

Planning application DM/25/0827

Dear Mr King

I wish to object to planning application DM/25/0872 on the grounds that the now proposed Toucan crossing, as opposed to the original Puffin crossing, would encourage law-breaking, Rule 64 in the Highway Code, due to local scallywags and more mature cyclists, who already use the existing footway, using an improved footway two metres in width, that directly fronts onto residential curtilages, as a cycle and e-scooter route to and from the town centre.

The issue of the required crossing was considered by the planning department for permission in connection with planning application DM/22/2272, according to Planning Law which in Mid Sussex is the current District Plan. The same Case Officer affirmed to the Planning Committee meeting on 10th August 2023 that the application had to be decided according to the existing District Plan resulting in a Puffin crossing being appropriate due to the width constraints of less than 3 metres in providing a cycle route in accordance with DfT LTN 1/20 requirements, as stated in Table 6-3.

WSCC Highways Authority have previously taken a different stance by eloquently commenting as follows.

“With the proposed crossing on B2112 Fox Hill, clarification would be sought from the applicant in terms of the type of crossing proposed. This is currently shown as a Toucan (for pedestrians and cyclists) although there is no cycle route (either existing or proposed) on the B2112. A crossing of this nature wouldn’t then ordinarily be appropriate. It’s suggested that a Puffin crossing (for pedestrians only) would be more appropriate. This should be clarified as the nature of the crossing does affect the layout required.” The case for not having a Toucan crossing at Hurst Farm has previously been successfully argued and accepted as being consistent where there is no cycle path in place. The latest plan, Drawing Number P01-a, dated September 2025 indicates the presence of a Puffin crossing.

Technical Note, September 2025
Vision-Led Approach to Development

- “2.18 Stantec has further reviewed the proposed controlled crossing location (now a proposed Toucan – see below for further details), and concluded that this is the optimum location taking into account a number of factors:
- i) to reduce the impact on the heritage asset to the north, a Grade II listed cottage located approximately 70 metres north of the site access;
 - ii) insufficient public highway land on the eastern side of Lunce’s Hill north of this point to provide a footway/cycleway;
 - iii) the proposed crossing location is on the desire line to the bus stop northbound and ties in with the Sigma Homes footway improvements, and recent Linden Homes Fox Hill footway improvements;
 - iv) the proposed crossing location would provide a safe crossing point to Public Right of Way footpath WIV/15/1, and bridleway WIV/3/1 situated immediately south of the Sigma Homes access.

“2.32 a proposed toucan crossing has been included close to the site access providing safe cycle access in and out of the site.”

Notwithstanding that a Puffin crossing would also provide a safe crossing point for dismounted cyclists and other pedestrians as mentioned in (iv) above, a Toucan crossing has previously been deemed unnecessary. The width of the shared cycle route failing to meet the requirements of LTN 1/20 conveys the wrong message to cyclists who will not dismount but continue northwards along the footway. A two-metre wide footway is a welcome improvement for pedestrians that will also facilitate those travelling north by car, an enhanced dropping off of schoolchildren and providing more room to park on solid ground away from the road and Fox and Hounds car park grass verge while doing so. Those travelling south will be limited to using the bus stop.

The consensus amongst Lewes District, Haywards Heath Town together with Wivelsfield and Ditchling Parish councils is that this application ought to be refused owing to valid concerns relating to, but not limited to, the increase in traffic volumes, lack of affordable housing, strain on overstretched existing highways infrastructure now and in the future, and doubts regarding the viability of sustainable travel that have also been expressed by local residents. There remains no provision for a safe crossing to the southbound bus stop which is yet another reason for refusal on safety grounds. Stantec appear to be hanging on to the coattails of WSP regarding other infrastructure improvements which are by no means guaranteed to be provided by Holmes England by August 2026.

In an earlier submission to both Mid Sussex and Lewes District Councils, the frequency of vehicles passing the site entrance was based upon traffic data submitted by WSP within the Environment Statement Volume 1, Chapter 13-Traffic and Transport, July 2022, where Table 13-6 is displayed.

Table 13-6 - Operational Phase Traffic Flows (Two-Way)

Link	Sensitive?	2027 Base				2027 Base + Development				% Change			
		AM	PM	AAW T	AADT	AM	PM	AAWT	AADT	AM	PM	AAW T	AAD T
A272 Rocky Lane (West of B2112)	No	1,858	1,551	16,120	16,295	2,042	1,671	17,554	17,745	10%	8%	9%	9%
B2112 Wivelsfield Road	No	1,399	1,446	13,446	13,593	1,500	1,491	14,138	14,291	7%	3%	5%	5%

