

Communities Economy and Transport

Rupert Clubb
BEng(Hons) CEng MICE
Director

County Hall
St Anne's Crescent
Lewes
East Sussex
BN7 1UE

Tel: 0345 60 80 190
www.eastsussex.gov.uk



To: Head of Planning
Planning and Environmental Services
Wealden District Council
Council Offices
Vicarage Lane, Hailsham
BN27 2AX

FAO: Claire Turner

Our Ref: WD/2022/3222
District Ref: WD/2022/3222/MAO

Applicant: Hertfordshire Holdings Ltd

Location: LAND TO THE SOUTH OF THE A271 AND EAST OF THE A22, LOWER HORSEBRIDGE, HAILSHAM

Development: DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 124 NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS, ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE (INCLUDING A NEW ACCESS JUNCTION ONTO THE A271) AND OPEN SPACE.

Road Name or Number	A271 / A22	Consultation Date	8 February 2023
National Grid Reference	557199111179	Contact Officer Details:	Claire Warwick 01273 482239 Claire.warwick@eastsussex.gov.uk

Recommendation:

No objection		Objection	x
No objection subject to the imposition of conditions		Objection due to insufficient information	

Executive Summary

This application seeks permission for 124 residential dwellings. The applicant sought highway and transport pre-application advice in relation to a proposal for 150 dwellings in 2022 but the process was not completed.

The accessibility of the site has not been fully appraised nor appropriate connections proposed to enable appropriate non car travel at the site.

The TA has been submitted without a conclusion on the impacts on Boship roundabout (A22/A267/A271 roundabout junction)

As such I object to this application as submitted.

Notwithstanding the above I have the following comments on the other elements of the planning application.

Response

Planning Status and Pre-application advice

This is a speculative application in that it has not been tested through a Local Plan process. As such the principle of development has not been established so the impacts of the development are expected to be assessed fully through the submitted TA.

The applicant did seek pre-application advice but it would appear that while some of that advice informs the TA, the required modelling of the Boship roundabout was not completed. The TA has been submitted without that detail. The TA refers to that missing information.

It should also be noted that the Transport Assessment does not follow a “decide and provide” approach to development impacts (whereby we agree what we want the development to “look” like and decide which measures and interventions to provide to achieve those outcomes). ESCC will be adopting this approach for major developments going forward as a means of promoting sustainable development. The TA is incorrectly focussed on car travel.

Site and surrounding network

The site is currently in agricultural use and is approximately 7.6 hectares. It is located to south of the A271 and east of the A22 in Lower Horsebridge in the parish of Hellingly. Hellingly and Lower Horsebridge are historic villages. The parish of approximately 8500 residents is set to grow with a number of major development sites under construction/with planning permission in the parish.

The development would be an edge of town development (albeit with gaps between the site and Hailsham to the south) by its nature far from local facilities. It would have good road connections.

The site is currently accessed from the A22 bypass or A271 via gated field accesses. A narrow (around 1m) footway is available along the site frontage on the A271. The nearest bus stops are on A271 at 150m to the east of the site and are not up to current standards. The eastbound bus stop is not marked.

The A271 is a distributor route from the A22 Boship roundabout eastwards to the A2100 near Battle. Pre-pandemic, the section through North Hailsham carried over 10,000 vehicles per day and is used for longer distance travel as one of the limited east-west A-road routes in East Sussex.

In the vicinity of the site the speed limit is 60mph the national speed limit. The road is a single carriageway- approximately 6.5m wide.

Vehicle crashes

Eight vehicle crashes have been recorded on the A271 in the vicinity of the site in the last five years, (seven of them at or on approach to Boship roundabout). The roundabout suffers a higher number of accidents, than would be expected and ESCC is keen to improve this record.

A planned improvement scheme at the roundabout and other junctions on the A22 (see paragraph on Traffic Impact below) will address safety issues and forms part of the package of Major Road Network highway works.

