

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council FAO: Jason Hawkes
FROM:	WSCC – Highways Authority
DATE:	22 October 2025
LOCATION:	Land Parcel at 519887 133300 Rusper Road Horsham West Sussex
SUBJECT:	DC/25/1543 Construction of Primary Road from the Left-In, Left-Out junction with the A264 (constructed pursuant to Outline Planning Permission DC/16/1677) to Bush Lane (Bridleway 1585), footpaths and cycleways, foul and surface water drainage including a SUDS basin and foul pumping station, landscaping, substations and associated infrastructure.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice

Comments are made against,

- Transport Statement, dated 12th September 2025
- General Arrangement, DR-0001 S5-P4
- RMA2 – Employment Land General Arrangement Sheet 1, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1001 rev P10
- RMA2 – Employment Land General Arrangement Sheet 2, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1002 rev P11
- RMA2 – Employment Land General Arrangement Sheet 3, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1003 rev P12
- Roundabout 1 Geometry, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1004 rev P5
- Roundabout 2 Geometry, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1005 rev P5
- Long Sections Sheets 1-5, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1007, 8, 9, 10, 11, rev P3
- Visibility Splays Layout Sheets 1-2, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1015, 16 rev P3
- Visibility Splays Layout Sheet 3, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1017 rev P4
- Adoption Plan Sheets 1-2, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1018, 19, rev P2
- Adoption Plan Sheets 1-2, MOW-RMA2-PH2-1020 rev P3
- Swept Path Analysis – Western Roundabout 16.5m Articulated Vehicle, MOW-RMA2-PH2-6201 rev P3
- Swept Path Analysis – Eastern Roundabout 16.5m Articulated Vehicle, MOW-RMA2-PH2-6202 rev P3
- Swept Path Analysis 12m Bus, MOW-RMA2-PH2-6203 rev P3
- Swept Path Analysis 11.2m Refuse Vehicle, drawings MOW-RMA2-PH2-6204,5,6,7,8 rev P3
- Swept Path Analysis 9.5m Tanker, MOW-RMA2-PH2-6209 rev P3
- Swept Path Analysis – Car Park 1 Large Car, MOW-RMA2-PH2-6210 rev P2
- Swept Path Analysis – Car Park 2 Large Car, MOW-RMA2-PH2-6211 rev P2

For the purposes of this application, WSCC are commenting on the acceptability of the

proposals in terms of planning. WSCC are not seeking to approve any part of the proposal for the purposes of highway adoption.

The submitted designs have been the subject of pre-application discussions with WSCC Highways. The principles and overall layout have been agreed as part of these discussions. For the most part, the design principles in terms of carriageway and cycle/foot way widths, and overall arrangements follow those already established through previously approved (and in part) constructed highway arrangements within Phase 1. Aspects in these regards are therefore agreed.

Related to the above, the provision of a two-way cycle way segregated from the adjacent footway on the northern side of the carriageway is also consistent with that agreed within 'Bailey Road'; the cycle route will eventually form a continuous route between Phase 1 and 2 as required by the approved Movement Parameter Plan forming part of DC/16/1677 and the Site Wide Cycle Strategy approved within DC/22/0232. It's recognised that the segregated route switches to shared use at crossing points. Such an arrangement follows the broad guidance within LTN 1/20. The exact means of segregating cyclists and pedestrians should be agreed as part of the detailed design; it must be noted that segregation via lining is no longer considered appropriate. The route also includes raised tables at side road crossings to prioritise those walking and cycling.

The carriageway arrangement includes higher forms of provision at some junctions with ghosted right turning lanes and two compact roundabouts proposed. For the purposes of the current application, exact details aren't included of the various uses that will be served from these junctions or any other for that matter. Given the plot sizes and anticipated level of traffic using the proposed primary road within Phase 2, no particular capacity related issues would be anticipated. In terms of the specific design, WSCC recognise that there are elements within the design of the roundabouts that don't strictly accord with relevant design standards (namely that the compact roundabout design is slightly bigger than design standards would ordinarily suggest is allowed. The justification for this has been discussed and agreed with WSCC, and ultimately the design is considered appropriate. No safety issues have been identified concerning the roundabouts within the Stage One Road Safety Audit.

As referenced above, in accordance with current WSCC Policy, a Stage One Road Safety Audit has been undertaken of the proposed carriageway, junctions, and foot/cycle way. The Applicant should provide an editable version of the RSA Response to enable WSCC to enter comments as Overseeing Organisation as well as to include any Agreed Actions.

The proposals also include a length of foot/cycle way running along the southern boundary of the site away from the length of primary road. This route again is included on the approved Movement Parameter Plan for DC/16/1677 and is included in the Site Wide Cycle Strategy. The route connects to an approved scheme of works for the existing Riverside Walk where this runs from Bartholomew Way parallel to the southbound carriageway of the A264 before continuing under the A264 and thereafter into the development site. The proposed length of foot/cycle way will provide a means of access into the current development parcels and onto the far eastern end of bridleway way 1585 (Bush Lane). Users will also be able to access Wimland Road, and thereafter those rural lanes to the east towards Crawley.

It would be helpful to understand what the intention is for this route in terms of future maintenance; that is whether it will be offered for adoption as public highway or whether the route is to remain effectively private albeit with permissive rights of access for walking and cycling. If the route is to be adopted as highway, suitable lighting would be required in accordance with WSCC requirements. If the route is to be permissive, an appropriate legal mechanism would be required to ensure future access. This could be as part of a s106 or permissive use agreement.

As more an observation, it's noted that the red line boundary at the far eastern end of the proposed road includes part of the Pegasus crossing, the majority of which falls outside of the current application. Also part included in the current application are areas of embankment, and a culvert. It's unclear why the red line boundary wasn't drawn to fully include or exclude the crossing, culvert, and embankment. The situation presented is somewhat unusual with these features overlapping into separate applications.

In summary, WSCC Highways have no particular issue with the design of the proposed infrastructure. There are though several matters that would require a response from the Applicant.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services