

## WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

|                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>TO:</b>                 | Mid Sussex District Council<br>FAO: Steven King                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>FROM:</b>               | WSCC – Highway Authority                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>DATE:</b>               | 10 February 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>           | Land At Borde Hill Lane<br>Haywards Heath<br>West Sussex                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>SUBJECT:</b>            | DM/25/3129<br>Outline planning application for the erection of up to 125 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access. |
| <b>DATE OF SITE VISIT:</b> | 4 February 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>     | More Information Required                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |

This is the first WSCC Highways response to the above outline planning application for the erection of up to 125 dwellings, together with the provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road. All matters reserved except for access.

### **Site location and access.**

The site is located to the north of Haywards Heath town centre. The site is bounded by fields to the north, the London to Brighton railway line to the east, residential properties to the south and Borde Hill Lane to the west. The site location is shown in Figure 1 found in the TA.

The Penland Farm residential development, to the west of Balcombe Road, was responsible for the construction of the existing three-arm roundabout (known as the 'South Lodge' roundabout) at the junction of Balcombe Road with Borde Hill Lane and Hanlye Lane to which this development proposal proposes to construct a 'fourth' arm for access purposes. Borde Hill Lane runs north towards Balcombe and Crawley, with Hanlye Lane running west from the site access towards Cuckfield. Balcombe Road generally runs south towards Haywards Heath town centre. Borde Hill Lane and Hanlye Lane are subject to the national speed limit, becoming 30mph on the approaches to the South Lodge roundabout. Balcombe Road, at this location, also has a 30mph speed limit.

Drawing SDP-XX-XX-DR-D-305 shows the layout of the proposed 4-arm roundabout. Additional geometric properties are shown on Drawing SDP-XX-XX-DR-D-352.

The TA states that a speed survey, conducted on the approaches to the Borde Hill Lane/Balcombe Road/Hanlye Lane roundabout, has been used to determine actual approach speeds. The 85th percentile approach speeds on all arms of the junction are shown to be predominantly below 35mph. The TA continues by saying that this information has been used to confirm the appropriate visibility requirements. Forward visibility splays are shown on the drawing for all approaches to the roundabout.

Drawings SDP-XX-XX-DR-D-353 to 355 show the swept path vehicle tracking for some vehicles for turning movements at the roundabout.

The design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. Details of this can be found in Appendix D in the TA. Further comments about the Safety Audit are found below under sub-heading Road Safety.

**With regard to the design of the roundabout, the Highway Authority requires the following additional information:**

- 1. A design audit will be required to demonstrate that the geometry and visibility splays (including forward visibility splays and visibility at pedestrian and cycle crossing points, too) comply with DMRB and that there are no departures from standard.**
- 2. The design is for a roundabout with no over-runable areas. The swept paths show that a bin lorry and Ford Transit can traverse the roundabout without needing the overruns. However, further information is required about the traffic composition on Balcombe Road – whether it includes 16.5m HGVs or the like. Given that such vehicles could use the road, swept paths for them are required, too. Buses should be tracked, too.**
- 3. A tactile-paved pedestrian crossing should be provided on the northern arm of the roundabout. This will require the extension of the footway emerging from the north side of the development access arm up to the traffic island which is currently without provision for pedestrians to cross.**
- 4. Consideration to cycle facilities should be given at the roundabout to enable such users to enter and leave the development, including provision for entering and leaving the carriageway on Hanlye Lane and Balcombe Road (northern arm).**
- 5. The applicant should show details of how pedestrians and cyclists would be able to enter and leave the shared-use/emergency path shown emerging to the east of the proposed site access and where it meets both the spine road and Balcombe Road.**
- 6. There is a significant level difference between the roundabout and the field where the new access arm is proposed. There will need to be considerable earthworks to reduce the roundabout approach gradient on that arm. Significant approach gradient could mask give way markings at the roundabout. Applicant to provide further detail of this (a long section would assist here).**
- 7. Two of the traffic islands appear narrow, such that clearance to street furniture may be problematic. Designers to review and adjust if necessary.**
- 8. WSCC is currently planning to revise signage at and on the approaches to the roundabout based on its current three-arm design (currently planned for Q1 2026/27). As the applicant proposes changes to the roundabout, including provision of a fourth arm to access the proposed development, they will also need to revise signage at the roundabout. As such, they should liaise directly with Richard Humphrey ([Richard.humphrey@westsussex.gov.uk](mailto:Richard.humphrey@westsussex.gov.uk)) at WSCC to co-ordinate changes at this location and to ensure that any changes made as a consequence of the development do not prejudice delivery of the scheme (also see comment in point 7 above).**

