



March 2020

Hanbury Properties Limited

**Appraisal of Agricultural Land Quality and a Soil
Resource Plan
for land at Shripney Road, Shripney, West Sussex**

Beechwood Court
Long Toll
Woodcote
RG8 0RR



1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	RELEVANT POLICIES	1
3	AGRICULTURAL LAND QUALITY AND USE	3
	Introduction	3
	Site description	3
	Agro-climatic conditions	4
	Soil parent material and soil type	4
	Existing Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) data	5
	Local Context	7
4	APPRAISAL OF THE SITE'S AGRICULTURAL LAND QUALITY	7
5	SOIL RESOURCE PLAN	8
	Purpose of the Soil Resource Plan (SRP)	8
	Soil Resources and Agricultural Land Classification	9
	Landscape design and soil suitability	9
	Soil Management Strategy	10
6	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	13

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Reading Agricultural Consultants Ltd (RAC) is instructed by Hanbury Properties Limited to assess the agricultural land quality and soil resources of land east of Shripney Road, Shripney, and prepare a Soil Resource Plan for the proposed development.
- 1.2 The outline planning application (ref BE/109/19/OUT) for development of land at Shripney Road proposes the construction of 46 residential dwellings. In March 2020, Arun District Council advised that a review of existing data in addition to a Soil Resource Plan would be required in support of the application.
- 1.3 This appraisal considers the agricultural circumstances at the site in the context of national and local policies for development involving agricultural land. The appraisal is followed by a Soil Resource Plan which sets out the soil types on site, the process of stripping and storing soils, and the process of reinstating soils for the various uses proposed within the development.

2 Relevant policies

- 2.1 Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework¹ (2019) indicates that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
 - protecting soils, amongst other matters, in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan; and
 - recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services, including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
- 2.2 Policy SO DM1, Soils, of the adopted Arun Local Plan 2011-2018² states that:

“Unless designated by this Plan or a Neighbourhood Development Plan, the use of Grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification for any form of development not associated with agriculture, horticulture or forestry will not be permitted unless need for the development outweighs the need to protect such land in the long term.

¹

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Eb_2019_revised.pdf

² <https://www.arun.gov.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93iim4n12844.pdf&ver=12984>.

The requirement to protect the best and most versatile land can be outweighed if it is demonstrated through sustainability and options appraisals that:

- a. Preservation of land of lower agricultural quality has greater benefits in terms of ecosystem services (for example carbon storage, flood water retention, support of biodiversity);*
- b. That any site preferred for development is demonstrated to be the best and most sustainable option, including but not limited to the terms of land quality, ecosystem services, infrastructure and proven need; and*
- c. The proposed development meets the requirements of the countryside policy and/or equine development policy.*

Where development is permitted it should, as far as possible, use the lowest grade of land suitable for that development. Development will not be permitted unless:

- d. The applicant has submitted sustainability and options appraisals, mitigation measures, and a soil resources plan for the development site;*
- e. Site appraisal documents submitted by the applicant must demonstrate that consideration has been given to DEFRA's Soil Strategy for England;*
- f. The productivity of the land is demonstrated using a methodology for assessing gross margins as contained in the Arun Soils and Agricultural Land Assessment Report; and*
- g. The applicant has submitted a comprehensive soil resources plan for the development site which demonstrates that care will be taken to preserve the soil resource, such that it can be incorporated into a Productive Green Environment following development.*

Developments shall also be consistent with all other Local Plan policies."

3 Agricultural land quality and use

Introduction

- 3.1 Guidance for assessing the quality of agricultural land in England and Wales is set out in the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) revised guidelines and criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land (1988)³, and summarised in Natural England's Technical Information Note 049⁴.
- 3.2 Agricultural land in England and Wales is graded between 1 and 5, depending on the extent to which physical or chemical characteristics impose long-term limitations on agricultural use. The principal physical factors influencing grading are climate, site and soil which, together with interactions between them, form the basis for classifying land into one of the five grades.
- 3.3 Grade 1 land is excellent quality agricultural land with very minor or no limitations to agricultural use. Grade 2 is very good quality agricultural land, with minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. Grade 3 land has moderate limitations which affect the choice of crops, timing and type of cultivation, harvesting or the level of yield, and is subdivided into Subgrade 3a (good quality land) and Subgrade 3b (moderate quality land). Grade 4 land is poor quality agricultural land with severe limitations which significantly restrict the range of crops and/or level of yields. Grade 5 is very poor quality land, with very severe limitations which restrict use to permanent pasture or rough grazing.
- 3.4 Land which is classified as Grades 1, 2 and 3a is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF¹ as the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.

