

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council FAO: Shazia Penne
FROM:	Highways, WSCC
DATE:	16/04/2026
LOCATION:	Cotlands Paddock, Horsham Road, Cowfold, RH13 8AH
SUBJECT:	DC/25/2079 Use of land for the stationing of 4no. static caravans for (Gypsy and Traveller) residential purposes and associated day rooms.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	12/02/2026
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice

This application has been dealt with in accordance with the Development Control Scheme protocol for small scale proposals.

WSCC in its role as Local Highway Authority (LHA) has been reconsulted by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) following the applicant's submission of amended plans. For context, the LHA previously provided comment on this application, dated 16/02/2026, raising no highway safety or capacity concerns.

From inspection of the amended plans, the proposed changes appear minor and would not warrant further comment from a highway safety point of view. The LPA are advised to refer to the LHAs previous consultation response, dated 16/02/2026, as the comments contained within can be applied for the current set of plans.

Given the number of written representations for this application, I thought it be best to clarify some points in regards to the LHA's assessment for this application. WSCC officers undertook a site visit on the morning of 12/02/2026 to assess the typical highway/traffic conditions as well as the existing vehicle access point. As stated previously, the LHA is of the view that there are no significant visibility concerns with the existing access point. I would add to this that there is vegetation either side of the access point (within the maintained highway boundary) that can be cut back to ensure suitable visibility levels are achievable in both directions.

Whilst I appreciate some representations highlight this to be an issue, I will stress the added weight to the use of an existing vehicle access point for these proposals. Historic Streetview mapping suggests that this vehicle access has been in use for several years, with Streetview imagery suggesting it has been in operation since at least 2009. The access has served an existing agricultural use, which has the potential to generate significant vehicle movements. Furthermore, such a use has the potential to utilise vehicles associated with agriculture, such as a tractor with trailer, without the need for planning permission. The proposed residential use is not anticipated to result in a significant material increase in movements to or from the site.

Following on from the above points, I have also checked five-year collision data, which shows no recorded collisions within the vicinity of the existing access point. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest the existing vehicle access has been operating unsafely during this time, or that the proposals would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

I have also seen some requests for a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) to be undertaken. WSCC's policy for RSAs dictate that an RSA should be required if:

- A development of 20 or more residential units is proposed
- An intensification of the existing vehicle access that would generate 100 or more two-way vehicle movements per day
- If off-site highway works are proposed

The proposed development is a relatively small one, only seeking 4 residential units. A development of this scale would not be anticipated to generate the 100 two-way vehicle movements stipulated by the policy. In addition, no off-site highway works are proposed – the existing vehicle access arrangement will be retained. Taking this into consideration, it would be unreasonable to request a Stage 1 RSA for a development of this scale.

Based on the above points, as well as comments provided previously, and observations made on-site, it would be very difficult for the LHA to justify an objection on highway safety grounds. The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Kyran Schneider
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services