

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Mid Sussex District Council FAO: Steven King
FROM:	WSCC – Highways Authority
DATE:	11 February 2026
LOCATION:	Land South And West Of Upper Imberhorne School Imberhorne Lane East Grinstead West Sussex
SUBJECT:	DM/26/0131 Approval of Reserved Matters following Outline Planning Permission (Ref. DM/23/2699) relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 550no. new residential units.
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice

1. Comments are made against,
 - Highways Conformity Technical Note, reference 2206781_C-XX-00-RP-C-0101A, dated January 2026
 - Landscape General Arrangement, drawing number GLS_080_127_1300 revision B
 - Planning Layout Sheet 2, drawing number CB_96_282_00_1 revision D
 - Planning Layout Sheet 2, drawing number CB_96_282_00_2 revision D
 - Planning Layout Sheet 2, drawing number CB_96_282_00_3 revision D
2. There are a large number of drawings provided, that largely show the same or very similar things, notably the General Arrangements, Planning Layouts, Hard Landscaping, as well as those within the appendices of the Highways Conformity Technical Note. For the purposes of these comments, only the above drawings have been reviewed. The Applicant should review drawings in terms of consistency.
3. It should be noted that WSCC Highways have reviewed the submitted drawings for the purposes of acceptability from a planning perspective. In doing, so the drawings have been reviewed against appropriate design guidance. Whilst WSCC note the intention for the majority of roads to be offered for adoption, WSCC is not seeking to approve any aspect of the proposals for highway adoption purposes as part of the current RM planning application. Highway adoption would be a matter for any future application for the adoption of carriageways, foot/cycle ways, and other ancillary areas under Section 38 of the Highways Act.
4. As the Principal Road is to provide access to a school, in accordance with the current WSCC Road Safety Audit Policy, a Stage One Road Safety Audit would be required. The Audit needs to cover only the Principal and Secondary roads relevant to access the school site; the Audit does not need to cover the entire site.

5. As more specific comments,
6. There are no apparent issues with the carriageway widths proposed within the development given the varying hierarchies of routes. There are various areas of shared surface with all users sharing the same area. The principle and location of these are considered appropriate. Where there are shared surfaces, margins are allowed for within the design as required by WSCC for adoption.
7. The layout includes a shared use foot/cycle way along the Principal Route. Given the anticipated level of use, shared use rather than a fully segregated is considered suitable. There is the anticipation that the majority of confident users will cycle on-carriageway in any case. Whilst the shared foot/cycle way is referred to, there doesn't appear to be any plan that clearly identifies the shared use cycle route along the Principal Route. It would be useful for this to be clearly indicated on the Planning Layout. This comment is more to ensure the route is designed as a shared surface as part of the detailed design/adoption process.
8. Whilst there are no issues with the widths along the Principle Route, this is indicated to be 6 metres wide with 2 metre wide verges and 3 metre foot/cycle ways on both sides. This results in a visually wide corridor. Given the gentle carriageway alignment, good forward visibility, and overall length, there is a concern as to how this will influence vehicle speeds. WSCC consider that the design will need to incorporate additional measures (e.g. raised tables and changes in surfacing) to calm vehicle speeds. This is especially so around the 'mixed use' and 'primary school' areas.
9. With further reference to the Principal Route and the foot/cycle ways along it, the Planning Layout indicates a continuation of the foot/cycle way surfacing across the junctions, as indicated in the snip below. From this, it's unclear whether priority is intended for those crossing over vehicular traffic. It's also unclear whether these are intended to be raised crossings. It would be useful to have a section or detail showing what exactly is intended at junctions on the Principal Route.



10. Again, relating to the Principal Route, it's appreciated that neither the 'mixed use' or 'primary school' areas form part of the current application. However, the roads, foot and cycle ways are within the current proposals, and as such these must be designed with these two areas in mind. With the primary school in particular, consideration will be required as to how parking associated with the school will be managed. Whilst WSCC would not wish to see 'School – Keep Clear' type markings included within the current application (these can form part of any details proposals with the school), the proposals should still include no waiting at any time restrictions for junctions in the immediate vicinity. Installing enforceable parking controls at an early stage and ahead of dwellings and the school being occupied would be more straightforward than to wait for issues at a later stage.
1. It's not clear what connectivity is proposed to the care community. Again, its accepted that this lies beyond the red edge but foot/cycle links to this will seemingly form part of the current application. It's not unreasonable to expect some foot/cycle trips from the care community northwards to the proposed mixed use area or to continue through the development northwards.
2. As an overarching comment, there are no general issues with the proposed level of parking with these complying with the WSCC Parking Guidance. With more detailed matters, there are no visitor parking spaces along the Principal Route. The route is though of adequate width to accommodate on-street parking, which would be no different from any other residential area. As already suggested, the Applicant may still wish to consider no waiting at any-time restrictions to control how and where parking can take place.
3. There appear to be a number of locations where over-run areas are intended for larger vehicles (e.g. adjacent to plots 246, 250, and 388). The material/construction of these isn't indicated on the submitted Planning Layout drawings. This aside, these are considered unnecessary. Where widening is needed, this should be constructed from the material used for the nearby carriageway. This is especially so in shared use areas.
4. There are several tertiary streets on the edges of the development that join the secondary roads via bellmouths. Given the very low number of dwellings served from the tertiary streets, the junctions with the secondary streets could be constructed as crossovers rather than bellmouths. This would then provide a continuous footway and prioritise pedestrian movements. There are several bellmouths along the Principal Route that could also be constructed as crossovers.
5. There seems no reason why the permeability between tertiary/private drives on the periphery of the site couldn't be improved through the provision of footpath connections between these. It's appreciated that a footpath runs around the perimeter of the site. Access to this isn't particularly convenient compared with the very short distances between the ends of the private drives. The justification for such improvements would be with respects to access for servicing as set out within paragraph 117d of the National Planning Policy Framework and paragraph 88 of the National Design Guide.

6. Bridleway 44bEG runs outside the red edge along the southern edge of the development. The bridleway will permit access for those on foot, cycle, and equestrians (which is less relevant for the development). The Planning Layout drawings indicate that only pedestrian links are intended onto the bridleway. Connections onto the bridleway should be such that these permit pedestrians and cyclists. There seems no reason why the perimeter route could not in its entirety accommodate cyclists albeit the surfacing would be in a self-binding gravel.
7. Has tracking been undertaken to ensure the proposed junction leading to the approved area of car parking associated with the school to the north is adequate to accommodate a bus/coach? This is highlighted as the car parking area includes two oversized spaces.
8. The 'Adoption Extents and Services Overview Plan' within the Highways Conformity TN indicates pedestrian dropped crossing points only along the Principal Route. Pedestrian dropped crossing points will be required throughout the development and not only on the Principal Route. This is a matter that will be reviewed as part of any highways adoption application.
9. Again, with reference to the above plan, the extents of adoption are taken as indicative at this stage. The extents indicated only include carriageways. The extents exclude foot and cycleways, as well as visitor parking bays. Some of the adoptable service margins also extend into what are understood to be private roads.
10. Plans are provided showing the location of cycle parking. Details would still be required by condition showing the stores themselves.
11. As a general comment, through the detailed design, the Applicant will need to consider the provision of dropped crossing points at appropriate locations and where desire lines exist for pedestrians trying to cross. These will need to be provided with tactile paving as will all crossings at junctions.
12. Overall and in conclusion, there are no significant concerns with the details presented. There are nevertheless various issues as identified above where additional information or amended details would be sought.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services