Kennard Lane	No	56	57	538	544	56	57	538	544	0%	0%	0%	0%
A272 Rocky Lane (between B2112 and Hurstwood Lane)	No	1,170	1,058	10,536	10,651	1,475	1,365	13,426	13,572	26%	29%	27%	27%
A272 Rocky Lane (between Hurstwood Lane and B2272)	Yes	1,670	1,349	14,270	14,425	1,707	1,379	14,589	14,748	2%	2%	2%	2%
B2112 Fox Hill (between A272 and Hurstwood Lane)	Yes	1,019	1,082	9,930	10,038	1,549	1,487	14,352	14,508	52%	37%	45%	45%
B2112 Fox Hill (South of Hurstwood Lane)	Yes	1,278	1,344	12,393	12,528	1,349	1,373	12,864	13,004	6%	2%	4%	4%
Hurstwood Lane (Southern Section)	Yes	295	291	2,771	2,801	383	195	2,734	2,763	30%	-33%	-1%	-1%
Hurstwood Lane (Northern Section)	No	312	316	2,973	3,005	82	108	895	905	-74%	-66%	-70%	-70%
Hurstwood Lane (Link to A272)	No	403	406	3,825	3,867	171	208	1,793	1,813	-57%	-49%	-53%	-53%
B2272 Franklyn Road	No	1,236	1,308	12,026	12,157	1,245	1,317	12,112	12,244	1%	1%	1%	1%
B2272 South Road	Yes	1,114	1,355	11,670	11,797	1,148	1,381	11,956	12,087	3%	2%	2%	2%
B2112 Hazelgrove Road	Yes	1,503	1,606	14,697	14,857	1,578	1,634	15,188	15,354	5%	2%	3%	3%
B2112 Sussex Road	Yes	1,271	1,625	13,690	13,839	1,372	1,670	14,381	14,538	8%	3%	5%	5%
A272 Lewes Road	No	1,459	1,332	13,191	13,335	1,465	1,338	13,250	13,395	0%	0%	0%	0%
B2272 Lewes Road	Yes	1,432	1,516	13,936	14,087	1,463	1,540	14,196	14,350	2%	2%	2%	2%

Table 2.2

Road Link ID	Road Link Name	Speed (km.hr ⁻¹)	Daily Two Way Vehicle Flow			
			Without Development		With Development	
			Total Vehicles	HDV	Total Vehicles	HDV
1	B2112 Lunce's Hill - between Green Road and Site Access	48	14,019	1,558	14,191	1,577
2	B2112 Lunce's Hill - between Site Access and Hurstwood Lane	48	14,452	1,606	14,984	1,665
3	B2112 Fox Hill - between Hurstwood Lane and Rocky Lane	48	11,626	1,292	12,158	1,351
4	B2112 Wivelsfield Road / Sussex Road - between Rocky Lane and B2272	48	16,090	1,788	16,323	1,814
5	A272 Rocky Lane - between B2272 and B2112	96	12,130	887	12,130	887
6	A272 Rocky Lane - between B2112 and Highbank	96	20,128	1,472	20,402	1,492

Further analysis of Stantec's traffic data in Table 2.2 which remains relevant for links 1,2,4 and 6 indicates an increase in vehicle volume flow of 9.1%, 10.4%, 14.97% and 14.22% respectively due to them being unaffected by the closure of Hurstwood Lane. Such increases are due largely to a consequence of traffic generated from the Northern Arc developments which hitherto were not considered by applicants in connection with neighbouring developments. Revised traffic flow between Hurstwood Lane and Cape Road without DM/25/0827 during the AM peak hour will be 1 every 2.4 seconds and 1 every 2.36 seconds during the PM peak hour, based on Table 2.2.

Traffic flow data pertaining to Fox Hill and A272 east of B2112 need to be presented with Hurstwood Lane closed and presented to RSP in order to inform their modelling input for air quality results delivering a meaningful outcome. Speed limits should also reflect the current situation due to previous undertakings regarding an extension of the 30mph limit not being fulfilled. Questions need to be asked of WSCC Highways regarding their assessment of traffic flow.

Mid Sussex may wish to reflect upon the wisdom of selling amenity land to Homes England which the planning department, possibly under pressure, dutifully recommended for permission despite WSP stating the following in paragraphs 13.6.4 and 13.6.5.

13.6.4 “As set out in Section 6 of Appendix 13.1 the B2112 Fox Hill/Hurstwood Lane priority junction at the southern end of this link is operating with a maximum RFC of 0.40 in the Future Baseline, increasing to 0.84 with the Proposed Development in place when the effects of the FTP are considered. In line with the criteria set out in Section 3.2 of this chapter, this suggests a low level of driver stress/delay in both scenarios.”

13.6.5 “The B2112 Fox Hill / A272 Rocky Lane / Wivelsfield Road / Kennard Lane roundabout at the northern end of this link is shown to operate with a maximum RFC of 0.85 in the Future Baseline, increasing to 1.08 with the Proposed Development in place when the effects of the FTP are considered. This suggests a medium level of driver stress/delay in the Future Baseline increasing to high with the Proposed Development in place.”

There appears to be an over-reliance on the Framework Travel Plan delivering the goods. The location of at least one Puffin crossing in close proximity to the Hurstwood Lane junction will result in traffic congestion that could be continuous up as far as the roundabout at the top of Fox Hill during peak hour periods. Paragraph 13.6.4 indicates that the junction Hurstwood Lane/Fox Hill is forecast to operate in 2027 similarly to the way the Fox Hill roundabout is currently operating at now. Any further development, such as scheduled development south of Folders Lane, that involves the B2112 as a conduit involving Haywards Heath will only make matters indescribably worse.