

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 August 2025 14:33:07 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Consultee Comments for Planning Application DM/24/2922

Consultee comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

A consultee has commented on a Planning Application. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 12/08/2025 2:33 PM from Clerk on behalf of Parish Consultation.

Application Summary

Reference:	DM/24/2922
Address:	Hollyrood House Ardingly Road Lindfield Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 2RA
Proposal:	Removal of outbuildings and alterations to the existing buildings and hardsurfaces to allow for a change of use from Class C2 (residential institution) use to a Class C3 (dwellinghouse) use to provide 3 no. 1-bed flats, 14 no. 2-bed flats, and 2 no. 3-bed two storey dwellings (and retaining Holy Rood Cottage as a 3-bed dwelling), together with 37 no. car parking spaces, private and communal amenity spaces, landscaping, bin and cycle stores. Alterations to existing access points onto and from Ardingly Road and Park Lane. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION received 5/02/2025, 7/02/2025, 18/02/2025, 28/03/2025, 19/06/2025 and 21/07/2025 to address comments from the Highways Authority, West Sussex LLFA, and provide further information in relation to BNG, Newts and Bats.
Case Officer:	Joanne Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Comments Details

Additional LRPC response to planning application:

Comments:	24/2922 Hollyrood House, Ardingly Road Lindfield RH16 2RA Change of use/removal of outbuildings, to create C3 3 x BR Flats, 14 x 2BR Flats, 2 x 3 BR, +retain 1 x 3BR house, + 37 Parking Spaces After our initial response 28/01/25 A Significant update re Highways response has been entered into the application public audit trail.
-----------	--

In addition to our previous representation dated 28th January 2025, Lindfield Rural Parish Council raises additional concerns which are predominantly Highways related:

Road Space Safety Audit dated 10th March 2025

1. Fatal Collision Omitted from Final Highways Report

LRPC notes with concern that the final Highways Report fails to reference a fatal collision that occurred on 22 November 2024 on Ardingly Road. This incident is publicly documented:

This omission undermines the credibility of the safety assessment and disregards a critical piece of evidence relevant to public safety.

Link = West Sussex village road remains closed 24 hours after serious collision

2. Road Safety Audit (RSA) Timing and Conditions—
excerpts below:

Section 1.3 “This Road Safety Audit Team comprised Steve Giles and Wendy Palmer. The Audit consisted of a desktop study and a site visit, which was conducted between 12:00 and 12:45 on Thursday 30th January 2025, when the weather was fine and the road surface dry. Temporary two stage traffic signals were in use on Ardingly Road between the site access and Park Lane, closing the southbound lane (Therefore ONLY one lane was open). Traffic flows were moderate, and no significant congestion was observed, whilst one pedestrian and one cyclist was seen travelling southwest on Park Lane.”

LRPC Concern:

The audit was performed during daylight hours and under artificially reduced traffic conditions due to roadworks. These do not reflect the reality of normal commuter traffic during winter conditions, when the fatal accident occurred. The audit fails to account for high-risk conditions such as:

- Darkness
- Wet surfaces/frequent flooding
- Peak commuter flow
- High Mean and 85% percentile speeds V High Speed Limit at the location.

WSCC RSA report states =

“1. Plan demonstrating how visibility splays onto Ardingly Road meet appropriate Design Standards. The Highway Authority has examined the measured speeds to determine the geometric parameters, with the result being that the 85th % tile speeds being considered to be acceptable to use on this occasion. As a result, the applicant proposes the maximum achievable visibility splays based on the constraints of the site – so 146m in the leading traffic direction (so looking north from the access point to Ardingly Road) and 113m in the trailing traffic direction (so looking south from the access point). Based on DMRB criteria for a road with a measured speed of 50mph (the 85th % tile speeds recorded on Ardingly Road by the applicant are slightly less at circa. 49mph), visibility splays should be 160m in both directions.”

LRPC concerns =

However, at 'one step below' the minimum criteria as also set out in DMRB, splay could be 120m in both directions. (Note: This is a deliberate strategy to reduce safety standards)

Relevant background information

This is a dangerous exit onto a primary commuter route to Gatwick/Crawley and M23/M25 corridor. WSCC effectively conspires with the developer to disregard a clear threat, evidenced by the death in November 2024, to ongoing public safety. With the immediate proximity of a bus stop and associated upgrade to promote sustainable travel, this oversight is potentially reckless.

Stages of a Road Safety Audit = www.road-safety-audit.co.uk/audit-stages.htm#:~:text=Stage%201%20Road%20Safety%20Audits%20are%20undertaken%20at,and%20the%20basic%20design%20principles%20can%20be%20altered.

Stages of a Road Safety Audit

There are four different stages of a Road Safety Audit each forming their own independent report but with reference to earlier stages, with each stage detailed below: -

Stage 1 Road Safety Audits are undertaken at the completion of preliminary design and normally before planning consent is granted, as this is usually the last occasion at which land requirements may be increased and the basic design principles can be altered. At the Road Safety Audit Stage 1 all team members shall visit site together and examine the existing highway layout or features and where the new highway improvement scheme ties into the existing highway.

The Stage 1 RSA is the last opportunity for the relevant stakeholders to get the safety aspects of this application sorted before determination.

WSC Policy observations are noted:

Specifically

West Sussex County Council Road Safety Audit Policy embraces the Vision philosophy of road safety. However, the Highways reports provided by WSCC for this application are inconsistent with best practice and ignore the evidence available from the unfortunate fatal accident in November 2024. Residents have made emotional representations to Lindfield Rural Parish Council concerning the ongoing threat to pedestrians and other road users in the vicinity of this location.