Site description

- 3.5 The site extends to 1.8ha of permanent grassland which has been used for grazing ponies for over 20 years. The site is constrained by existing infrastructure on three sides, with the A29 Shripney Road to the west and residential properties to the north and south, and by an established treeline comprising mature oaks and a ditch to the east.
- 3.6 The site is low-lying and level at around 2-3m above Ordnance Datum (AOD).

³ **MAFF (1988).** *Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales. Revised guidelines and criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land.* MAFF Publications.

⁴ **Natural England (2012).** *Technical Information Note 049 - Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land,* Second Edition.

Agro-climatic conditions

- 3.7 Agro-climatic data for the site have been interpolated from the Meteorological Office's standard 5km grid point data set at a representative altitude of 3m AOD, and are given in Table 1. Climate at the site is moist and warm with large moisture deficits. The number of field capacity days is marginally higher than average for lowland England (150 days) and is slightly unfavourable for providing opportunities for agricultural field work.

Table 1: Local agro-climatic conditions

Parameter	Value
Average Annual Rainfall	751mm
Accumulated Temperatures >0°C	1,544 day°
Field Capacity Days	153 days
Average Moisture Deficit, wheat	120mm
Average Moisture Deficit, potatoes	117mm

Soil parent material and soil type

- 3.8 The underlying geology mapped by the British Geological Survey⁵ is the White Chalk Subgroup, comprising chalk with flints. River terrace deposits overlie the chalk and may include sand and gravel, locally with lenses of silt, clay or peat.
- 3.9 Detailed soil series mapping⁶ (1:25,000 scale) shows the Park Gate soil series, shallow phase with calcareous C horizon, across the west of the site and the Hook series, shallow phase with calcareous C horizon, in the east. Detailed descriptions of each are available from profiles observed in the locality, near Chichester.
- 3.10 The Park Gate series example profile was located in woodland and consequently has topsoil characteristics that are not present at the site. However the topsoil is described as a friable silt loam with a fine and medium crumb structure. This overlies friable silt loam which is mottled and has a very weak fine and medium subangular blocky structure. Upper subsoil horizons (recorded as 17-30" (approximately 43-76cm) and 30-36" (approximately 76-91cm depth) are of medium silty clay loam which is mottled and has a moderate medium prismatic structure with some subangular blocks. Lower subsoil is very calcareous and comprises mottled, friable silty clay loam. The structure is moderately well developed with fine and medium subangular blocks.

⁵ **British Geological Survey (2020).** *Geology of Britain viewer*, <http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html>

⁶ **Soil Survey of England and Wales (1967),** *Soils of the West Sussex Coastal Plain. Map Sheet SU 90*

- 3.11 The Hook series example profile is also located near Chichester, on agricultural land. The topsoil is friable silt loam with a weak, fine and medium subangular blocky structure and occasional flints. The topsoil depth is noted as 10" (25cm). Upper subsoil is a friable silty clay loam which has a moderate medium and coarse prismatic structure. The upper subsoil has few mottles, becoming common within 18" (46cm) and abundant towards the bottom of the horizon (which is near 80cm depth). Lower subsoil is described as mottled, friable, highly calcareous, structureless silt loam⁷.
- 3.12 Although the prismatic upper subsoil would hinder drainage, the profile has abundant roots throughout. The mottling in both profiles suggests each is affected by groundwater and drainage is inferred as imperfect.
- 3.13 The Park Gate and Hook series are the component soils of the Park Gate association. Park Gate soils are commonly assessed as Wetness Class (WC) III or IV, whilst the Hook soils can be better drained, of WC II⁸.

Existing Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) data

- 3.14 Provisional ALC mapping shows the site as Grade 1 which is defined as:

"Grade 1 - excellent quality agricultural land

Land with no or very minor limitations to agricultural use. A very wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can be grown and commonly includes top fruit, soft fruit, salad crops and winter harvested vegetables. Yields are high and less variable than on land of lower quality."

