

TECHNICAL NOTE

Job Name: Former Novartis Site
Job No: 332612684
Note No: TN02
Date: May 2025
Prepared By: Gareth Elphick
Subject: Review of Transport Evidence

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Stantec UK Ltd (Stantec) have been appointed by Horsham District Council to undertake a review of Transport evidence provided as part of application DC/25/0629¹ Novartis site, Parsonage Road at Horsham for 206 new homes.
- 1.2. The documents reviewed are :
 - **Transport Assessment – March 2025. Written by Paul Basham Associates on behalf of Lovell Partnerships. And updated version June 2025 – post a meeting 21st May 2025.**
 - **Travel Plan – March 2025. Written by Paul Basham Associates on behalf of Lovell Partnerships**
- 1.3. These documents were updated June 2025 post a meeting 21st May 2025 (Stantec, Paul Basham, Nexus Planning and Horsham District Council). The new documents were an Addendum Transport Assessment (ATA) and revised Travel Plan. The ATA addressed on-going Stantec comments aswell as comments from WSCC.
- 1.4. A site visit was undertaken by Stantec on 2nd May 2025. No particular comments are noted. The site visit reflected the expectations that had been formed from initial Desktop Research in terms of the transport network of the surrounding area.
- 1.5. This Technical Note is similar in format, and duplicates a number of points, to a review of the TA for the adjacent 'site' as part of DC/25/0415. This review relating to DC/25/0629 has fewer points to cover as the access is more distal from the level crossing, and there is not a change of land-use in relation to an existing permission. This site does however have basement parking – not something extant in the 'Muse' portion proposal.

DOCUMENT ISSUE RECORD

Technical Note No	Rev	Date	Prepared	Checked	Reviewed (Discipline Lead)	Approved (Project Director)
332612684/100/TN02	-	May 2025	GE	GH	GH	GH
	A	July 25	GE			GE

This report has been prepared by Stantec UK Limited ('Stantec') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which Stantec was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). Stantec accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

T: +44 (0)123 352 7250

¹ Residential development comprising approximately 206 dwellings, including the conversion of 'Building 3' and demolition of 'Building 36'. Vehicular access taken from Wimblehurst Road. Car and cycle parking, landscaping and open space and associated works. The replacement of the existing cedar trees at the site.

TECHNICAL NOTE

2. Transport Assessment Review

2.1. The submitted document has the chapters listed below. These have been reviewed in turn by Stantec and comments provided as considered appropriate.

1. Introduction
2. Planning Policy
3. Existing Conditions
4. Proposed Development
5. Trip Generation
6. Trip Distribution
7. Access Arrangements
8. Junction Capacity Modelling
9. Off Site Highways Works and Contributions
10. Summary and Conclusions

Associated Appendices²

Introduction (Chapter 1)

2.2. This chapter covers the planning history of the wider site as per planning permission DC/18/2687³. The TA confirms this application replaces live Reserved Matters (RM) applications DC/23/0183 and DC/23/0171.

2.3. The proposal site remains housing-led with a reduction in the proposed numbers from the original Outline application and the combined quantum from the 2 RM applications.

Planning Policy (Chapter 2)

2.4. The latest NPPF (December 2024) is referenced in the TA. However, no response to NPPF policy is explicitly given. Such a section would allow the transport Vision of the proposal to be more clearly outlined, especially in terms of providing and promoting sustainable transport modes. This Vision can be tailored to be commensurate with the size / location of the site.

2.5. In this instance, we assume that the Travel Plan can be considered an appropriate proxy for a sustainable transport "Vision". On that basis no additional information is requested with respect to this.

² This note whilst cognisant of these Appendices has limited its substantive review to the main text.

³ Outline planning application for the erection of up to 300 dwellings (C3) including the conversion of existing offices buildings 3 and 36) up to 25,000sqm of employment (B1) floorspaces and provision of 618sqm of flexible commercial/community space (A1 A2 A3 D1 Creche) use classes) within the ground floor of converted building 36. Improvements to existing pedestrian and vehicular accesses from Parsonage Road and Wimblehurst Road, new cycle and pedestrian accesses from Parsonage Road, together with associated parking and landscaping. All matters reserved except for access."

TECHNICAL NOTE

- 2.6. Other documents are referenced in the TA, comprising various WSCC Transport Policy documents. It is noted that the Horsham Local Plan is not referenced. We have not reviewed the Local Plan to determine whether there is any transport policy that would be relevant to considering permission for this site. We assume the LPA will take a view on this.
- 2.7. In summary the information presented within the TA for the policy documents is considered reasonable, but noting the possible additions above which may provide further context to the LPA / LHA if included.

