

**From:** Ian Gledhill <ian.gledhill@westsussex.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 23 April 2025 11:55:10 UTC+01:00  
**To:** "Mark Stead" <mark.stead@i-transport.co.uk>  
**Cc:** "Lucy Jardine" <lucy.jardine@i-transport.co.uk>; "Judith Ashton" <Judith@judithashton.co.uk> (Judith@judithashton.co.uk)" <judith@judithashton.co.uk>; "Steven King" <Steven.King@midsussex.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: DM/25/0014, DM/25/0015, DM/25/0016 & DM/25/0017 - Land West of Turners Hill Road Crawley Down, West Sussex  
**Attachments:** TAN VRCD140425-001.docx

Mark, I returned from leave yesterday. I have now reviewed the additional information and will provide a full formal response to MSDC when I can; I would hope this to be at some point early next week. With regards to the information you have provided, with the exception of the proposed footway widening/shared use route between the proposed Toucan crossing and Sunny Avenue alongside the B2028, which I will cover separately below, I have no further comments.

As noted in my formal comments dated 8<sup>th</sup> April 2025, further advice was awaited from the WSCC Traffic Signals team. They have now provided their comments on the proposed Toucan crossing at Huntsland and the Toucan crossing at Vicarage Road. I have paraphrased the Signals team comments regarding the Huntsland crossing and they have provided separate additional comments against yours for Vicarage Road.

#### Huntsland Road Crossing

With regards the changes outlined on the provided drawing, the Traffic Signals team have highlighted that more work is required to upgrade this site. Firstly the crossing width will need to be increased; WSCC's standard width for a Toucan is 4.0m; the current Puffin arrangement is 2.8m. An extra pole will be required, and all poles will need to be moved further away from the kerb face to meet the 800mm clearance to centre of pole requirement. Additionally due to the change in nature of this crossing, a new public consultation will need to be undertaken.

The Traffic Signals team have also questioned the merit and benefit of upgrading this crossing given the additional works needed to the crossing itself and the short lengths of shared use that it will then tie into on the east side of the B2028. In these respects, I am mindful of the works proposed and that these will benefit primarily only the 50 units forming the more northerly of the southern parcels. For cyclists, this parcel otherwise ties into the southern parcel and thereafter the Worth Way. On this basis, it's then whether there is in practice any need for the Toucan crossing and the lengths of shared use leading up to (this includes those works within the development itself); it would not be desirable to lead cyclists onto the B2028 for reasons already stated. Should those cycle related elements be removed, the signalised crossing near to Huntsland would remain as is along with there being footway widening on the east side of the B2028 as previously highlighted by WSCC and covered in your recent note.

### Vicarage Road Crossing

A crossing should be located a minimum of 20m from a conflict point with a side road. Can the separation be clarified. The crossing is 14m south of the centre line of the next junction to the north. There is no minimum clearance distance between a crossing and a junction – the relevant design standard – Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 6 – recommends that there is sufficient space for at least one waiting vehicle. It also advocates striking a balance between giving drivers time to move away from a junction and brake and minimising deviations from pedestrian desire lines (ref: para 15.12.1 and 3). A 14m gap is more than sufficient for a typical car (usually no more than 5m long) to wait at the stop line. The separation available also minimises deviation from pedestrians' or cyclists' desire lines. The crossing cannot be located further south because the carriageway and footway is constrained by the width of the bridge. Root protection areas prevent the siting of a footway (and therefore crossing) on the northern side of the junction. The crossing is around 4m from where the existing uncontrolled crossing is located and is a significant improvement on it. There is no scope to relocate further from the junction. 14/04/25 – All points raised in response are logical, and since WSCC's initial comments, a move towards a site by site basis has been determined. As previously requested, please provide speed data to help justify the distance between the crossing & conflict point.

There is a comment on the drawing stating the width behind a signal pole of 0.79m. This distance is substandard; the absolute minimum required is 1.2m, however our preferred minimum is 1.5m to enable wheelchairs/pushchairs to safely pass. This is no longer applicable. The latest access drawing shows a 2m clearance behind the pole. The hardstanding will be widened using highway verge behind the existing footway. 2m exceeds these minima and is an acceptable shared cycle route width (ref: LTN1/20 Table 7-2). 14/04/25 – Please annotate distances for all poles on the drawing; pole positioning seems to be set for a Puffin crossing, and not a Toucan, which should be 800mm from kerb face to centre of pole. Annotation on the drawing should clarify available space.

There are a large number of established trees which have the potential to impact approaching driver & waiting pedestrian visibility. A green man is only an invitation to begin crossing, and pedestrians should be able to see the approaches clearly; anyone crossing from West to East may have challenges observing Southbound traffic flow. Whilst DMRB/TSM Ch.6 includes no requirement for visibility to/from waiting pedestrians at signal-controlled crossings – the key test is driver visibility to signal heads – visibility splays between a pedestrian waiting to cross on the western side of the road and oncoming vehicles can be achieved to the stated stopping sight distance (ref: Appendix F). The sightline towards a pedestrian on the western side passes very slightly under the canopy of a tree. However, in order to secure visibility between vehicles and pedestrians, the sight line must be retained at a height of under 2m. The canopy does not extend this low, although it will need to be maintained to secure continued visibility. Again, it is important to note the proposed signal-controlled crossing is a significant improvement on the existing crossing arrangement at this location, benefiting not only residents of the proposed

development but existing users of Worth Way and the wider Crawley Down community. 14/04/25 – Please provide a copy of Appendix F for future referencing. Visibility to be checked during site commissioning & adjustments to vegetation made if required.