Accessibility

Some retail (a small co-op, takeaway, pharmacy newsagent etc.) is available in Upper Horsebridge on the A271 approximately a 1.6km to the east. Lower Horsebridge offers two pubs, a vets and Rugby club. Other local services and the main employment centres are in Hailsham and other surrounding towns.

As local facilities close to the site are limited, residents will need to leave the area, to access retail, employment and leisure facilities. Linking this site via non-car modes to local facilities and other existing/committed non car routes is difficult given distances involved and the severance caused by the Cuckmere River and tributary.

An NMU Audit has not been submitted with the application to detail the current availability and standard of non-car travel routes for residents, The TA does cover distances to a number of facilities and associated walking and cycle times, but what's not included is an assessment of the quality of those routes.

As an example, while Hellingly primary school is 1km away (800m in the TA) and longer or those living to the south or west of the site, the footways connecting the site to the school are narrow and will require children to walk along two classified roads- the A271 (60mph proposed as 30mph) and B2104 (40mph) which is unlit. The route would certainly not be suitable for cycling for children.

There is scope to widen footways given the presence of highway verges, so it is disappointing that the improvements are not proposed.

No footway improvements to the school- or anywhere else, are proposed as part of the development only a footway along the site frontage and pedestrian refuge islands as part of the new access arrangement – a Right Turn Lane. The pedestrian refuges were only

added as a result of a recommendation of Road Safety Audit rather than the applicant recognising their importance.

The necessary associated tactile paved dropped crossing points are not shown on plans no: 332110699_5501_SK001 rev P03.

Hailsham Community College, supermarkets and Quintins Medical centre are 3km away. Again, no consideration of the walking routes has been given in the TA.

Cycling

As covered in the TA there are no dedicated cycleways in the vicinity of the site. Local facilities may be within 5, 10 and 15 minute cycle rides, but the routes are not of a standard to enable less confident cyclists and children to use them.

The Cuckoo Trail, a long-distance cycle route links Heathfield and Eastbourne via Hellingly and Hailsham. The site access is over 1km from the Cuckoo Trail accessed via Horsebridge Road. The route continues south 7km to Polegate station. The Cuckoo trail is an important pedestrian/cycle link in the town and its use should be maximised through suitable connections and crossing points.

The footway on the A271 could be widened to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians to allow a more secure route to the Cuckoo Trail.

Hailsham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

Hailsham LCWIP sets out East Sussex County Councils assessment of the quality of walking and cycling routes in Hailsham and makes recommendations for improvement that ESCC will seek to deliver as part of a commitment to improving active travel in the county. I consider routes 220, 221 and 310 in the Hailsham LCWIP to be of most relevance for the future residents of this site.

The LCWIP recommends:

Route 220 Cuckmere Close to Battle Road

Upgrades to footways to shared use

Improved access onto and from Cuckoo Trail at signalised crossing

Review of pedestrian access and crossing provision

Review footway widths and upgrades to shared use

Review of on carriageway cycle facilities

Review on street parking, improve access from right turn to petrol station

Review crossings at roundabouts and other junctions and wayfinding to paths

Route 221 A271- Lower Dicker to Park Gate

Provision of consistent footways throughout, and improve to shared use width on to south side of road.

Improved frequency of safe crossing points within residential area

Route 310- Summerheath Road to Upper Horsebridge

Reduction in speeds and consider measures to encourage slower vehicle speeds

Review parking provision

Upgrade footway to shared use, improve visibility at junctions

Review of junction treatments and pedestrian crossing points

Reduce speed limit to 20 mph in narrow section between Grovelands Road and Hempstead Lane roundabout

The applicant refers to the LCWIP in section 2.4 of the TA “Planning Framework” but does not propose to deliver improvements to serve this development.

These routes and recommendations should be considered by the applicant and measures put forward to enable active travel. This is to the benefit of the new residents of the development, and as a way to mitigate the traffic impact of the development through travel behaviour change not capacity works at junctions.