**Should any changes be made to the design of the roundabout, those changes should be put before the Road Safety Audit team for comment, with those comments being added to the RSA Decision Log and forwarded to the Highway Authority to review.**

**Proposed development.**

The TA describes the application as follows:

*"Outline planning application for the erection of up to 125 dwellings, together with provision of landscaping, open space, and associated development works, with access from Balcombe Road."*

**Traffic impact of development including trip distribution onto local road network.**

*Trip generation: -*

The TRICS database (version 8) has been used by the applicant to estimate the likely trip generation for the proposed development. The full output from the TRICS database can be found in Appendix E.

The following criteria have been used when selecting appropriate sites from the database for the residential units:

- Land Use 03/A – Residential, Houses Privately Owned
- Sites in England and Wales, excluding Greater London
- Development sizes from 50 to 250 units
- Suburban and Edge of Town sites surveyed from 2016 onwards
- Population within 1-mile radius up to 10,000
- Population within 5-mile radius up to 100,000
- Weekday surveys
- Only latest surveys included where a site has been re-surveyed

Table 6.1 (taken from the TA and replicated below) shows the 'Total People' trip rates for the peak hours 08:00-09:00 and 17:00- 18:00:

|               | Trip Rate In | Trip Rate Out |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| 08:00 - 09:00 | 0.188        | 0.669         |
| 17:00 - 18:00 | 0.525        | 0.265         |

Table 6.1

Table 6.2 (again, taken directly from the TA) shows the vehicle trip rates for the peak hours 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00:

|               | Trip Rate In | Trip Rate Out |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| 08:00 - 09:00 | 0.117        | 0.326         |
| 17:00 - 18:00 | 0.334        | 0.159         |

Table 6.2

The capacity analysis is based on a development proposal of 125 homes. Table 6.3, below) summarises the number of people and vehicle trips associated with a development of 125 homes using the trip rates in the tables above:

|               | Total People Trips |           |         | Vehicle Trips |           |         |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------|---------|
|               | Trips In           | Trips Out | Two-way | Trips In      | Trips Out | Two-way |
| 08:00 - 09:00 | 24                 | 84        | 108     | 15            | 41        | 56      |
| 17:00 - 18:00 | 66                 | 33        | 99      | 42            | 20        | 62      |

Table 6.3

Table 6.4 shows the 12-hour weekday vehicle trip rates for 07:00-19:00. It is anticipated that a development of 125 homes would generate around 514 two-way trips in this twelve-hour period:

|               | Trip Rate In | Trip Rate Out | Two-way | Trips In | Trips Out | Two-way |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|----------|-----------|---------|
| 07:00 - 19:00 | 2.045        | 2.067         | 4.112   | 256      | 258       | 514     |

Table 6.4

The applicant says that the anticipated method of travel to work presented in Figure 4.2 (found in the TA) has been used to estimate the number of trips by each travel mode. The trips by model of travel are summarised in Table 6.5, below:

|                           | AM Peak Hour |          |           |         | PM Peak Hour |           |         |
|---------------------------|--------------|----------|-----------|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|
|                           | Modal Split  | Trips In | Trips Out | Two-way | Trips In     | Trips Out | Two-way |
| Driving a car or van      | 53.6%        | 13       | 45        | 58      | 35           | 18        | 53      |
| Passenger in a car or van | 2.6%         | 1        | 2         | 3       | 2            | 1         | 3       |
| On foot                   | 11.3%        | 3        | 9         | 12      | 7            | 4         | 11      |
| Bicycle                   | 1.3%         | 0        | 1         | 1       | 1            | 0         | 1       |
| Train                     | 28.2%        | 7        | 24        | 31      | 19           | 9         | 28      |
| Bus, minibus, or coach    | 1.0%         | 0        | 1         | 1       | 1            | 0         | 1       |
| Motorcycle or moped       | 0.7%         | 0        | 1         | 1       | 0            | 0         | 0       |
| Taxi                      | 0.3%         | 0        | 0         | 0       | 0            | 0         | 0       |
| Other                     | 0.9%         | 0        | 1         | 1       | 1            | 0         | 1       |

Table 6.5

The predicted number of vehicle trips in Table 6.5 for the AM peak hour is similar to the number of trips estimated by using the Vehicle Trips category in the TRICS database. The applicant says that the trip generation in Table 6.3 has been used in the capacity analysis to present a robust calculation of the vehicle trips from the proposed development.