Existing conditions (Chapter 3)

- 2.8. This chapter is, as would be typical, presented as a factual account of the transport network serving the site and the local surrounds. It is consistent with our desktop study and site visit observations. The road classifications could be added to the description for completeness.
- 2.9. The cycle network, and LCWIP, is mentioned. It is a reasonable description of topography and distances. It is noted from our site visit and review that the cycling is mainly 'on-road' with the disincentives to new cyclists therein.
- 2.10. Bus stop locations and service options (Metrobus 61, 71 and 200) to reach town centre (bus station) and railway station are noted. The walking network is described. The walking network is described and consistent with our desktop study and site observations.
- 2.11. It is noted that a Copenhagen Crossing at Richmond Road was initially proposed. This was removed in the ATA.
- 2.12. Accident data is provided.
- 2.13. In summary, this chapter presents a reasonable description of the local transport network and is typical of what would be expected within a TA document.

Proposed Development (Chapter 4)

- 2.14. The parking provision is justified in relation to parking standards (WSCC Guidance on Parking in New Developments (2020)). 252 no. car parking spaces and 220 no. cycle parking are proposed. The site is confirmed as within PBZ (Parking Behaviour Zone) 4 as per WSCC Parking Guidance.
- 2.15. Basement Parking is also part of the parking mix (77 spaces). Vehicle spaces are 2.4m by 4.8m⁴. Whilst Basement Parking is appropriate, the constrained nature of a basement should be fully considered. If spaces are too tight to ensure regular use, even if the spaces are theoretically of sufficient size, commentary should be made that the parking provision on the site is robust to ensure no overflow into remainder of site or onto the external highway network. The 77 spaces is approximately one-third of the total parking.
- 2.16. The TA 4.17 states that Provision agreed in principle in 'Outline'. However Stantec now understand this was actually as part of the non-determined Reserved Matters.
- 2.17. Further clarity on linkages, and implications therein, to the other portion ('Muse') of wider site is requested. Narrative on the possible movements that are envisaged between the two 'sites' is requested.

⁴ As updated in ATA – understood to be based on Manual for Streets (MfS).

TECHNICAL NOTE

- 2.18. Refuse freighter tracking is provided, however passing other vehicles or parked cars could be more robustly assessed and demonstrated by showing other vehicles being present, noting relatively narrow widths (4.5m) throughout the site. That said it is noted that if residents and their visitors use the appropriate parking spaces, parked cars are not an issue.
- 2.19. In summary, this chapter presents a reasonable description of the proposed development and is typical of what would be expected within a TA document.

Trip Generation (Chapter 5)

- 2.20. The (vehicular) Trip Generation is noted and is reasonable. The Trip Generation rates are based on TRICs and are considered an appropriate approach. A comparison with the previously consented scheme is given. However, the formation of the scenarios is discussed in the next section.

Trip Distribution (Chapter 6)

- 2.21. This chapter is straightforward and no concerns noted

Access Arrangements (Chapter 7)

- 2.22. A single access is proposed. WSCC Guidance allows this in relation to Manual for Streets. A previous right-turn lane is proposed to be re-instated / re-lined.
- 2.23. It is noted that the access will be slightly reduced in comparison to existing/previous access.
- 2.24. Visibility splays are demonstrated.
- 2.25. Road Safety Audit is provided and in line with GG119. This RSA covers both the site access and changes (pedestrian facilities) to the North Heath Lane mini-rbt. No substantive comments are required, other than to note that a RSA does not sift through options but comments on the option presented
- 2.26. Clarity is requested on the reference in TA7.5 to emergency vehicles, namely whether the link to Phase 3 is required for robustness. It is presumed that the fire authority has been consulted independently.
- 2.27. A 'Copenhagen Crossing' was initially proposed. This was removed in the ATA. The ATA confirms that this has been removed from the proposal providing a description for the rationale. Stantec are neutral on whether Copenhagen crossings are appropriate, albeit do note that their presence is expected to become more prevalent in the future thus prioritising pedestrians.
- 2.28. In summary, this chapter presents an access arrangement which is similar to the existing layout.

Junction Capacity Modelling (Chapter 8)

- 2.29. The junctions scoped for the original application are defined (9no including level crossing) with five of these being dismissed from the updated assessment. These five junctions are four locations distal to the site (A,D,E,F), and the site access to the other portion of the site (I). The removals of these junctions from the analysis are justified and considered reasonable.
- 2.30. 2 new junctions are also included, these have been added to reflect the change of tidality from the previous application.
- 2.31. Junction G – the Level Crossing has not been explicitly referenced as being removed from the list of junctions. However, this is presumed to be a typographical error and its exclusion is due to the greater distance from the site access for this application than DC/25/0415.

TECHNICAL NOTE

- 2.32. New traffic data has been used due to time elapsed since earlier planning application.
- 2.33. Industry software has been used, and standard scenarios included for modelling purposes.
- 2.34. However, Stantec draw attention to the formation of the scenarios. It may be appropriate to include all of the site ('Muse' and 'Lovell' portions) into the with-development scenario rather than having the 'Muse' portion of the site as part of Committed Development. The approach undertaken in the TA may be underestimating highways impact.⁵ Consideration should be given to whether the alternative approach would change the conclusions reached.
- 2.35. The ATA has sought to further address this point and explain the planning situation. Stantec presume that this point will be elaborated in Members' Briefing as appropriate.
- 2.36. This point regarding the scenarios should be considered in relation to each of the individual sites discussed below.

