Stonebond Properties (Guildford) Ltd
Stonebond House,
132-136 New London Road,
Chelmsford, Essex CM2 0RG

t: 01245 377299

9th November 2026

Dear Kate Turner,

DC/26/1569 - Millfields Farm, Rusper
Applicant Response to WSCC Highways Consultation Response Dated 23 October 2026

Introduction

This note has been prepared on behalf of Stonebond Properties in response to the consultation response submitted by Alison Meeus of West Sussex County Council Highways dated 23 October 2026 in relation to the Section 73 application seeking amendments to the approved off-site highway works.

The purpose of this response is to clarify the rationale behind the proposed highway amendments and demonstrate that the submitted scheme reflects the outcome of an extensive Section 278 design process undertaken in consultation with the relevant officers within WSCC Highway Agreements.

WSCC Consultation Response

The consultation response states:

"It would seem the extent of the TRO does not match with the actions set out in the agreed Stage 1 RSA."

The response goes on to request revised plans showing the TRO extending to Red Barn Farm together with supporting Road Safety Audit information.

Whilst we acknowledge that the possibility of extending the speed limit further east was referenced during the Stage 1 RSA process, the consultation response does not fully reflect the subsequent detailed design work, highway authority discussions and road safety auditing that has taken place.

Stonebond Properties (Guildford) Ltd
Stonebond House,
132-136 New London Road,
Chelmsford, Essex CM2 0RG

t: 01245 377299

Evolution of the Highway Design

The original Stage 1 RSA recommendation sought relocation of the 30mph speed limit to a suitable point east of the proposed site access, supported by a gateway feature.
Importantly, the Overseeing Organisation Response did not require a fixed location for the gateway feature. Instead, it stated that WSCC were "of the view" that the speed limit could be extended further east, "subject to a suitable point being found to site the signs where forward visibility can be maintained".

The qualification contained within WSCC's response is important because it recognised that any revised location would need to be demonstrated as safe and practical through the detailed design process.

Following the RSA1 process, extensive discussions took place between the Applicant's highway consultants, the Applicant team and Chris Pratt, Principal Engineer (Highway Agreements) at WSCC, as part of the Section 278 review process.

These discussions resulted in the development of the current proposals which were subsequently accepted for progression through the Section 278 process. The correspondence demonstrates that:

- WSCC Highway Area Office supported the proposed gateway approach.
- WSCC requested incorporation of the gateway feature into the S278 design.
- WSCC subsequently confirmed they were satisfied with the East Street speed limit amendment proposals.
- WSCC confirmed that the proposals could progress alongside the associated TRO process.

The current proposals therefore represent the outcome of detailed engagement with the Highway Authority's technical officers rather than a departure from an agreed highway solution.

Stonebond Properties (Guildford) Ltd
Stonebond House,
132-136 New London Road,
Chelmsford, Essex CM2 0RG

t: 01245 377299

Technical Constraints Associated with the Location Referenced by WSCC Planning

The location referenced within the consultation response was reviewed in detail during the Section 278 design process.

The Applicant's highway engineers concluded that locating the gateway feature in the area referenced within the RSA1 response would introduce a number of significant constraints and potential safety concerns.

Conifer Cottage Visibility

The location shown on Drawing 70116686-SK-001 Rev P04 would adversely affect the visibility splay available to vehicles emerging from Conifer Cottage.

Positioning the gateway feature in this location would obstruct visibility for vehicles turning right from the property and therefore create a less favourable highway arrangement than that currently proposed.

Red Fox Barn / Red Barn Cottage Constraints

The verge adjacent to Red Fox Barn and Red Barn Cottage is insufficiently wide to safely accommodate the proposed passively safe gateway feature.

The gateway installation requires approximately 1.85 metres width to accommodate the necessary foundations and supporting structure. Available verge widths are constrained and would place the gateway feature either too close to the carriageway or within visibility envelopes.

Visibility from Existing Accesses

The alternative location would also adversely affect the visibility splay available to vehicles emerging from Red Fox Barn, reducing visibility towards approaching traffic from the east.

Stonebond Properties (Guildford) Ltd
Stonebond House,
132-136 New London Road,
Chelmsford, Essex CM2 0RG

t: 01245 377299

Accordingly, the detailed design process identified a number of highway safety and engineering constraints which did not become apparent until the scheme progressed beyond the initial RSA1 stage.

Road Safety Audit Review

Following refinement of the design, a revised Stage 2 Road Safety Audit was undertaken by Shropshire Road Safety Services. The audit considered the amended highway proposals and identified only limited observations relating to signage and vegetation management.

The audit did not identify any safety concern regarding:

- The location of the gateway feature.
- The extent of the 30mph speed limit extension.
- The proposed TRO arrangements.

The accompanying Designer's Response similarly accepted the audit findings and did not identify any requirement to relocate the gateway feature or further extend the speed limit eastwards. The absence of any safety concerns within the revised audit is significant and demonstrates that the current arrangement is capable of operating safely.

Stonebond Properties (Guildford) Ltd
Stonebond House,
132-136 New London Road,
Chelmsford, Essex CM2 0RG

t: 01245 377299

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully considers that the consultation response has not taken full account of the detailed design evolution that has occurred through the Section 278 process.

Whilst the possibility of extending the speed limit further east was identified at RSA1 stage, this was always subject to a suitable location being identified. Subsequent engineering assessment demonstrated that the location referenced within the consultation response is constrained by visibility requirements, access arrangements and available highway land.

The current proposals have been developed through detailed consultation with WSCC Highway Agreements and reflect the outcome of detailed engineering assessment. They also have been independently reviewed through a revised Stage 2 Road Safety Audit and have not generated any road safety concerns relating to the gateway feature location or speed limit extent.

For these reasons, Stonebond respectfully requests that the Local Planning Authority gives significant weight to the detailed technical work undertaken since the original RSA1 process and accepts the proposed amendments submitted under application DC/26/1569.

Yours sincerely,

William Forster

William Forster
Planning Manager, Stonebond