

Fairbridge Way Improvements Designer's Response

Road Safety Audit Stage 1/2

West Sussex County Council

Project number: 60610807
60610807-ACM-CS-FBW-RP-HW-0001

June 2026

Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
Nana Offe	Nathan Mitchell	Nathan Mitchell	Melissa Robertshaw
Principal Engineer	Regional Director	Regional Director	Director

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
P01	11/06/2026	First Issue	MR	Melissa Robertshaw	PM

Prepared for:

West Sussex County Council

Prepared by:

AECOM Limited
Marlborough Court
10 Bricket Road
St Albans
AL1 3JX
United Kingdom

T: +44-1727-53-5000
aecom.com

© 2026 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1.	Project Details.....	5
2.	Introduction	6
3.	Key Personnel.....	6
4.	Road safety audit decision log.....	7
5.	Design organisation and Overseeing Organisation statements	9

1. Project Details

1.1 Project details and authorisation

Project: 60610807- Brookleigh (Northern Arc), Burgess Hill development
Report Title: Fairbridge Way Improvements RSA1/2 Designer's Response
Date: 11 th June 2026
Document Reference & Rev: 60610807-ACM-CS-FBW-RP-HW-0001
Produced by: AECOM
On behalf of: West Sussex County Council (WSCC)
Prepared by:
Name: Nana Yaw Offe
Position: Principal Engineer
Signed:
Organisation: AECOM
Date: 11 th June 2026
Approved by:
Name: Nathan Mitchell
Position: Regional Director
Signed:
Organisation: AECOM
Date: 11 th June 2026

2. Introduction

2.1 Introduction

Scheme Details: Fairbridge Way Pedestrian and Cycle Improvements

Stage of RSA: Combined Stage 1 and 2

RSA Details: RSA Report Ref. 60610807-ACM-HGN-FAIR-RP-SA-0001, Dated 8th June 2026

3. Key Personnel

3.1 Key personnel

Overseeing Organisation: West Sussex County Council

RSA Team: Mark Watson
BA (Hons) MCIHT MSoRSA CoC
Road Safety Audit Team Leader
AECOM Limited

Chris Burlton
BA (Hons) MCIHT MSoRSA
Road Safety Audit Team Member
AECOM Limited

Design organisation: AECOM

4. Road safety audit decision log

This section includes a Road Safety Audit Response (as recorded within the Road Safety Audit Decision Log) which has been completed following the issuing of the Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit Report (Ref: 60610807-ACM-HGN-FAIR-RP-SA-0001). Details relating to the preparation of this Road Safety Audit Response have been included below. Signed statements by the Design Organisation (DO) and Overseeing Organisation (OO) are included in Appendix D.

Report title: 60610807- Brookleigh (Northern Arc), Fairbridge Way Improvements	Date: 11 th June 2026
Prepared by: Nana Yaw Offe	Position: Principal Engineer
Design Organisation: AECOM	On behalf of: West Sussex County Council

4.1 Road safety audit decision log

Ref.	RSA Problem Summary	RSA Recommendation	DO Response	OO Response	Agreed RSA Action
A1	No details of onward connections provided, and short section of proposed cycle/ footway contains a pinch-point. Crossing users may become stranded and use inappropriate onward routes such as within the live carriageway where they could be struck by passing road users, or the pinch-point may result in collisions between cyclists and other cycle/ footway users.	It is recommended that suitable onward cycle/ footway provision, with suitable tie-ins, widths and alignments to address the concerns set out above, is provided in the final associated design.	Accepted. Onward footway/cycleway provision to be provided by others as part of proposed development under separate S278 agreement. Extent of surfacing proposed to the north of the crossing within existing highway boundary is to provide tie in flexibility.		
B1	Roundabout central island and proposed crossing position/ layout may restrict visibility to the crossing for road users entering the roundabout from Cuckfield Road, resulting in vehicle collisions with crossing users and/ or rear end shunt type collisions on the circulatory carriageway	It is recommended that the crossing location and/ or layout is revised. Potential options include providing a splitter/ refuge island halfway across the crossing or relocating the crossing further east on Fairbridge Way. Given the visibility concerns raised it is advised that additional pedestrian/ cycle warning signage is provided on the approaches to the crossing in any case. See also Problem/ Recommendation C1.	Partially accepted. The crossing has been sited taking into consideration DMRB visibility requirements (CD116 Section 3.59) and third-party land constraints. Based on the size of the roundabout, at the give way line on all approaches, DMRB requires the design of the existing roundabout to provide road users visibility of the whole circulatory. This existing provision should in turn facilitate intervisibility to the crossing at the give way line as it is sited within 20 metres of the give way line on Fairbridge Way. Regardless, recommendation for additional signage on Cuckfield Road is accepted. Signage to be agreed with WSCC through the S278 Agreement process for inclusion in construction drawings at the delivery stage.		
B2	Restricted intervisibility between the northern part of the proposed crossing (including waiting area) and road users approaching roundabout from Isaac's Lane may result in vehicle collisions with crossing users and/ or rear end shunt type collisions on the circulatory carriageway.	It is recommended that sufficient intervisibility is provided between road users on Isaac's Lane and users of the proposed crossing (including the northern waiting area). This could be achieved by reducing vehicle speeds on the Isaac's Lane approach to the roundabout, or by providing a greater level of intervisibility by removing additional vegetation or relocating the crossing.	Partially accepted. 40m intervisibility is the minimum requirement set out in traffic signs manual chapter 6 table 15.1 for 30mph 85th percentile speed which the proposals provide. With regards to the existing tree, DMRB CD109 Section 3.4 permits isolated slim objects less than or equal to 550mm as they only result in intermittent obstructions to sight lines. Retention or removal of the existing tree to be agreed with the highway authority through the S278 process for inclusion in construction drawings at the delivery stage.		
C1	Excessive crossing length exposes crossing users to the risk of being struck by passing road users, particularly those exiting the roundabout.	It is recommended that the crossing layout is revised to shorten the length over which users have to cross in a single movement. Potential options include providing a splitter/ refuge island halfway across the crossing or relocating the crossing further east on Fairbridge Way where the carriageway is narrower. As stated in Problem/ Recommendation B1 it is advised that additional signage warning of the crossing is provided on the approaches.	Rejected. Maximum length of crossing between the channels (i.e. carriageway width) is 9.94m hence crossing length is considered acceptable. West bound vehicle manoeuvrability also requires use of area where a splitter island is suggested. The anticipated vehicle swept path for the occasional large commercial recovery vehicles traveling to and from the center on Fairbridge Way would clash with the alternate proposal.		

Ref.	RSA Problem Summary	RSA Recommendation	DO Response	OO Response	Agreed RSA Action
C2	Crossing carpet may become slippery during wet or icy conditions, resulting in potential slips/ falls and subsequent personal injury or conflicts between road users and crossing users.	It is recommended that the proposed surfacing/ layout of the crossing carpet is reviewed and revised as necessary so that the crossing able to drain adequately and so any slip hazard is minimised, during wet or icy conditions.	Rejected. Adequate fall has been provided in the design to aid drainage of the 'crossing carpet' with a minimum longitudinal gradient of 2% provided, draining from west to east across the table top plateau.		

5. Design organisation and Overseeing Organisation statements

5.1 Design organisation statement

On behalf of the Design Organisation (DO), I certify that:

- 1) the RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation.

Name:

Signed:

Position:

Organisation:

Date:

5.2 Overseeing Organisation statement

On behalf of the Overseeing Organisation (OO), I certify that:

- 1) the RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation.
- 2) the agreed RSA actions will be progressed.

Name:

Signed:

Position:

Organisation:

Date:
