

Sent: 18 December 2025 18:49

To: Caroline Grist <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: DM/25/2720: Kilnwood Apartments, Rocky Lane [DMHS-DMS.FID7802416]

Hi Caroline,

This email responds to the comments submitted by your Tree Officer.

I deal with each point below. But I would say that the Tree Officer seems to have 'over stepped the mark' in commenting on parking and landscape matters when really her remit is trees.

Hi Caroline,

I continue to have concerns over placing a further building on this land. A further building removes 14 car spaces designated for the three blocks of apartments already approved and constructed and there does not appear to be parking for a further building. This is not realistically a valid concern of the Tree Officer. The Highway Authority have consistently raised no objection to the scheme because adequate parking is provided as part of the current proposals, partly due to the oversupply of parking on previous schemes.

This places further pressure on landscaped areas and spaces between and around buildings. It places no additional pressure on the landscaped areas because the required parking standards are met. Any proposal to provide additional parking, would need to be the subject of a separate application for planning permission and the LPA would, therefore, have full control over this. I would add that there is no intention to provide any additional parking and to do so would not be supported by policy.

The approved plans show strengthening of the buffer between the development and railway. The current application removes this, and involves removing a section of G2. This removes the ability of this group to develop to their full potential and to provide a buffer from the railway. Disagree see rebuttal by Frank Spooner Senior Consultant and Operations Director for SJAtrees attached.

It also pushes the development closer to the group of TPO trees. Drawing no HB/003 rev C, Feb 17 denotes the approved landscaping and this can no longer be implemented, should this development be approved. Disagree - see rebuttal by Frank Spooner Senior Consultant and Operations Director for SJAtrees attached.

This is an elevated site (similar to that immediately to the east, which has been developed) and the approved landscaping and spaces between buildings will provide greater screening in the future, as well as their current contribution. The spacing between buildings will remain the same, the proposed landscaping will provide new and additional planting which does not currently exist.

Trees have already been removed to facilitate the approved car parking areas. This is not relevant to the current application as all parking has been implemented in accordance with previously approved applications.

Whilst I appreciate that no high quality trees are to be removed for the proposed building. So no objection to the current application in relation to trees – but rather 'concerns' as expressed below. I have concerns about the cramped nature of the building, squeezed between a tree buffer and an existing building. The building is not 'squeezed' but has a similar gap between buildings as all the other blocks to the east. There is no tree buffer directly to the east – the TPO'd trees to the north-east and north are all retained.

There will be a significant impact on the landscape views and the space and planting between buildings will be diminished. This statement is not borne out by the facts, as set out above the spaces between buildings remains generous and there would be no loss of landscaping/planting, but rather significant additional planting to the south and west. The comment regarding 'landscape views' again goes beyond the remit of the Tree Officer. As you both know, with the previous application we submitted an LVIA, which considered a larger 9 unit scheme. The conclusions of that assessment were that; 'The development would be relatively discrete allowing only partial near distance views. It would be seen as a block replicating the MSDC high quality, Kilnwood Apartments. The changes proposed would result in 'Not Significant Landscape Character and Visual Impacts'. This is because

the Site is not 'Semi-rural' in character, the overall tree amenity would not be harmed. There are good grounds with regard to Landscape Character and Visual impacts, for planning consent to be granted by Mid Sussex District Council for the proposed Apartment.

I do not consider that there will be adequate space for trees to develop to their full potential. Disagree - see rebuttal by Frank Spooner Senior Consultant and Operations Director for SJAtrees attached.

Kind regards,

Peter

Peter Rainier | Principal Director of Planning | Tel: 01293 605160 |
For and on behalf of DMH Stallard LLP
Origin One, 108 High Street, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 1BD

All of our Gatwick teams are now based together in one office at Origin One, 108 High Street, Crawley, West Sussex. RH10 1BD.



IMPORTANT MESSAGE:

Please be aware of cyber crime. DMH Stallard LLP will NOT notify changes to our bank account details by email.

If you receive any communications suggesting that the firm's bank account details have changed, you should contact the firm via the number on the firm's website or headed notepaper immediately to confirm the details before making payment.

Please be aware that a phishing email may contain a fraudulent phone number for DMH Stallard LLP. DMH Stallard LLP will not take responsibility if you transfer money to a wrong account.

DMH Stallard LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales (registered number OC338287).

Its registered office is at The Portland Building, 27-28 Church Street, Brighton, East Sussex. BN1 1RB and it is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (ID. 490576).

The term "partner" is used to refer to a member of DMH Stallard LLP or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of our members, and of the non-members who are designated as partners, is open to inspection at our Brighton office.

[Please click here to see our disclaimer](#)

Please don't print this email unless you really need to.