*Trip Distribution* - The applicant has used the origin-destination data from the 2011 Census for the Mid Sussex 011 area to understand the likely trip distribution of traffic generated by the proposed development. They continue by saying that the number of journeys from Mid Sussex 011 to Super Output Areas (Mid Layer) in Mid Sussex, all other local authority districts in the South East region, and other regions in the UK has been collected and appropriate routing using the Google Maps journey planner applied to compile the proportion of trips travelling in each direction. They also say that where there are viable alternative routes available, the trips have been divided between these routes based on distance and journey time.

The trip distribution calculations are presented in Appendix F, found in the TA. Table 6.6 (below) summarises the proposed distribution to be used for the development's vehicle trips:

| Route                     | Proportion |
|---------------------------|------------|
| South via Balcombe Road   | 39%        |
| North via Borde Hill Lane | 30%        |
| West via Hanlye Lane      | 31%        |

Table 6.6

Figure T2, at the end of the TA, shows the calculated proposed development traffic movements for 125 homes in the AM peak hour and PM peak hour.

Vehicular access to and from the proposed development will be via the new fourth arm on the enlarged and reconfigured roundabout.

The proposed development traffic flows shown in Figure T2 estimates that there will be more than 30 development trips in each peak hour using the site access junction.

The West Sussex County Council Transport Assessment Methodology states:

*"Generally the study area will include all junctions where there is a predicted increase in total entry flows of 30 or more vehicles in any hour – or if the junction already experiences peak period congestion an increase of 10 or more vehicles – as a result of the development proposals."*

Whilst development traffic using Balcombe Road is predicted to be less than 30 vehicle movements in each of the peak hours, the applicants have also considered the junction of Balcombe Road/College Road/Mill Green Road for capacity in the peak hours as this junction is approaching capacity at peak times. The distribution of the development traffic flows at this junction is based on the existing turning proportions.

### Highway Capacity Impact: -

#### South Lodge roundabout (site access).

The applicants have used the TRL Junctions 10 software package for future year of 2030 to model the site access junction, being five years from the year of application. The RFC values give the Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC), which indicates what proportion of each arm's total capacity is being utilised. RFC values above 0.85 signify that the arm is nearing capacity and RFC values over 1 indicate that the arm is at or exceeding capacity.

The TA says that 2030 traffic flows have been obtained by adding growth to the 2024 traffic flows using the NTM/TEMPro growth factor for Mid Sussex of 1.0693 for the AM peak and 1.0690 for the PM peak. The 2030 traffic flows are shown in Figure T3 in the TA without development and Figure T4 (again in the TA) with the development traffic included. The results of the analysis are summarised in Table 7.1 overleaf, with the full output presented in Appendix G, also found in the TA:

| 2030 with development | AM Peak Hour | Queue | PM Peak Hour |       |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
|                       | RFC          |       | RFC          | Queue |
| Site Access           | 0.04         | 0     | 0.02         | 0     |
| Balcombe Road         | 0.48         | 1     | 0.42         | 1     |
| Harvey Road           | 0.49         | 1     | 0.39         | 1     |
| Borde Hill Lane       | 0.32         | 1     | 0.30         | 0     |

Table 7.1

The assessment shows that the roundabout operates well under-capacity in 2030, based on the traffic flows modelled and with the addition of the development traffic, with virtually no queuing on any of the arms of the roundabout.

