

Initial WSCC Highways response to consultations upon draft Neighbourhood Plans in the Mid Sussex area received in February 2015

Further to your request for comments upon your short-listed housing sites, and given that there is limited detail available at this stage, the following comments are very much the result of a 'high level' assessment and are made without prejudice towards any future consultations or planning applications:

HKNP002 - Police House Field

There are no in-principle issues with this proposal and it is possible that this site has been investigated for development in the past. The only matter we would raise at this stage is the location of the suggested access that we would suggest needs to be at the western end of the site. There is otherwise a risk of difficulties with achieving sufficient visibility to the east due to the carriageway alignment.

HKNP012 - The Old Rectory, Church lane

The potential quantum of development is noted. The site is accessed along what are in places narrow lanes with no specific pedestrian facilities. The carriageway widths and alignments would act to restrict vehicle speeds. It is noted that there are already a number of dwellings accessed along the lane and that residents have to walk in the carriageway. This proposal would generate additional vehicle and pedestrian movements, although speeds would remain low. A key matter would be the provision of facilities for pedestrians from both existing and future developments. It would appear that a pedestrian route could be provided within the site. This would seemingly only really benefit future residents, however, with existing residents having to walk in the carriageway with additional development traffic. There are sections of carriageway that are narrow with limited forward visibility. This proposal has the potential to increase the risk to pedestrians. The off-road route proposed also discharges pedestrian onto a very narrow section of Church Lane with steep embankments. Whilst apparently lightly trafficked, there is still a potential issue for conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.

If this site were to be taken forward, greater consideration would need to be given to providing for pedestrians on the existing narrow lanes.

HKNP013 - Jeffreys Farm Buildings

Whilst vehicular access would need to be considered in greater detail (visibility from the existing access appears restricted to the north), the principle of development is otherwise acceptable. A length of pedestrian footway would need to be provided to tie in with existing footways on Lewes Road.

HKNP014 - Land to North of Farm Buildings (A), Jeffreys Farm

Whilst vehicular access would need to be considered in greater detail (the provision of visibility splays would also have a notable impact upon the existing hedgerow), the principle of development is otherwise acceptable. It is recommended that a pedestrian route is provided alongside the proposed vehicular access. This would then follow the potential desire-line for pedestrians, which the route as shown does not. Such a route would be achievable within the limits of the existing highway.

HKNP016 - Sugar Lane Field

Two access options are indicated. An access (vehicular and pedestrian) would be better placed to the south or the centre of the site (there is no reason why a crossroads arrangement could not be provided with Jefferies). This would then maximise visibility and ensure the tie-in with existing pedestrian access routes. The principle of development is otherwise acceptable.

HKNP017 - Jeffreys Farm Field

Whilst vehicular access would need to be considered in greater detail (visibility from the existing access appears restricted to the south), the principle of development is otherwise acceptable. A length of pedestrian footway would need to be provided to tie in with existing footways on Lewes Road.

If you need advice as to the drawing of sightlines and visibility splays you are recommended to consult the Manual for Streets, which is a national design document produced by the Department for Transport and the Department for Communities and Local Government.