

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council FAO: Jacques Burrowes
FROM:	WSCC – Highways Authority
DATE:	11 March 2026
LOCATION:	Land at 520564 133496 Brook Lane Faygate West Sussex
SUBJECT:	DC/26/0079 Erection of 2no. 4 bed dwellings with associated parking and landscaping.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application and would provide the following comments.

Summary

The proposal is for the erection of two residential dwellings on land at Faygate. The site is located at Brook Lane, a privately maintained road; consequently, these comments should be considered as advice only.

Brook Lane serves an existing property, Clyst Hayes and appears to provide field access to land parcels adjacent to the site. It has been stated within historic documentation that a Class E use may have operated from Clyst House- however the detail of this is unclear at this time.

Access

The applicant proposes to utilise the existing vehicular access onto Brook Lane to serve the two dwellings, with alterations to the internal site access route to run parallel along the southern property boundary. The vehicular access to the publicly maintained highway is located to the south at the junction to Crawley Road, the A264.

Brook Lane is maintained as a PROW, Bridleway: COL/1589/1, this allows pedestrian traffic to travel from this portion of Brook Lane to the north over the nearby railway line to the northern side of Brook Lane. This northern section of Brook Lane adjoins the Publicly Maintained Highway at the junction with Wimland Road.

Parking

Regarding parking, each dwelling will be provided with a driveway with provision for three cars, totalling six spaces. From consulting the WSCC Parking Demand Calculator, the LHA considers the proposed parking provision to be sufficient. Space is available within each property frontage to perform a turn on site. This facilitates egress from the site and subsequently onto the Publicly Maintained Highway, in a forward gear. To perform this turn may require a multiple point manoeuvre within each property frontage, it would however not be considered an unsafe practise.

Secure and covered cycle parking has been assigned to each dwelling and appears in line with WSCC standards for dwellings of this size.

Servicing

Refuse collection is proposed from the access to Brook Lane and should not impact upon the A264. This is an existing practise for residents of Clyst Hayes. The Highway Authority does recommend however that the applicant discuss these proposals with the relevant waste and recycling disposal authorities to ensure that this is an agreeable practise.

Further to the above, it is advised that Manual for Streets (MfS) does state in paragraph 6.8.9 that building regulations indicate, residents should not have to travel over 30m to put bins out and collection operatives should not have to travel in excess of 25m to

collect/deposit bins. This is however a matter of amenity for the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to consider.

Should it be deemed necessary to collect refuse and recycling internally of the site, sufficient space should be demonstrated by means of swept path analysis, showing that collection vehicles have the ability to turn and safely egress onto the Publicly Maintained Highway in a forward gear.

Sustainability

Although cycle parking is to be provided, The LHA anticipate that cycling may not appeal to all road users in this location due to the context of the adjoining routes- therefore there would be anticipated a reliance on the use of a car for a number of journeys. Bus services do not operate within proximity of the property but are present within the built-up area of Faygate. Rail services are also present in Faygate and may offer a solution to longer journeys further afield.

Conclusion

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.

Should planning consent be granted, conditions securing Parking and Cycle Parking should be sealed alongside it.

Jodie Wilkes

West Sussex County Council – Planning Services