Bus services

In the vicinity of the proposed development there is only an hourly bus service, which runs Monday to Saturday daytime only. This is Stagecoach’s route 54 running between Uckfield, Horsebridge, Hailsham, Polegate and Eastbourne. The East Sussex Bus Service Improvement Plan sets the ambition of increasing the frequency of this service to half-hourly, and to introduce a new hourly evening and Sunday service. Such improvements are required to increase the sustainability of this edge of town site.

Currently the nearest bus stops for the west part of the development are located on the A271 at ‘Pay Gate Cottages’, though the westbound stop is unmarked. The eastbound stop only consists of a bus stop pole and has no raised kerb. Its position is approximately up to 550 metres distant from dwellings in the south-west section of the proposed development layout. A pair of new bus stops is therefore required west of the current location (within 400 metres of all the proposed dwellings), each consisting of a raised kerb, bus stop clearway markings, bus stop pole, shelter (subject to the Parish Council’s agreement) and a real time information sign. A safe road crossing provision would also be needed.

In line with other developments in North Hailsham, I would seek a contribution of £1,100 per dwelling towards improving bus services in the area, including establishing the proposed uplift to route 54.

Rail Services:

The nearest train station is in Polegate with regular services to Eastbourne, London and Gatwick Airport and along the south coast between Brighton and Hastings. Bus service 54 connects to Polegate station. It is important that Polegate station is further served by buses.

In conclusion, I consider that the position of the access – onto the A271 to the north of the site in effect means the development does not “face” Hailsham town or Hellingly/Lower Horsebridge villages which leads to extended walking and cycle distances/times to all the local facilities. No connections are available or achievable to the south to allow better connection to the town mainly due to the Cuckmere River severing

the site from the rest of Hailsham. Better connections are needed to reduce vehicle trips and few have been put forward or even suitably assessed as part of the application.

The application does not meet the requirements of a 'ten- minute town', as identified in Hailsham's Neighbourhood Plan, whereby there is an aspiration that key amenities are within a ten-minute walk.

Travel Plan

A Travel Plan Framework has been submitted as part of the application. The document generally follows ESCC and national guidance and includes a number of measures to encourage non car trips.

Travel Plan Co-ordinator

Key to the success of the Travel Plan will be the promotion and visibility of the Travel Plan and appointment of the Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC) to manage the Travel Plan from the commencement of development til the successful Travel Plan delivery for at least 5 years. I note the applicant's commitment to this and the intended tasks for the TPC. Details of the TPC should be forwarded to ESCC on appointment.

It seems that in this case the details of the Travel Plan will be widely available in the marketing suite as new homes are sold, through information packs for new residents (this should include all residents not just first residents), events and site notice boards. The applicant proposes that the TPC will set up a Travel Plan Steering Group.

Measures:

The measures detailed to enable walking, cycling, public transport use and reduce the need to travel are noted but should be expanded. While I expect suitably designed pedestrian routes and cycling parking to be provided within the site, the key to a successful development and Travel Plan to is to connect the site to the wider transport network/ local facilities and remove (perceived) barriers to sustainable mode choice. Further measures to enable walking, cycling and public transport use and to reduce the need to travel should include (not exhaustive)

- Route planning and way finding signage (including access to Cuckoo Trail)
- Explanation of all benefits of active travel (wellbeing, health, climate change, local air pollution and reduced congestion)
- Establishment of walking buses, walking groups/partners
- Creation of a Bicycle User Group,
- Promotion of events (Walk or Cycle to Work/School Week) Dr Bike sessions.
- Vouchers for bikes, (including electric cycles) scooters and associated equipment (helmets, bike pump etc),
- Supply of high visibility clothing.
- Supply of personal alarms to residents
- Shopping delivery vouchers/coordination

Car club and car sharing – Given that many residents are likely to drive from this site onto the strategic road network, a car club and car sharing could be important measures in the Travel Plan. The applicant has only committed to investigate the possibility of a car club. The use of an existing car share database is welcome. Residents should be incentivised to car share/use a car club through things like prize draws and sharing the (cost) benefits of car sharing. The database should be extended to other residential areas. A number of the other committed north Hailsham development sites have similarly committed to car sharing and car clubs.