Every signalised crossing, requires street lighting, and there does not appear to be suitable locations to install lighting columns. This would need to be checked with the authorities PFI provider, to ensure the proposed crossing can be suitably lit. There is street lighting at the junction with Grange Road and on Vicarage Road. The crossing does not appear to be any more remote from lighting than the signal-controlled crossing by Huntsland. The level of lighting of the column is acceptable and the puffin crossing to the north, which is similarly sited in relation to lighting columns, sets a local precedent. 14/04/25 – Prior to full design acceptance being granted, confirmation will be required by WSCC's PFI Provider that the current lighting is suitable for the installation of a signalised crossing. If the current provision is deemed to not be suitable, then a copy of the required street lighting design, along with details relating to installation will be required for future reference.

It is important to identify the proposed location for the signals controller and location for a maintenance bay. A maintenance bay is identified adjacent to the proposed access road. The controller box can be provided immediately south of the signals and is indicatively shown on drawing **ITB9155-GA-069A**. The matter can be confirmed at the detailed design stage. 14/04/25 – Point closed; locations identified seem most suitable given the constraints of the location.

We require a copy of the speed survey results for our records, and also to provide justification for the method of control which will be proposed should this scheme reach detailed design and construction. 14/04/25 – Point not responded to'.

With the last point, I appreciate that the speed survey information was previously provided to me and that WSCC hold this data.

Kind regards

Ian Gledhill

[Ian Gledhill](#) BSc MCIHT | Principal Planner – County Highways (Development Management) - Planning Services, [West Sussex County Council](#) | Location: Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH  
Internal: 25717 | External: 0330 222 5717  
E-mail: [ian.gledhill@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:ian.gledhill@westsussex.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Mark Stead <mark.stead@i-transport.co.uk>

**Sent:** 22 April 2025 13:49

**To:** Ian Gledhill <ian.gledhill@westsussex.gov.uk>

**Cc:** Lucy Jardine <lucy.jardine@i-transport.co.uk>; 'Judith Ashton <Judith@judithashton.co.uk> (Judith@judithashton.co.uk)' <judith@judithashton.co.uk>; Steven.King@midsussex.gov.uk  
**Subject:** DM/25/0014, DM/25/0015, DM/25/0016 & DM/25/0017 - Land West of Turners Hill Road Crawley Down, West Sussex

**\*\*EXTERNAL\*\***

Ian,

I hope you had a good break.

I don't suppose you've had the time to review the contents of Judith's email to Steven King of 14 April –hopefully it gives you everything you need but do get in touch if you need anything else.

Related to Crawley Down, NH are considering conditioning a requirement that development at Turners Hill Road does not come forward until the mitigation at M23 J10 is complete. We have until 25 April 2025 to respond to them.

Their position would effectively make us beholden to St Modwens, which is not something we can accept. Furthermore, we are surprised NH are seeking this condition because the St Modwens scheme seems well advanced:

- the mitigation is supposed to be delivered before 375 homes are occupied (*ref: DM/19/5081, which agreed a variation of condition 32 of 13/04127/OUTES*).
- as of 1 April 2023, 257 homes had been occupied under applications DM/21/044 and DM/18/4321 (*ref: appendix 2 of HLS Position report of October 2023 - attached*).

I'm not certain whether the 375 threshold has been reached since then, but it seems likely.

We are therefore looking to clarify the progress of the mitigation scheme and would be grateful if you or your colleagues can clarify. Has notice been served on the highway authority to undertake the works? Has technical approval been granted?

I'd be grateful for any further information you can provide in advance of NH's deadline (sorry it's short notice) to give greater clarity on expected delivery.

Kind regards

Mark

**Mark Stead**  
Associate Partner

for i-Transport LLP



E: [mark.stead@i-transport.co.uk](mailto:mark.stead@i-transport.co.uk)

W: [www.i-transport.co.uk](http://www.i-transport.co.uk)

**Solent Office:** Building 1000, Lakeside North Harbour, Western Road, Portsmouth, PO6 3EZ  
T: 03316 300366 M: 07841 446726



---

i-Transport is the trading name of i-Transport LLP, which is a limited liability partnership registered in England under number OC311185. Registered Office: 264 Banbury Road, Summertown, Oxford OX2 7DY. A list of members is available upon request.

We use the word "partner" to refer to a member of i-Transport LLP or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications.

Please note that the information in this e-mail is confidential and unless you are (or authorised to receive it for) the intended recipient, you must not disclose, copy, circulate or in any way use the information it contains. If you have received this e-mail in error please inform us and immediately delete all copies from your system. Whilst it is believed that this e-mail and any attachments are free of any virus or other defect, it is your responsibility to ensure that your computer or IT system are not affected and we accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising.

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

---

#### LEGAL DISCLAIMER

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.

---