#### Balcombe Road/College Road/Mill Green Road.

The existing priority junction has been modelled using the TRL Junctions 10 software package for the years 2024 and 2030. Table 7.2 summarises the operation of the priority junction based on the observed 2024 traffic flows:

| 2024 without development | AM Peak Hour | Queue | PM Peak Hour |       |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
|                          | RFC          |       | RFC          | Queue |
| Balcombe Road right turn | 0.90         | 7     | 0.73         | 3     |
| Mill Green Road          | 0.69         | 2     | 0.75         | 3     |

Table 7.2

Table 7.3 summarises the operation of the junction in 2030 without the proposed development traffic added:

| 2030 without development | AM Peak Hour |       | PM Peak Hour |       |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
|                          | RFC          | Queue | RFC          | Queue |
| Balcombe Road right turn | 0.97         | 13    | 0.79         | 4     |
| Mill Green Road          | 0.75         | 3     | 0.82         | 4     |

Table 7.3

Table 7.4 summarises the operation of the junction in 2030 with the proposed development traffic added. The applicants have said that the turning movements of the proposed development traffic has been assumed to be proportional to the existing turning proportions:

| 2030 with development    | AM Peak Hour |       | PM Peak Hour |       |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|
|                          | RFC          | Queue | RFC          | Queue |
| Balcombe Road right turn | 0.99         | 15    | 0.80         | 4     |
| Mill Green Road          | 0.76         | 3     | 0.84         | 4     |

Table 7.4

The addition of the proposed development traffic sees a marginal increase in the RFC values and a slight increase in queue lengths in the AM peak at the junction. However, the small increase in traffic at this junction does not result in a significant impact due to the proposed development traffic.

### **Vision-led assessment.**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. The Government published proposed reforms to the NPPF in July 2024. Following consultation, a revised version of the NPPF was adopted in December 2024.

Paragraph 115 states:

*"In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*

- (a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;*
- (b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- (c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code 48 ; and*
- (d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach."*

**No form of vision appears in the text of the TA, nor any targets, method of monitoring or penalties should measures in any vision-led approach not be achieved. Any such, the applicant should update the TA by including a vision for the scheme in accordance with current best practice, including measures to support the vision designed to reduce traffic impact of the development on the local road network plus additional measures should the vision not be fully realised. A monitoring strategy should also be provided. This is in addition to any Travel Plan measure that might be forthcoming for the development.**

**Road safety.**

*Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA)* – Seven ‘problems’ were identified by the RSA team based on the design as currently submitted. These are as follows:

**3.1.1 PROBLEM**

Location: Approaches to the proposed roundabout.

Summary: Inappropriate surfacing could lead to overshoot collisions or rear end shunts.

The proposals do not include the introduction of anti-skid surfacing or detail the Polished Stone Value (PSV) to be used on the approaches to the roundabout. Surfacing with an insufficient PSV could lead to overshoot or rear end shunt collisions. Further, vehicles approaching the roundabout may be straddling two different surface types and may experience differential braking, which under sudden severe braking conditions could lead to loss of control collisions.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended high friction surfacing or surfacing with a high PSV be provided on all the approaches to the roundabout.

**3.1.2 PROBLEM**

Location: Proposed roundabout.

Summary: Surface water on carriageway could lead to loss of control collisions.

Kerblines are proposed to be altered, where no details of the drainage proposal or carriageway profiles have been provided for assessment. Low or flat areas may cause ponding of surface water. This could be detrimental to road safety and could lead to loss of control accidents.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended drainage details and vertical profiles should be provided at Safety Audit Stage 2.

**3.2.1 PROBLEM**

Location: Approaches to proposed roundabout.

Summary: Lack of forward visibility may increase the risk of junction related or shunt type collisions at the roundabout.

Stopping Sight Distances have been provided for assessment, where there is concern that the forward visibility splays on all approaches, excluding Hanlye Lane pass over non-highway land. Vegetation in these splays could restrict visibility, where insufficient visibility may increase the risk of junction related or shunt type collisions at the roundabout.



## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the forward visibility splays should be within the adoptable highway, or that a suitable covenant should be arranged to ensure that the splay is not obstructed by vegetation.

### **3.2.2 PROBLEM**

Location: Proposed roundabout.

Summary: Insufficient space could lead to side swipe accidents.

The approaches to the roundabout are shown as having a two-lane entry with a two-lane circulatory carriageway, where the exits narrow to a wide single lane. There is concern that if two lanes of traffic decide to use the same exit then insufficient space or lack of lane designation markings and signage could lead side swipe collisions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that single lane approaches are installed or that the signage and lane destination markings be employed to avoid merging traffic issues at the exits.

### **3.4.1 PROBLEM**

Location: Proposed pedestrian crossing points on Access Road and Balcombe Road at the roundabout.

Summary: Restricted visibility could lead to vehicle to pedestrian collisions.

