

## WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

<b>TO:</b>	Horsham District Council FAO: Sam Whitehouse
<b>FROM:</b>	WSCC – Highways Authority
<b>DATE:</b>	17 October 2025
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land North of Guildford Road Bucks Green Rudgwick West Sussex
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	DC/25/1269 Outline Planning Application for up to 90 no. residential dwellings (including 40% affordable) all matters to be reserved apart from access.  Further information received from Sam Whitehouse's email on 9th October 2025.
<b>DATE OF SITE VISIT:</b>	N/a
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	Advice

WSCC Highways have provided comments previously on this proposal. A number of matters were raised that the Applicant has responded to via a letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> October 2025.

Taking the points raised previously by WSCC and the Applicant's responses, the further following comments would be offered.

Incomplete speed survey data – A complete set of speed data has now been provided. This is noted and accepted.

Road Safety Audit – An editable version of the RSA Response has been provided. This has been completed by WSCC and returned to the Applicant for agreement. The finalised and agreed version of the RSA Response will be provided to Horsham DC for the planning file in due course.

Existing Lynwick Street access – It's noted that this is to be closed and the hedgerow reinstated. WSCC Highways have no particular concerns with the closure, although it's recognised that the access's possible retention was raised by other consultees. A condition requiring the access to be closed will be appropriate.

Pedestrian and Active Travel Accessibility – Updates have been made to the following drawings along with appears to be a new drawing provided,

- Proposed Access Strategy, drawing 1810054-03 revision G
- Proposed Access Strategy, drawing 1810054-07

The only amendment appears to be the widening of the proposed footway to 2 metres where possible within the existing public highway. It's recognised that a consistent 2 metre width cannot be achieved with a 1.5 metre narrowing along a short section. This section is adjacent to an existing lay-by and as such pedestrians would not be

immediately adjacent to free flowing traffic on the A281. It's recognised that the arrangements now shown achieve the maximum width possible within the existing highway verge. The proposed arrangements are considered acceptable when viewed against guidance in Inclusive Mobility.

**Pedestrian Crossing points** – There are two uncontrolled crossing points shown as part of the proposals. The locations and arrangements remain as per the initially submitted details.

The Applicant's response to the comments made by WSCC are acknowledged. Regarding the crossing points, WSCC would respond as follows.

The Applicant has identified a number of facilities and services present to the immediate south of the A281 that are within a very short walking distance. An uncontrolled crossing has been provided as a result. Given the nature of the A281 and the types of existing uses available to the south (i.e. sports and play facilities that are heavily weighted towards use by younger people), there would be merit to enhanced crossing facilities beyond that presently proposed.

WSCC recognise that a signalised crossing would be excessive given the likely levels of demand. However no consideration appears to have been given to as to whether a pedestrian refuge can be accommodated. This is a lower cost and potentially more suitable option compared with traffic signals. It is accepted that there are a number of constraints (existing accesses mainly) that could prohibit such an arrangement but this should still be considered by the Applicant.

In reviewing the crossing at the site access, WSCC also recognise the existing signalised crossing located to the east. The use of this would entail a 600 metre round trip, making it inconvenient given the straight line distance from the development to the various facilities immediately to the south. The use of the crossing is therefore an option, albeit unlikely to be used.

A uncontrolled crossing is also proposed to the west of the site. It's apparent that visibility at this crossing point could be obstructed by parked cars (also raised separately as part of the Stage One Road Safety Audit) as well as the vertical alignment of the carriageway to the west, which is not mentioned in the Applicant's response. No assessment has been made of achievable visibility for those crossing. WSCC would also question the need for this crossing point. Given the apparent constraints and lack of obvious need, WSCC would recommend that this crossing point is removed from the proposals.

**Transport Vision** – This is noted. Given the scale and context of this development, the vision is proportionate. The vision (which is paraphrased here) makes reference to maximising connections for current and future residents of the local area, to the village of Rudgwick, as well as the amenities located to the south of the A281. At present, the development is not necessarily maximising connections to the amenities to the south of the A281 as highlighted within preceding comments.

**Lynwick Street junction** – It's recognised that this no longer forms part of the proposals.

**Travel Plan** – A travel plan (dated 10<sup>th</sup> April 2025) has now been provided. The TP submitted covers all required aspects. As key points,

It's noted that the TP doesn't include any 'aim targets'. The inclusion of measurable targets is a fundamental aspect of a TP. In order to generate aim targets, ordinarily a developer would determine travel mode shares for existing residents from Census Travel to Work data as a proxy for future residents. A developer would then provide revised mode shares based on the anticipated effect of the TP. The aim targets may then be subsequently revised once a developer has undertaken initial travel surveys of the development. WSCC would require the TP be revised to include some initial aim targets.

The measures proposed to support the TP are noted. The provision of £50 towards the purchase of public transport tickets is quoted. For the purposes of this site, it would be beneficial as to what this may equate to in terms of purchasing bus tickets. The purpose of the TP is to influence long term travel habits; if £50 only equates to a few days worth of travel, then this would be of limited use.

7.3 indicates a baseline survey to be undertaken within 6 months of the dwellings being occupied. This should ideally make reference to a minimum number of dwellings being occupied at the time the baseline survey is undertaken. The survey would otherwise not obtain a meaningful sample.

The proposed car club is noted. This would be covered via a separate clause within any s106 agreement. The Applicant should provide confirmation from a car club operator that they are willing to operate from this site.

The Applicant should note that WSCC apply an auditing fee for the post planning monitoring of TPs. The fee is currently £3,950.

In summary, there remain various areas that the Applicant would need to address.

**Ian Gledhill**  
**West Sussex County Council – Planning Services**