Supermarket deliveries- To reduce retail trips, vouchers for supermarket deliveries will be offered to residents. The RTPC could manage such delivery timeslots so fewer trips by delivery vehicles are made.

Working from Home- Since the beginning of the pandemic a greater number of prospective residents will likely be working at home for at least some of their working week. The provision of space within dwellings to do this is imperative along with appropriate broadband connections. “Office space” within dwellings should be considered as part of dwelling layouts.

Targets

The applicant wishes to agree the measures and targets with ESCC once the first (baseline) survey has been undertaken. At this point they have used census travel to work data to estimate mode share as a starting point to determine targets. The Framework Travel Plan acknowledges that there are opportunities to improve the non-car network which is not taken forward in the TA.

The targets can be finalised on completion of the baseline survey, but it would be helpful to have an idea of the applicant’s intention with regard to targets. I would suggest an overall target of a 10% reduction in single occupancy vehicles.

Monitoring

ESCC requires that the Travel Plan is monitored in accordance with SAM from TRICS. The applicant refers to SAM which requires the completion of a base line survey (usually at 25% of occupations or 6 months after first occupation whichever is sooner (in order that residents’ travel habits are not yet established) and follow up surveys 1, 3 and 5 years later.

Remedial/further Travel Plan measures may be required if Travel Plan targets are not met.

The Travel Plan Framework should be amended in light of the comments above.

ESCC will require an Audit fee of £6000 to cover the cost of auditing the Travel Plan process from a Highway Authority perspective from completion of the full TP documents to a time after the year 5 monitoring and implementation of remedial Travel Plan measures (should they be needed).

Proposed vehicle access arrangements

The applicant proposes a Right Turn Lane access into the site from the A271. The highway alterations would commence almost immediately on exit from the Boship roundabout. The applicant also proposes an amendment to the speed limit – ie extending the existing 30mph to the west of the site eastwards up to the Boship roundabout to tie in with the proposed 30mph at Boship (as included in ESCC's scheme, see below)

I do not object to the principle of a Right Turn Lane access nor the 30mph extension as shown on plan 332110699_5501_SK001 rev P03 which will go some way to make the route more attractive to pedestrians (and possibly cyclists).

The access has been designed to DMRB standards and will achieve visibility splays of 2.4m by 90m in both directions commensurate with the proposed 30mph speed limit. Traffic counts have been undertaken on the A271 recording volumes and speed. The 85th percentile vehicle speeds are recorded as 36mph westbound and 33mph eastbound. From an ESCC perspective these traffic speeds would allow for the implementation of an extended 30mph speed limit.

It should be noted that the implementation of a 30mph limit will require a Traffic Regulation Order separate to the planning process. The applicant will be expected to cover ESCC costs for undertaking the legal process. A fee of £5000 will be required. The TRO will be subject to consultation with emergency services and the public and is therefore open to objections.

A stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken on the access proposal, (although not included within the submitted documents WDC website). Three problems were identified. The applicant has accepted the Auditor's recommendations and updated the plan accordingly. I have no concerns relating to the access design as a result of the RSA.

Tracking drawings have been submitted (again not included within the submitted documents WDC website) showing how a refuse vehicle and fire appliance would access the site. The junction will be able to accommodate these vehicles, but I note the refuse vehicle is not the correct size. WDC use 12m long refuse vehicles. The plans should be amended.

Traffic impact

Trip rates

As part of pre-application discussions with the applicant the trip rates for the residential development were agreed based on an agreed selection of TRICS sites and ESCC modelling in this area for other studies.