- 3.15 However, the Provisional ALC maps are not suitable for assessing the quality of individual sites, as explained in Natural England's TIN049:

"These maps are not sufficiently accurate for use in assessment of individual fields or development sites, and should not be used other than as general guidance. They show only five grades: their preparation preceded the subdivision of Grade 3 and the refinement of criteria, which occurred after 1976. They have not been updated and are out of print. A 1:250 000 scale map series based on the same information is available. These are more appropriate for the strategic use originally intended ..."

⁷ **Hodgson (1967)**. *Soils of the West Sussex Coastal Plain*. Soil Survey, Harpenden.

⁸ **Jarvis et al (1984)**, *Soils and Their Use in South East England*, Harpenden, Bulletin 15

3.16 TIN049 goes on to say:

“Since 1976, selected areas have been resurveyed in greater detail and to revised guidelines and criteria. Information based on detailed ALC field surveys in accordance with current guidelines (MAFF, 1988) is the most definitive source. Data from the former Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) archive of more detailed ALC survey information (from 1988) is also available on <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/>.”

3.17 The site was surveyed as part of wider survey area that encompassed all of the agricultural land between north-west Bersted and east of Flansham⁹. The survey was undertaken at a reconnaissance scale of approximately one observation per four hectares. However, one observation was made directly within the site at Shripney Road, with an additional two in the field parcel across the ditch immediately to the east. The profiles are somewhat similar in their upper horizons with the mapped soil type and the detailed example profile descriptions for the two soil series.

3.18 The profile observed within the site and the closest profile outside the site boundary include dark greyish brown or brown (10YR4/2 or 4/3 in the Munsell soil colour charts¹⁰) medium silty clay loam topsoil to an average depth of 28cm. The topsoil is stoneless to slightly stony. Upper subsoil is also of medium silty clay loam which is yellowish brown (10YR5/4 or 5/6) and extends to an average depth of 44cm.

3.19 Lower subsoils become heavier with depth, comprising yellowish brown (10YR5/6) clay at the site. There are some mottles and ferrimanganiferous concretions, however the profile is permeable, of WC I, and is limited by droughtiness to Grade 2.

3.20 The neighbouring profile to the east has lower subsoil horizons of brown (10YR5/3) heavy silty clay loam over light olive brown (2.5Y5/3) clay. Mottling in the subsoil and reduced permeability from 50cm depth result in WC III and a wetness limitation to Subgrade 3a. This point has however been mapped and reported as Grade 2 in keeping with the surrounding observations of Grade 2.

3.21 The second profile observed in the neighbouring field differs slightly, comprising silt loam topsoil overlying permeable heavy silty clay loam and clay, with medium silty clay loam present

⁹ **ADAS (1994).** *Bognor Regis By-Pass Reconnaissance Survey, Agricultural Land Classification Report. Ref No.: 4202/050/94*

¹⁰ **Munsell Color (2009).** *Munsell Soil Color Book.* Grand Rapids, MI, USA

between 85cm and 120cm depth. The clay is brown (10YR5/3) and mottled, but the profile is permeable throughout, of WC II. This profile is limited slightly by wetness to Grade 2.

Local Context

- 3.22 The available survey data extends to the entire surrounds of the village of Shripney and shows the agricultural land quality to be high. Most of the agricultural land around the village is very good quality Grade 2, with large areas of excellent quality Grade 1 to the west and south of the village. There is a small area of Subgrade 3b quality mapped to the south-west of the village although this land is floodplain (Flood Zone 3) and not available for development.
- 3.23 Satellite imagery shows that almost all of the agricultural land around Shripney is in arable production and is being managed according to the Grade 1 or 2 classification.

4 Appraisal of the site's agricultural land quality

- 4.1 The site was surveyed on behalf of MAFF in 1994 and classified as Grade 2, which is BMV agricultural land. As the ALC is concerned with the long-term inherent physical characteristics of the soil and land, rather than with the land's current management or nutrient status, the ALC established in 1994 is definitive and will not have altered in the interim.
- 4.2 In terms of national and local policy, it is necessary to:
- recognise the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land; and
 - where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, to prefer areas of poorer quality land to those of a higher quality.
- 4.3 The site has been used for grazing ponies for at least 20 years, and there has been no agricultural production associated with this site for that time. The inherent quality of the land does not provide any economic or other benefit that needs to be recognised by planning decisions.
- 4.4 Moreover, the physical constraints to the site mean that the site cannot achieve or realise its inherent agricultural potential. Bringing an isolated site of such small size (1.8ha) into arable production on its own is not economically viable. However, the site cannot be amalgamated with the extensive area of arable land to the immediate east because of the substantial ditch and line of mature oak trees along its eastern boundary. Given that the remaining BMV land around Shripney is farmed in arable production and meeting its inherent capability, it is clear that this site would also have been put to arable use were it not for these significant constraints.

