

# Urban Design Observations

**To:** Development Management, Rachel Richardson

**From:** Anna Kramarczyk-Dillon, Architect/Urban Designer, Mid Sussex DC

**Application ref:** DM/25/1467

**Date:** 17/11/2025

**Address:** Land At Old Vicarage Field And The Old Estate Yard, Church Road, Turners Hill, West Sussex

**Description:** Demolition of existing buildings and the development of 40 dwellings (including affordable housing) with open space, access, parking, drainage, landscaping and other associated works as well as the creation of a new community car park and replacement parking for Lion Lane residents. Amended transport plans, technical note and travel plan received on 15.08.2025..

**Stage:** Planning

---

I have reviewed the response to my previous comments. While I appreciate some small changes made, I believe they do not go far enough to address my previous comments.

Please see follow up comments below.

- There is an established informal path currently running close to the blue line. Regardless of the limitations described and explained in the applicant's reply I am still of an opinion that this link should be reinforced and not discouraged. At the moment this corner of the site is not in accordance with the Principle DG8: Establish a clear movement network that connects with the surrounding area of the Mid Sussex Design Guide. Please reconsider blocking the established informal desire line (*"The north eastern Lion Lane car park will have a landscaped boundary in the form of a hedge, which will prevent any potential pedestrian desire lines in this part of the site"*).



- Following on my previous request for more information of hard and soft landscape:  
There are too many inconsistencies between drawings (3D perspectives show trees that are not on the plans, hard landscape descriptions vary between drawings, hard and soft landscaping is presented in a vague strategy rather than a proposed plan. Long elevations expose close boarding along the streets.  
The proposed addition of new trees remains unclear and insufficient, and the previous request for additional trees (indicated by blue dots on the earlier sketch) has not been addressed.

I believe at present landscaping plans lack sufficient detail and don't demonstrate material choices that will result in securing a meaningful and context driven landscape design.

I therefore repeat my request for a comprehensive set of hard and soft landscaping plans.

Please ensure drawings include:

- Clear annotations and a key.
- Revised provision of additional trees.
- Information about an indicative heights of the proposed trees.
- Proposed lighting if any.
- Separate plan detailing boundary treatments (inspired by the existing boundary treatment in the area, such as front gardens enclosed by the stone boundary walls and low-rise hedgerows, brick walls to the back gardens)

- My previous comments regarding elevations remain unchanged.  
Many of the proposed elevations lack the depth, detail, and articulation typical of the local vernacular.  
Materials are still inconsistently applied and in places still appear to be 'peeling off' at building corners or returns (suggesting superficial application rather than integrated design).

Considering the proximity of the Conservation Area choice of materials in this scheme is important. I don't support the use of white weatherboarding (most likely composite boarding) and have concerns regarding the selection of white uPVC windows.

To better reflect the identity and heritage of the village, a more thoughtful and context-driven approach to palette of colours and materials is needed. In particular correct choice of cladding, **brick and brick bonding pattern** would be helpful.

Whilst this alone would not overcome the concerns raised above, together with the right boundary treatment, it would assist in reducing the unconvincing pseudo-vernacular style nature of the houses, which simply are architecturally unremarkable and rather generic.



Photos: Immediate context of the site: good examples of the existing palette of colours, materials and brick patterns.

I would like to repeat my request for facing material application plan (include brick choices together with brick bonding type, choice of windows and front

doors together with doors and window RAL colours. To secure the quality of the finishes at this stage.

- My previous comments: *All upper-level apartments should include at least Juliet balconies directly accessible from the main living area., while ground floor units are expected to have private outdoor spaces also directly accessible from the main living area* remain unchanged.  
For more explanation, please see Mid Sussex Design Guide: Principle DG46: Provide attractive and usable external amenity space for all homes.