Vision Zero which is included in WSCC Road Space Audit Policy objectives states "An RSA should consider only those matters having an adverse effect on road safety" and "RSAs are accepted as best practice and assist local authorities to fulfil in part the statutory duty for road safety under the Road Traffic Act" and "The RSA in identifying such risks will then recommend what can be done to reduce the potential for such a collision and/or limit its consequences."

However, if an RSA is undertaken at an inappropriate time and/or ignores important information, potentially the RSA process in this application is critically undermined.

Road safety audit report requirements are:

5.8 The RSA report shall contain a separate statement for each identified RSA problem describing the location and nature of the problem and the type of collisions or road user

injuries likely to occur as a result of the problem.

5.9 Each RSA problem shall be followed by an associated RSA recommendation.

5.10 The RSA team shall provide proportionate and viable RSA recommendations to eliminate or mitigate the identified RSA problems.

“Therefore, the vision splay in the leading traffic direction would exceed this by 26m, whereas the splay of 113m in the trailing traffic direction would be slightly less (by 7m). Therefore, as this is “predominantly” (but not completely) an existing situation being improved which would marginally increase traffic flows only in the PM peak period with an overall reduction in daily traffic flows generated by the site compared to the previous use and, additionally, in consideration of the existing PIA data showing no incidents at the access point, the Highway Authority is satisfied with the access arrangements proposed with regard to visibility splays, subject to the Road Safety Audit recommendation of a 500mm ‘buffer’ zone also being provided and maintained to minimise vegetation encroachment on the visibility splays. The recommendation in the Safety Audit recommends that the foliage either-side of the access be cut back with sufficient clearance behind the junction visibility splays to minimise future maintenance and limit the risk of obstruction to the emerging driver’s view. The applicant has responded to this by saying that Drawing No. 24044-001 (visibility splays) has been amended to include reference to foliage behind visibility splays (within 500mm and within the site) to be cut back to minimise future maintenance and limit the risk of obstructions to the emerging driver’s view.”

Access Safety Improvements

To mitigate public danger and support sustainable transport objectives, LRPC recommends:

1. Separate Vehicle and Pedestrian Access:

- o Use Park Lane for vehicular access
- o Restrict Ardingly Road entrance to pedestrian use only

2. Alternative Access Control:

- o Allow entry only from Ardingly Road together with mixed pedestrian access to Bus Stop
- o Require exit via Park Lane for vehicles

These changes would reduce conflict between vehicles and pedestrians and enhance safety near the bus stop and residential access points.

Conclusion

LRPC urges the planning authority to reconsider the safety implications of this application. The current RSA and Highways assessments do not adequately reflect the risks posed by the proposed development. The omission of a fatal accident, substandard visibility splays, and failure to apply Vision Zero principles raise serious concerns about public safety.

Bus Stops

WSCC Highways Development Control team should consult internally with their own public transport team in relation to bus stop layouts and implement their best professional advice.

WSCC are currently using BSIP funds to upgrade the bus stops near Buxshalls on Ardingly Road and on Gravelly Road - These stops will have raised Kassel kerb platforms. The WSCC officer's response is technically incorrect as raised Kassel kerbs mean the bus does not have to drop or use a ramp reducing the boarding and alighting time for the bus and passengers at this vulnerable location. Kassel kerbs are the preferred best practice option. The bus passenger waiting area should also ensure space for a wheelchair to turnaround which is a min 2x2 square with consideration of clearance from edges. Also, in accordance

with LTN 1/24 the designer should consider passenger access to/from the bus stops. That means a clear wheelchair accessible route to the bus stops from Holyrood House. This was not delivered as original specification at Buxshalls, which LRPC have identified and identified. Once again BSIP money is being used to cover this omission, when it could have been covered by developer infrastructure requirement to make development acceptable in planning terms. As this application is post LTN 1/24 WSCC should ensure compliance in relation to this change of use.

Additional considerations for sustainable transport

Wildlife friendly LED lighting to provide clear visibility of and for waiting passengers should be considered as a safety enhancement.

In relation to item 7 and the over sweep issue - we would note complete inconsistency with the WSCC response to tightening the junction as suggested in relation to the Gladman development - DM/24/0446. LRPCs request to minimise junction size due to speeds etc was rejected by WSCC Highways. WSCC Highways are not consistent in relation to this issue.

LRPC Specific list of requests related to this application:-

Bus Stops

at site entrance are upgraded with Raised Kassel Kerbs and real-time timetable information, together with wildlife friendly LED lighting.

Speed Limit

RSA references to 85% percentile speeds, however current legislation requires that Speed Limit be referenced against the actual Mean speeds of traffic at the location. The speed limit should be reduced to 40 mph from Lindfield to north of the Buxshalls development.

Section 106 funding

We request that any Section 106 Infrastructure Development Funding is ringfenced for LRPC and allocated to Scaynes Hill Common Car Parking provision and maintenance.

Summary

In principle, LRPC supports this application if the following discrepancies are addressed via amendments or planning conditions,

- Closure/stopping up of vehicular exiting onto Ardingly Road
- EVC- Minimum 18 spaces to provide charging for electric vehicles.
- Bus-Stop upgrade to support sustainable transport to LTM124 standard.
- S106 Overage clause based upon final achieved pricing for development to increase allocation for sustainable/Affordable Housing contribution.
- Section 106 Infrastructure Development Funding for LRPC is ringfenced and allocated to Car Parking and maintenance at Scaynes Hill Common.

If these requirements are not fully addressed, for the absence of doubt, LRPC objects to this application.

Kind regards