

From: Anna Clayton <clerk@rudgwick-pc.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 October 2025 22:58:44 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>; "ian.gledhill@westsussex.gov.uk" <ian.gledhill@westsussex.gov.uk>; "Nicola.Pettifer" <Nicola.Pettifer@horsham.gov.uk>
Cc: "assistant clerk" <assistant.clerk@rudgwick-pc.gov.uk>
Subject: Land North of Guildford Road DC/25/1269 – Transport Issues
Categories: Consultations

Good Evening

Rudgwick Parish Council (RPC) contends that the core issue remains as the crossing point for pedestrians by the main site access. It is still proposed only to provide an informal crossing point at the desire line. To then claim that pedestrians will 'most likely' not use it and take a 2 x 300m = 600m detour to the controlled crossing is an outrageous assertion without any apparent merit.

It is further asserted that the majority of pedestrian movements from the site will not need to cross the A281 based on an unquantified comparison of pedestrian access of Rudgwick services v Bucks Green services. There is an irrational, subjective and unevidenced conclusion that the different metrics of pedestrian movement versus scale of service provision directly correlate, without any regard to distance. Surely distance plus need to access the particular service are the parameters driving frequency plus method of transit used.

The key point is that there is significant service provision, just across the (A281) road and for a development of 90 houses with 200 occupants (see NHS submission) this will create not insignificant pedestrian access to those services via the desire line.

Also, it can reasonably be assumed that virtually 100% of accesses from the site to the Bucks Green services will not use a vehicle. Whereas the percentage of accesses from the site to Rudgwick services (most over 1km away) not using a vehicle, will be nothing like 100%, and perhaps could be as low as 50%. This would completely undermine the logic put forward by Motion, even if (unproven) the number of accesses by any method to Rudgwick services was indeed greater than the number of accesses to Bucks Green services.

In addition, it could be argued that the most vulnerable pedestrian accesses to any service would be children crossing the A281 to get to the many sports and leisure facilities hosted at the KGV fields, which they might individually do many times a day, especially during school holidays.

RPC still agrees with WSCC that the provision of an informal crossing point to the west apparently to access The Fox is both unnecessary and potentially dangerous. This should be removed from the proposals as there is no justification for it.

Motion maintain that the provision of 2 new informal A281 crossings plus the existing controlled crossing (i.e. a total of 3) somehow dilutes the requirement for a better crossing at the site access. This is quite illogical in that The Fox crossing point (even if unjustifiably retained) would surely not be used to access the KGV Fields as it would then require the crossing of the Loxwood Road and involve a lengthy detour. Also, as previously noted, the controlled crossing

point is too far away from the desired crossing point, and so can be expected to have minimal effect on these new (additional) crossings of the A281 by VRU.

The existing controlled crossing is well placed for existing residents to minimise the number of pedestrian crossings of the A281 not using it. The location of the proposed development creates a completely new desire line for pedestrians to cross the A281, as evidenced by the proposed provision of an informal crossing near the site entrance. Given the number of new housing units proposed added (150% more than in the existing Bucks Green settlement boundary) and the significant service provision 'across the road' the number of pedestrian movements using the desire line will undoubtedly be significant.

RPC therefore remains firmly of the view that an informal crossing at the site entrance is totally inadequate. As a minimum it would suggest a substantial pedestrian refuge island with illuminated bollards. As per Active Travel England this would 'slow traffic and reduce the crossing distance'. Active Travel England also states, "Uncontrolled crossings are commonly used to assist pedestrians in crossing side roads along a main route. They feature dropped kerbs to transition between the footway and carriageway levels and incorporate tactile paving. Sometimes known as informal crossings, they may be used in lower traffic areas". The A281 in Bucks Green is certainly not a lower traffic area.

RPC maintains that pedestrian/cycle access is required from the site directly onto Lynwick Street for the reasons it has previously stated. It is ludicrous to expect VRU needing to access Lynwick Street to have to negotiate the A281/Lynwick Street junction and also cross the A281 when it could easily be avoided by provision of an access. The existing gated access could surely be modified accordingly. It is worth noting that the submitted Access and Design Statement (Page 7 - 2nd diagram - Landscape Opportunities Plan) indicates a Potential Pedestrian Connection directly onto Lynwick Street, but then it doesn't manifest itself anywhere in the final proposals. Why?

RPC does not disagree with the Vision put forward by Motion. Unfortunately, a number of the proposals put forward by Motion self-evidently contradict that Vision and are clearly ill thought through and lacking objective evidence, and often any rational logic.

RPC has only briefly examined the submitted Travel Plan. Some initial comments follow:

- Para 3.14 suggests that FP 1386 can be used to access the village centre. This is nonsense as it goes nowhere near the village centre.
- Para 3.19 states that the 'majority' of services are to the East. It fails to mention the significant sport and leisure provision to the South, across the busy A281, with the only proposed access (at the desire line) via an informal crossing
- Para 3.20 suggests that the SkatePark is nearer than the Village Hall. Again this is nonsense. Also the Scout Hut and Pre-School are in the same premises, so how can the distances be different?

In fact, nowhere in the Travel Plan is the issue about VRU needing to cross the A281 to access the extensive facilities at the KGV Fields mentioned; why not?

RPC look forward to receiving your response and comments on this matter.

Many thanks

Anna

Anna Clayton

Clerk to Rudgwick Parish Council

Telephone: 01403 822678

E-mail: clerk@rudgwick-pc.gov.uk

Clerk &/or Assistant Clerk are contactable Mon-Fri within normal office hours

In the event of an emergency please call 07927 702321.

Parish office open to the public Mon, Thu & Fri 10.00am-1.00pm

Our emails are checked before sending but we take no responsibility for inadvertent transmission of viruses. We advise that email is not secure or confidential. If you have received this message in error you are asked to destroy it and advise us please. Our emails are confidential to the intended recipient, are our property and may not be utilised, copied or transmitted to third parties. This message confirms that it is from an authorised source.