. Instead, it is recommended that it is specified in percentages, as shown below:	<i>we will add that onto our drawing</i>	<i>done</i>
60% Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)	<i>as above</i>	<i>done</i>
20% Field maple (Acer campestre)		
10% Hazel (Corylus Avellana)		
5% Trees (wild cherry, oak or hornbeam)		
5% made of holly, spindle, crab apple, dogwood, blackthorn and guelder rose (only a few % each IF they are present in the locality).		
The substation in the north-west corner should be screened with additional planting including hedgerow or climber planting, considering its prominent location at the entrance to the scheme.	<i>we will add some screening</i>	<i>done</i>
Hedgerow planting should also be proposed alongside the existing close-board fences to the properties at either side of the entrance from Woodlands Close. This can be used as defensive planting considering that these rear gardens are now exposed.	<i>we will label the hedges on the drawing to make it clearer</i>	<i>done</i>

Amendments made to address the LPA Comments

**Ann Rowland BA Hons BLD CMLI**

**Director, Landscape Perspective Ltd**

Development should avoid the root protection areas (RPAs) of all trees within or surrounding the Site. Any hard landscaping proposed within the RPA of existing trees must use no-dig surface solutions.	<i>note to that effect can be added to the drawing, again this is something that would be provided when discharging conditions</i>	<i>done</i>
A predominance of one species or variety should be avoided in order to minimise the risk of widespread biotic threats to the urban forest and to increase species diversity. Preference should be given to native trees and shrubs, but in certain urban and residential situations, better results might be achieved by the use of naturalised trees and shrubs, which are not necessarily native but are the correct tree for site conditions and would add landscape and arboricultural value	<i>whilst we are not at this stage producing planting plans we will add a planting schedule with species</i>	<i>done</i>