- 4.5 The development of approximately 1.8ha of agricultural land is not a significant development of agricultural land, particularly in circumstances where that land has not been in agricultural use for many years. Even so, within the context of development around Shripney, it is apparent that this site is of the same or lower quality than other agricultural land around the village that could be potentially available for development. There are no opportunities to direct development to land of a poorer agricultural quality.
- 4.6 The proposal does not conflict with paragraphs 170 and 171 of the NPPF as there are no economic or other benefits associated with the presence of BMV land at this site, and there are no opportunities to use poorer quality agricultural land for development around Shripney.
- 4.7 Policy SO DM1 of the adopted Arun Local Plan indicates that the use of BMV land for any form of development not associated with agriculture, horticulture or forestry will not be permitted unless the need for the development outweighs the need to protect such land in the long term. This is the planning balance that lies outside the scope of this appraisal.

5 Soil Resource Plan

Purpose of the Soil Resource Plan (SRP)

- 5.1 The SRP outlines a suitable strategy and procedures for stripping, storing and reinstating soils throughout the construction of the proposed development. Adherence to the SRP will ensure that the physical soil properties are maintained throughout construction, such that undisturbed and reinstated soil profiles will be able to support healthy root growth and successful plant establishment.
- 5.2 The SRP will also be used to:
- identify the existing soil resources present at the site and those that are to be used in the construction of the proposed development. This will then be used to provide a specification for the reinstatement of soil profiles in the construction period; and
 - identify the approximate anticipated volume of each type of soil (topsoil and upper subsoil) that will be available for re-use in the detailed design of the proposed development, primarily in gardens.
- 5.3 The preparation of this SRP has relied on:
- soil survey data obtained on behalf of the former MAFF in a survey undertaken in 1994⁹; and

- Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites¹¹ which provides details and best practice guidance on the handling, storage and reinstatement of soil resources.

Soil Resources and Agricultural Land Classification

- 5.4 A semi-detailed ALC survey was undertaken in 1994 at an observation density of one per four hectares and encompassed a wide area in the locality. One observation was made within the present site boundary and two observations in the field to the immediate east. The area surrounding the site has been classified as Grade 2, very good quality agricultural land. Minor variations in the soil profiles result in different limitations: within the site, the profile is of WC I and limited slightly by droughtiness, whilst in the neighbouring field, there is a slight wetness limitation.
- 5.5 The topsoil recorded at the site comprises slightly stony medium silty clay loam of 260mm depth. Including the two profiles in the adjacent field, the average topsoil depth across the three profiles is 290mm.
- 5.6 Most of the site boundaries, particularly to the west, south-east and east, have well established tree belts along them, and the soils in these areas will remain undisturbed. The potential area to be stripped of topsoil is estimated at 1.29ha. Based on the average topsoil depth (to account for localised variation in topsoil thickness) there is an estimated volume of approximately 3,750m³ of available topsoil resource within the site.

Landscape design and soil suitability

- 5.7 The topsoil resource stripped from the site will be utilised primarily in the detailed design of residential gardens, with additional public open space and a play area (as shown the attached masterplan).
- 5.8 The site has been under permanent grass for at least twenty years. The soils are therefore proven to be well suited to this purpose and are appropriate for re-seeding with grass for gardens and open space.
- 5.9 A suitable soil profile for reinstatement should utilise as much of the displaced topsoil resource as is possible. The area across which soils will be required to be reinstated, encompassing gardens and green space, is estimated as approximately 0.6ha. Reinstating profiles with 300mm medium silty clay loam topsoil over the original, in-situ silty clay loam upper subsoil should be

¹¹ Defra (2009). *Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites*.

achievable throughout all garden and open space areas, and will require approximately 1,800m³ of topsoil. The remaining approximately 1,950m³ should be used for beneficial and sustainable reuse off-site in a manner appropriate to the soil's quality.