Junction H (Wimblehurst Road Site Access)

- 2.37. No significant delays are predicted.

Junction C (Parsonage Road/Wimblehurst Road/North Heath Lane roundabout)

- 2.38. Capacity modelling of the junction has been presented within the TA and the capacity constraints noted.
- 2.39. A traffic monitoring approach for this junction has already been agreed as part of the extant permission s106 document as being an appropriate strategy for this junction. We note that the current proposal retains this principle, and we have no reason to disagree with this.
- 2.40. Such a traffic monitoring approach is reasonable in an emerging 'monitor-and-manage' paradigm promoted as per recent policy guidance. This presupposes that a junction mitigation scheme is not identified as already required, to make the site feasible in transport terms, which we assume to be the case.
- 2.41. In addition, changes to assist pedestrian priority at the junction are proposed. This priority is in the form of raised crossings. Whilst assisting pedestrian movement, this proposal should be discussed, if not already done so, with WSCC / bus providers, as bus providers may resist implementation of raised crossings.

Junction B (Wimblehurst Road/B2237/West Parade Signalised Junction)

- 2.42. Contributions, not full 'provision' are offered by the applicant to on-going plans to improve this junction. See Chapter 9 discussion.

New junction - Parsonage Road/Parsonage Way/Foundry Lane Roundabout

- 2.43. Discussion of the proximity to level crossing should be added as the modelling does not include this interaction.

New junction - Parsonage Road/Rusper Road/Crawley Road/Redkiln Way/Kings Road Roundabout

- 2.44. No additional comments other than the generic point on scenarios.

⁵ Notwithstanding no offset was applied as previously mentioned. Whether offset could be applicable is a planning / legal matter that is not discussed in this note.

TECHNICAL NOTE

2.45. In summary, the chapter has described the traffic impact. The planning nuance of the two adjoining stand-alone applications (the application referenced above, and DC/25/0415) are noted.

Off Site Highways Works and Contributions (Chapter 9)

2.46. The contributions offered by the applicant reflect the previously agreed S106 contributions are noted (Bus and Cycle improvements)

2.47. We understand that the LHA are considering upgrade of the North Parade signalised junction and have consulted on proposals for this junction. We further note that the applicant is prepared to make a contribution towards such operational upgrades to this junction.

2.48. Should the LPA / LHA be minded to require a contribution, and it is justified and necessary to do so, then a proportionate sum of money towards the cost of the upgrade would seem reasonable. A This would need to be the subject of an agreement for inclusion to a S106 agreement. In particular, an agreement on the definition of "proportionate" would need to be agreed. For example, this may relate any of the following, or indeed an alternative approach:

- The number of development vehicles passing through the junction as a percentage of total throughput.
- A comparison of modelling outputs to determine the proportionate impact of the development.
- An equivalent "nil detriment" upgrade cost.
- The number of development vehicles passing through the junction as a percentage of development traffic from all new local developments sites (in a CIL manner).

Summary and Conclusions (Chapter 10)

2.49. No additional comments required.

3. Travel Plan Review

3.1. The Travel Plan has the following chapters.

Introduction (1)

Travel Plan Policy (2)

Existing Site Conditions and Local Accessibility (3)

Proposed Development (4)

Indicative Baseline and Targets (5)

Travel Plan Strategy (6)

Implementation and Monitoring (7)

3.2. The document is fairly standard and incorporates expected sections and introduction of role of Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC). Potential measures are described.

3.3. Chapter 5 indicates an intended reduction of mode share for car from 75% to 65% over 5 years. A three interim is also stated at 70%.

TECHNICAL NOTE

- 3.4. Chapter 6 introduces simple measures.
- 3.5. Chapter 7 outlines a monitoring approach at End of Years 1,3 and 5 including a TRICs SAM Survey.
- 3.6. The car club spaces, if Phase 3 comes forward, are noted. Confirmation of plan if Phase 3 does not come forward, or is notably delayed should be clarified.
- 3.7. Additional detail on fall-back positions for more stringent measures have been provided in the updated Travel Plan. The issue of Travel Vouchers is also confirmed. Locking in Travel Plan commitments will need to be further formalised via planning conditions.

4. Stantec Conclusions

- 4.1. Neither document is seen to have significant deficiencies. That said clarity on the points raised above would be useful. The substantive points, albeit not exhaustive, are listed below.

Transport Assessment:

- Basement Parking

Please ensure all spaces are sufficient to ensure regular use.

- With-Development Scenario.

The nuance of the stand-alone planning applications is noted and should be drawn to the Members' attention.

Travel Plan:

- More stringent measures if required.