No details relating to the pedestrian / traffic intervisibility splays at the crossings have been provided for assessment. There is concern that excess vegetation, particularly in the spring and summer months on the Access Road and Balcombe Road arms of the roundabout may restrict intervisibility. Restricted intervisibility could lead to vehicle to pedestrian collisions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the vegetation be cut back and periodically maintained to retain visibility.

### **3.4.2 PROBLEM**

Location: Proposed pedestrian refuge on Balcombe Road.

Summary: Restricted visibility could lead to vehicle to pedestrian collisions.

No details relating to the pedestrian / traffic intervisibility splays at the crossing have been provided for assessment. There is concern that excess vegetation, particularly in the spring and summer months on the northeastern side of the carriageway may restrict intervisibility. Restricted intervisibility could lead to vehicle to pedestrian collisions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the vegetation be cut back and periodically maintained to retain visibility.

### **3.5.1 PROBLEM**

Location: Proposed pedestrian refuge on Balcombe Road.

Summary: Absence of high mounted 'Keep left' signs and illuminated bollards could lead to loss of control collisions.

At this early stage in the design the proposed pedestrian refuge does not have signage, where the refuge is on a semi-rural road. There is concern that vehicle splay and detritus may obscure the bollards and may lead to the island being inconspicuous, where a lack

of conspicuity, particularly in conditions of poor visibility may cause kerb strikes and possible loss of control collisions.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that 'Keep left' bollards should be installed and that high mast mounted signs to diagram 610 (Keep left) should also be installed, further that the signage aspect to diagram 610 should be illuminated e.g. solar powered.

### **Design Team's response to the RSA recommendations.**

The Design Team has accepted all the recommendations.

**A DRAFT of the Decision Log with WSCC highways (the 'Overseeing Organisation') comments attached to it, will need to be provided to the applicant for consideration, with the FINAL copy capturing the agreed course of actions as recommended in any FINAL RSA being made available to the planning case officer when completed. However, given that changes might need to be made to the roundabout because of the points made on page 2 of this response, the RSA Decision log should be held back in case it needs to be added to. If changes are made, then a revised version should be produced by the applicant and made available to the Highway Authority to add its parts.**

*Personal Injury Accidents (PIAs)* - A review of the personal injury accident data in the vicinity of the site and reported since 1st January 2020 has been undertaken by interrogating the Crashmap and West Sussex County Council Collision Locations Map websites. Figure 4.3, found in the TA, shows the locations of one 'serious' incident (red) involving two vehicles, and one 'slight' incident (yellow) involving one vehicle, in the vicinity of the existing roundabout.

### **Sustainable/non-car access to development.**

*Walking and cycling* – The TA includes walking and cycling isochrones to show the local area that can be reached in a 5, 10, 15 and 20-minute journey time from the site and can be found at the end of that document. Figure 2 (also in the TA) shows the walking isochrones and local facilities within a reasonable distance from the site. The TA says that Haywards Heath railway station and its surrounding facilities can be reached in 20 minutes on foot.

Balcombe Road and Penland Road are promoted by Mid Sussex District Council and Haywards Heath Town Council as suitable routes for cycling and useful for connecting the town centre with the Borde Hill Estate. Figure 3 in the TA shows the cycling isochrones. The TA says that Haywards Heath, as well as destinations including Lindfield, Cuckfield, Balcombe and Ardingly can be reached with a 20-minute cycle ride.

*Public transport (buses)* - The nearest bus stops to the site are located on Penland Road, approximately 300m to the south of the site. The timetable for local buses is appended to the TA in Appendix B and the frequency of services summarised in Table 4.1, found below:

| Service Number | Route                                                      | Monday-Friday |         | Saturday    |         | Sunday  |         |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|
|                |                                                            | Daytime       | Evening | Daytime     | Evening | Daytime | Evening |
| 31A            | Cuckfield – Haywards Heath – N Chailey – Newick – Uckfield | 120 minutes   | .       | 120 minutes | .       | .       | .       |

Table 4.1

**As the frequency of services is low (one bus every two hours and not all day), the applicant should explore with the local operator (Compass Travel\*) ways of improving this to provide a higher frequency. Evidence of discussions with them should be provided. Additionally, commitment should be given to providing improvements at local bus stops in the form of real time passenger information, shelters and seats (and show where these stops are). If no stops are nearby (which appears to be the case), then the applicant should look where new stops could be located close to the site.**

**(\*Compass Travel - Chris Chatfield [cchatfield@compass-travel.co.uk](mailto:cchatfield@compass-travel.co.uk) or Michael Bishop [mbishop@compass-travel.co.uk](mailto:mbishop@compass-travel.co.uk))**

*Public transport (railways)* - The nearest railway station is Haywards Heath. The station is approximately 1.5km from the site and can be reached via Balcombe Road and Burrell Road. Frequent services operate to London Victoria via Gatwick Airport, Littlehampton, Hove, Worthing, Brighton, Hove, London Bridge, Bedford and Cambridge. On weekdays during the daytime there are 20 services per hour.

