

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 July 2026 11:41:59 UTC+01:00
To: "Steven King" <steven.king@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0303

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 29/07/2026 11:41 AM.

Application Summary

Address: Land North Of Borers Arms Road Copthorne West Sussex RH10 3LH

Proposal: Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for access for the demolition of an existing commercial building and the erection of up to 260 dwellings, up to 1,700sqm of employment floorspace E(c)(iii), E(g)(i)(ii)(iii), car parking, landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Copthorne Bank and Borers Arms Road. (Revised highway plans and supporting information received 23/07/2026.).

Case Officer: Steven King

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 3 BORERS CLOSE COPTHORNE

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour or general public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

1. Pedestrian Safety Compromises

The developer has explicitly chosen to ignore critical recommendations from the independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) to favor vehicular access:

Missing Pedestrian Island: The RSA identified a safety risk for vulnerable pedestrians crossing the widened access road (which exceeds 10m) and recommended a central island or shortening the crossing. The developer rejected this recommendation, prioritizing HGV turning maneuvers over pedestrian safety.

Substandard Footway Widths: The RSA explicitly recommended a minimum footway width of 2m to prevent pedestrians (especially wheelchair and pram users) from being forced into the carriageway. The developer compromised this, narrowing the footway to 1.5m past Units 4 and 12 simply to avoid impacting industrial servicing space.

2. Flawed Parking Justification

The logic used to justify the reduction in existing parking is highly vulnerable to challenge:

False Offset: The report admits an overall loss of eight parking spaces for the existing industrial estate. It claims this loss is "offset" by 64 new spaces in the proposed development.

***Double Counting:** However, the report states those 64 new spaces are required to serve the *new* 1,700 sqm commercial building (which demands up to 68 spaces based on maximum standards). Therefore, those spaces will likely be fully utilized by the new building, offering no actual surplus to offset the lost spaces for existing businesses.

3. Traffic Impact and Collision Data

Failing Junction Dismissed: The traffic modeling admits that the A2220/Copthorne Common Road roundabout will fail in the AM peak period, operating over capacity with an RFC > 1.0. The Local Highway Authority subjectively dismisses this failing junction by claiming the impact isn't "severe", but you can argue that adding traffic to an already failing junction is unacceptable.

Narrow Data Window: The claim that there are no recorded collisions at the access point relies on a narrow 3-year data window. This is the absolute minimum standard and fails to

account for long-term historical trends or unrecorded near-misses.

4. Incomplete Safety Audit

* **Missing Critical Data:** The independent RSA explicitly notes that they were not provided with information regarding landscaping, levels, gradients, pavement details, drainage, or signage. You can argue that the safety audit is fundamentally incomplete and cannot guarantee road safety if the auditors were not given the full design details.

Kind regards