

DC/25/1269 – Land North of Guildford Road

Rudgwick Parish Council (RPC) notes the submission by Sussex Police dated 22nd January 2026 and comments as follows.

RPC has consistently argued that the development of a proposed new housing estate in Bucks Green, on the A281, requires the introduction of traffic calming measures. This arises from the background of the A281 already having high traffic volume (10,000 movements per day) with regular police intervention via mobile speed cameras (and Community Speedwatch) that, when coupled with the (at least) doubling of homes in the settlement, would create an untenable situation.

RPC therefore fully supports the Sussex Police request to secure a S106 planning obligation to provide a fixed speed camera on the A281 directed at traffic entering Bucks Green (from Guildford direction) at an appropriate location between the start of the 30mph limit and the proposed site entrance.

Sussex Police notes that using Agilysis software the V85 of traffic is in excess of 40mph, and this fully accords with data taken from the Speed Indicator Device (SID) deployed by RPC in this same area. Data from Speedwatch sessions and deployments from Sussex Police Mobile Speed Teams is also evidence of the extent of speeding in the Bucks Green hamlet and has already been supplied to HDC.

Sussex Police states “The infrastructure outlined in this request has been specifically identified by the NPT/NRT teams policing the areas of Horsham District as necessary to deal with the likely form, scale and intensity of incidents this new housing development will generate”, and “This is a difficult location for the Safety Camera Team to have a site and Community Speed Watch would be sporadic. The preferred situation would be a fixed speed camera = £40,000”.

RPC acknowledges the difficult location assertion, and may have to remove its SID there as it is proving increasingly dangerous to access the SID to refresh batteries, and even to get within Bluetooth range to download data. Also, it has had some limited effect, but as Sussex Police note, it appears to be often ignored.

RPC is therefore in full agreement of this infrastructure request and considers that it arises as a direct consequence of the siting of a new, large, housing development with vehicular access onto the busy A281 (with a priority junction) where evidence shows that a significant volume of traffic is travelling in excess of the 30mph limit.

RPC considers that the S016 infrastructure request is an appropriate site specific provision necessary to mitigate the impact of the proposed scheme and should be secured as a planning obligation.

It concurs with the view of Sussex Police that this request for Infrastructure provision clearly meets the CIL Tests (Regulation 122)

- Necessary to make the development acceptable
- Directly related to the development
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

Other Highways/Access Matters (summary).

- New Puffin Crossing of the A281 – All now appears acceptable.
- Continuous pavement (fronting the A281) from Bus Shelter to site entrance – Acceptable but pavement width needs to be increased to 2m (from a proposed 1.5m) where it skirts around the lay-by when/if adjoining (ex) Pig Farm site development plans progress.
- Lynwick Street direct access for VRU only – WSCC content to have this but no proposal yet put forward by developer to provide this.

- Removal of proposed pavement (west side) on new access road entrance and relocation of informal crossing point – RPC has made its case for this amendment in its note dated 15th January 2026 having previously submitted a diagram on 2nd January.

Red Line Boundary of Site

In its original submission of 29th September RPC challenged the red line site boundary proposed being significantly greater than that put forward in the emerging site allocation. RPC stands by all the reasons and evidence it put forward then which appear to have been further vindicated now by the stance of HDC's Landscape expert, who is maintaining an objection.

RPC also notes significant concerns expressed by the Environmental Protection Officer regarding noise levels in certain parts of the site.

To permit, without just reason, this increase in development area would appear to directly conflict with the following taken from the Shaping Development in Horsham District (SDPAN) endorsed by Cabinet as recently as 17th September 2025

5.7 It is the Council's view that the proposed site allocations are based on robust evidence, most notably site assessment work and were capable of accommodating sustainable development. For this reason, the Council will consider positively proposals on sites identified in the eLP, which accord with such evidence and are in accordance with (non-housing supply) HDPF or Neighbourhood Plan policies. Therefore, the Council would encourage applicants to have regard to site-specific matters identified in relevant eLP, including the quantum of development.

The quantum of development for this site is shown in Appendix 2 (of this same document) as 60. There appears to be no justification to expand the site given that HDC constrained it to the allocation in the HDLP (Policy HA14) based on robust evidence and site assessment work, re-confirmed by the latest objection from HDC's landscape expert.

Paragraph 5.12 of said document requires that:

- *The level of expansion is appropriate to the scale and function of the settlement the proposal relates to;* RPC considers that a 100% level of settlement expansion is at the maximum
- *The proposal demonstrates that it meets local housing needs or will assist the retention and enhancement of community facilities and services*

Indicated housing provision should incorporate bungalows – Neighbourhood Plan Policy RNP4

- *The development is contained within an existing defensible boundary and the landscape character features are maintained and enhanced*

With the expanded site the landscape impact is significant. Fully respecting HA14 (which arose from robust assessment by HDC officers) will provide the necessary future defensible boundary, and on higher ground.

RPC is unaware of any viability issues requiring site expansion to accommodate more housing units. Nor is RPC aware of any proposals to reduce the indicative 2.5 storey homes down to a more acceptable 2 storey or to provide some homes as bungalows (especially on the higher ground), thereby to accord with RNP4 and RNP8 and also to assist in ameliorating the detrimental landscape impact.

Conclusion

Despite progress in improving the Access arrangements (for both VRU and vehicles) and subject to necessary S106 terms, RPC maintains an overall Objection to this application as it cannot see any justification to expand the red line site boundary beyond that which HDC's robust (and repeated) assessments constrained it to be. The issues arising from the proposed expansion have not been addressed nor mitigated, with no substantive reason put forward by the Applicant's Agent to justify the increased site area proposed, that inherently has significant negative landscape impact.