- 5.10 The topsoil and upper subsoil resource is inherently freely draining which, provided the structure is maintained through good working practices, should allow for good tree and grass establishment, although close monitoring for signs of vegetation failure will be necessary.

Soil Management Strategy

- 5.11 Inevitably, soil structural quality will be disrupted by handling or trafficking. There are three principal objectives when stripping, handling and storing soils:

- avoiding unnecessary damage to all soil horizons, especially by compaction and smearing;
- maintaining a reasonable degree of fissuring, and hence aerobic conditions, in stored soils, especially topsoil; and
- replicating the original permeability of the soil profile when the materials are replaced.

- 5.12 All soil material to be re-used will be handled only under appropriate conditions, when in a dry and friable state, which is when they are least susceptible to damage by compaction and smearing, and according to the following rainfall criteria:

- if there is very light rain or drizzle, handling can proceed for up to four hours unless the soils are already in too moist a state (determined by field tests);
- if there is normal rain, handling will cease if the rain has not stopped in 15 minutes;
- if there is heavy rain (as from intense showers, slow-moving depressions) handling will stop immediately;
- after rainfall has ceased, field tests will be applied to determine when handling may re-start.

- 5.13 The field tests used to determine the suitability of handling should be applied to soils from at least five locations in each area to be assessed. Records of all tests will be kept.

- 5.14 The soils should be assessed as follows:

If the soil sample is wet, films of water are visible on the surfaces of grains and aggregates and/or when a soil sample is squeezed in the hand and it readily deforms into a cohesive "ball".	NO HANDLING
---	-------------

Peds (structures) break up/crumble readily when squeezed in the hand rather than forming into a ball	HANDLING OK
If the sample is moist, there is a slight dampness when squeezed between the fingers but it does not significantly change colour (darken) on further wetting	NO HANDLING BY DOZERS BUT MAY BE HANDLED BY TRACKED EXCAVATORS IF CONSISTENCY TEST (See 5.16) IS PASSED
If the sample is dry and brittle it will look dry and change colour (darken) if water is added	HANDLING OK IF CONSISTENCY TEST (See 5.16) IS PASSED

5.15 The consistency of the soil should also be assessed, using the following methodology:

Attempt to mould a soil sample into a ball by hand:

Impossible to mould a soil sample into a ball by hand because the soil is too hard (dry)	HANDLING OK
Impossible to mould a soil sample into a ball by hand because the soil is too loose (dry)	HANDLING OK
Impossible to mould a soil sample into a ball by hand because the soil is too loose (wet)	HANDLING NOT OK
Possible to mould a soil sample into a ball by hand	GO TO 5.17

5.16 If a ball can be formed by hand, attempt to roll it into a thread of 3mm diameter:

Impossible to roll the ball into a thread of 3mm diameter on a flat non-adhesive surface using light pressure from the flat of the hand; the soil crumbles or disintegrates	HANDLING OK
Possible to roll the ball into a thread of 3mm diameter on a flat non-adhesive surface using light pressure from the flat of the hand	NO HANDLING

Soil handling

5.17 There is one soil type to be stripped from the site.

5.18 Any bulky vegetation will normally be cut and removed before stripping.

- 5.19 Plant of appropriate size for the operation will be used to strip the topsoils and place them into storage bunds within the site, the locations and volumes of which must be recorded. Haul routes to the storage areas will first be stripped of topsoil to avoid trafficking over undisturbed topsoil by wheeled vehicles.

Depth of Soil Stripping

- 5.20 The full thickness of the topsoil horizon should be stripped, identified by colour, avoiding incorporation of subsoil material into the removed topsoil.
- 5.21 The topsoil resource could be stripped uniformly to 300mm without incorporating notable volumes of upper subsoil material.

Topsoil stockpiling

- 5.22 Topsoil must be stockpiled when in an appropriate condition as determined by the field tests for moisture and consistency described above in paragraphs 5.15 to 5.17. This will ensure the soil is less prone to damage and compaction and will also facilitate re-spreading where applicable.
- 5.23 Topsoil stockpiles are proposed to have a maximum height of 3m and a side gradient of 1 in 3 to allow for maintenance by mowing rather than strimming. Stockpiles must be located away from areas that may be at risk of flooding or ponding during the construction phase. This precludes the use of the south-eastern corner of the site which lies adjacent to a food zone. The remainder of the boundary of the site which is outside the area of built development but away from tree canopies and roots would be appropriate for the siting of stockpiles.
- 5.24 Any stockpiles in place for more than 6 months will be grassed down, normally with a low-maintenance mix unless otherwise agreed, and kept in a tidy and weed-free condition.
- 5.25 Locations will be monitored for signs of ponding. If that occurs, temporary drainage measures will be put in place.