#### **Travel Plan.**

**The Travel Plan needs to be updated in accordance with current WSCC guidance\* and also include the following:**

- 1. Commitment to £150 travel vouchers for each household**
- 2. A series of additional measures should trip reduction targets within the Travel Plan are not achieved**

**Both the Travel Plan and its associated monitoring fee would need to be secured by S106 Agreement.**

**(\*This can be made available on request).**

#### **Parking.**

The TA says that parking at the proposed development will conform to WSCC guidance for new developments.

*Car parking* - The site is located at the boundary of Parking Behaviour Zone 1, as set out in the WSCC parking guidance note. Parking Behaviour Zone 3 is immediately to the south of the site, with Parking Behaviour Zone 4 to the southwest, incorporating the Penland Farm residential development.

Table 5.1 (extract taken from the TA and found below) shows the Residential Parking Demand (spaces per dwelling) for various sizes of homes:

| Number of bedrooms | Number of Habitable Rooms | PBZ1 | PBZ3 | PBZ4 |
|--------------------|---------------------------|------|------|------|
| 1                  | 1 to 3                    | 1.5  | 0.9  | 0.9  |
| 2                  | 4                         | 1.7  | 1.3  | 1.1  |
| 3                  | 5 to 6                    | 2.2  | 1.8  | 1.7  |
| 4+                 | 7 or more                 | 2.7  | 2.5  | 2.2  |

Table 5.1

*Cycle parking* - One cycle space will be provided for 1 & 2-bedroom homes and 2 cycle spaces for 3+ bedroom homes. 1 & 2-bedroom flats will have 0.5 spaces per home, and 3+ bedroom flats will have 1 space provided in communal storage.

EV parking is not mentioned. This and the overall parking provision for the development, would be checked again at any detailed reserved matters/discharge of condition stage.

### **Internal road layout.**

While it is acknowledged that the proposal only seeks detailed consideration of the access arrangements to and from the development, the Highway Authority has the following observations to make based on the illustrative layout of the internal road layout which the applicant is requested to note of (list should not be considered exhaustive):

1. In-line with Active Travel England's aspirations and LTN 1/20 guidance, priority at junctions should be considered for pedestrians and cyclists throughout the development.
2. Improved permeability for walking and cycling should be made throughout the scheme.
3. Some of the internal roads appear to give a 'mixed message' regarding priority for users, e.g. some roads have different surfacing shown (denoting shared surface arrangements) but still include a footway running alongside one side of the carriageway (the latter which should not be provided if a shared surface environment is proposed). This should be re-examined should the scheme move to the next stage of design. WSCC provides standard details by using the following link: - [Road agreements - West Sussex County Council](#)
4. Lack of service margins in places could make adoption under S38 not possible.

### **Conclusion.**

Additional information is required, details of which can be found in the main body of this response in **highlighted green text** and summarised below. When replies are available, the case officer should re-consult the Highway Authority, at which time it will consider the proposal further:

1. A design check of the roundabout to be provided.
2. A plan should be provided to show amendments to the roundabout and providing the additional information as set-out in points 1-8 on page 2 of this response.
3. Provision of a Vision-Led TA for the development, including details of mitigation to support the vision, additional measures should the vision not be fully realised plus a monitoring strategy (this should be separate to any Travel Plan for the site).
4. Provision of a further version of the Road Safety Audit Decision Log with the design team's responses captured on the same plus any additions as a result of any changes as referred to in points 1-8 on page two of this response.

5. Evidence of discussions with local bus provider – namely Compass Buses – to explore increased service frequency of service, plus commitment to improved or new stops with real time passenger information, shelters and seating.
6. Travel Plan update.

Response ends.

**Tim Townsend**  
**West Sussex County Council – Planning Services**