West Sussex County Council - Planning Consultation Response

To: Horsham District Council

Date: 29 October 2026

FAO: Matthew Porter

From: WSCC - Highways Authority

LPA Reference: DC/26/0366

Location: Land North West of Southwater

Proposal: Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for primary access to the highway) for a phased development comprising: the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of residential dwellings (including affordable housing) (Use Classes C2 and C3); a mixed-use neighbourhood centre (Use Classes E and F); education facilities (Use Class F1(a)); business and employment floorspace (Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g)); redevelopment of existing agricultural buildings including construction of a building for community use (Use Classes E and F2); improvements to public rights of way; sports pitches; gypsy and traveller pitches/plots; public open space; landscaping, and associated infrastructure.

Additional information and amended plans

have been received for this proposal on 6th August 2026.

More information received on 13th October 2026.

Date of Site Visit: N/A

Recommendation: Advice

Comments are made against the WSP Technical Note 5 – Response to ATE and WSCC Comments, dated 9th October 2026.

WSCC Highways have previously issued formal comments concerning the proposals along with providing recommended conditions and wording for s106 obligations.

For the most part, the latest Technical Note deals with matters raised by Active Travel England. WSCC Highways have separately provided formal comments and agreed matters in relation to the various schemes of improvements set out in TN5.

The only outstanding matter is that relating to the A24 Hop Oast Roundabout. WSCC have previously accepted that on traffic grounds, the development is not generating such demands to justify the full signalisation of this roundabout. As such, a proportionate contribution towards any signalisation scheme would be justified.

WSCC have advised that in considering the proportionate contribution, the potential increase in walking and cycling trips resulting from the development needs also to be factored in. This is considered relevant given the destinations being created within the development that will generate walking and cycling trips.

TN5 provides an assessment of potential walking and cycling trips. These are effectively broken down into trips generated by the development (i.e. from future residents within the development) and trips to the proposed development (i.e. from residents living beyond the development). The approach adopted in the TN implies that only those trips generated by the development would be factored into any contribution. WSCC doesn't agree with this approach. Given the development is directly providing or facilitating land for other uses that wouldn't otherwise be provided, it seems appropriate to factor all trips into the calculations.

The above aside, TN5 doesn't otherwise identify the value of the contribution being offered. It would be helpful if the Applicant could provide an indicative cost against the scheme design presented and agreed as part of this application. The costs should reflect the early stage of the design with a suitable cost optimism bias included.

WSCC recognise and accept in-principle a proportionate contribution to the signalisation of the A24 Hop Oast Roundabout, albeit direct delivery of the scheme by the Applicant remains the preference. If a contribution is to be made instead, this should still be of a significant value; the concern remains otherwise of how the remainder of any funding will be secured and therefore placing doubts over the ability for these works to be delivered that will ultimately benefit future residents.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services (Highways)