Subsoil preparation

- 5.26 Soil placement will occur once the areas to be reinstated to gardens and green infrastructure are dry and clear of debris. Any debris that may have been incorporated into the subsoil resource during the construction phase will be removed.
- 5.27 To ensure successful establishment of grass and trees, the subsoil must be uncompacted and well aerated in order to avoid waterlogging and the development of anaerobic conditions. If significant rainfall occurs, work must be suspended and not restarted until the weather forecast is expected to be dry for at least one full day.

Topsoil re-spreading

- 5.28 Topsoil should be taken out of stockpiles when in a dry and friable condition, and loose-tipped onto the prepared subsoil, to a depth of 300mm (plus up to 20% to allow for settlement).
- 5.29 Following topsoil resspreading, the soil profiles should be decompacted if required following inspection, and larger clods broken up prior to the soil being seeded or trees being planted.
- 5.30 Tree and grass establishment must be monitored subsequent to planting. At the first signs of failure, the soil profiles will be examined in order to identify any drainage or compaction issues, and a strategy to ameliorate these issues will be developed.

6 Summary and Conclusion

- 6.1 The site east of Shripney Road extends to 1.8ha of permanent grassland used for grazing ponies. The site has not been in agricultural production for at least 20 years. The site is physically constrained on every side, either by existing infrastructure, housing or natural boundaries.
- 6.2 An ALC survey undertaken on behalf of the former MAFF included one observation within the present site boundary and concluded that the site and its immediate surrounds are of very good quality Grade 2 agricultural land.
- 6.3 Although the site is inherently of BMV quality, its small size and fragmentation prevent the land being farmed to its potential quality. As such, the site has remained as pony grazing rather than being incorporated into surrounding arable land.
- 6.4 In terms of national and local policy, it is apparent that:
- there has been no agricultural production associated with this site for at least 20 years, and that the inherent quality of the land does not provide any economic or other benefit that needs to be recognised by planning decisions;
 - the development of 1.8ha of land that has not been in agricultural use for over 20 years is not a significant development of agricultural land;
 - there are no opportunities to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land for development around Shripney.
- 6.5 There is one soil type to be stripped and re-used, which is a good quality, slightly stony, freely draining, medium silty clay loam, with an average depth of approximately 290mm. Most of the site boundaries have well established tree belts along them, and the soils in these areas will

remain undisturbed. The potential area to be stripped of topsoil is estimated at 1.29ha which would generate a volume of approximately 3,750m³ of topsoil resource.

- 6.6 A suitable soil profile for reinstatement should use as much of the displaced topsoil resource as is possible. The area across which soils will be required to be reinstated, encompassing gardens and green space, is estimated as approximately 0.6ha. Reinstating profiles with 300mm medium silty clay loam topsoil over the original, in-situ silty clay loam upper subsoil will require approximately 1,800m³ of topsoil. The remaining topsoil should be used for beneficial and sustainable reuse off-site in a manner appropriate to its quality.
- 6.7 All soil material to be re-used will be handled only under appropriate conditions, when in a dry and friable state, which is when they are least susceptible to damage by compaction and smearing. Rainfall, soil moisture and consistency criteria will be followed to ensure soil is handled in appropriate conditions.



Application Boundary



On behalf of:

Hanbury Properties

Produced by:

**DAVIESLANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTS**
Rural & Landscapes Architects, 100, High Street, Brighton, BN1 1AB, UK
Tel: 01273 915000, Email: info@davieslandscape.co.uk

PROJECT:

**Land East of Shripney Road,
Shripney**

DRAWING TITLE:

Illustrative Masterplan

DRAWN: 19.20.2018

SCALE: 1:1,000 @ A3

REPORT REFERENCE: DLA 1948 L 07.P06

This drawing is a landscape architectural illustration only and is not a technical drawing. It is intended to provide a visual representation of the proposed development and is not to be used for any other purpose without the written consent of Davies Landscape Architects.