The subsequent trip generations for this development of 124 dwellings are:

Table 4.3: Peak Hour Person and Vehicle Trip Generation

	AM Peak			PM Peak		
	Arr.	Dep.	Total	Arr.	Dep.	Total
<i>Total Person Trip Generation</i>						
Proposed Trip Rate	0.173	0.754	0.927	0.614	0.311	0.925
Trip Generation	21	93	115	76	39	115
<i>Total Vehicle Trip Generation</i>						
Proposed Trip Rate	0.105	0.345	0.450	0.323	0.148	0.471
Trip Generation	13	43	56	40	18	58

Modelling

The applicant has undertaken modelling of local junctions based on 150 dwellings justified as a robust approach. While I will accept this (it is the scale of development envisaged at Pre-app stage) this does not follow current guidance for assessment of traffic impacts on the capacity of junctions.

The TA demonstrates that the new Right Turn Lane access will operate satisfactorily without detriment to the traffic flow on the A271.

The modelling of the other local junctions on the A271 westwards does not cause me concern in terms the impact of this development on junction capacity. While the junctions may operate above capacity in 2030 and with development traffic added the actual increase attributable to this development is low and ESCC planned improvements to the MRN will go some way to re-route traffic in the area. As stated above I feel it would be better to mitigate the impact of this development through improved pedestrian, cycle and bus links.

Boship roundabout

As stated above and in the Transport Assessment, it is ESCC's intention to complete upgrading works at Boship roundabout. The scheme will include the signalisation of the roundabout and the implementation of a 30mph speed limit on the A271 approach. The scheme will reduce the risk of conflict and improve capacity by allowing more controlled movement around the junction and managing traffic flow.

The roundabout improvement is part of a package of improvements proposed by ESCC for the A22 corridor. ESCC intends to deliver six junction improvements on the A22 from Boship roundabout south to the A22/Dittons Road roundabout junction. The current designs have been subject to public consultation and have generally received positive feedback. ESCC awaits acceptance of the business case for these improvements from DfT and confirmation from government on our bid for Major Route Network (MRN) funding. A decision is expected in May.

The applicant is aware of the planned improvements to Boship roundabout and other parts of the MRN. Modelling of the Boship roundabout was undertaken but not completed as part of the pre-application discussions between the applicant and the Highway Authority. It is regrettable that the modelling process was not completed before submission of the application. I note that further information is likely to be submitted. I will

comment on that in due course. As it stands the impacts on Boship roundabout have not been suitably assessed and/or mitigated.

CIL Funding for Major Road Network interventions

WDC officers have previously agreed, that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds would be released to complement Major Route Network (MRN) funding from government to deliver the package of works identified to support housing delivery. I trust that a consistent approach will be taken by WDC and that CIL monies attributable to this development would be available to add to MRN funds to deliver the works.

Please also note however that given this site is not allocated it may be more appropriate to secure a specific contribution towards the MRN schemes.

Internal Layout

As an outline application, the layout of the site is not being considered as part of this application. Should outline planning consent be granted then ESCC would require any Reserved Matters application to demonstrate that the development layout is designed in accordance with the principals of the Manual for Streets to ensure a permeable development that meets the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, service vehicles and cars- in that order.

The applicant should note my comments in relation to pedestrian cycling and bus connections when designing the internal site layout. Non car routes should be as direct as possible, ie take less time than driving.

Any design submitted will also need to be subject to independent safety audit procedures. Suitable access throughout the site for emergency and refuse vehicles should be demonstrated.

Parking

While this is an outline application with all matters reserved except access, I wish to confirm that cycle and car parking will be required in accordance with the East Sussex County Council Parking Standards, should this development be approved.

Cycle Parking

Safe, secure and covered cycle parking facilities need to be provided at new developments and are equally important as car parking, as cycling has the potential to replace shorter car journeys. The level of cycle parking will need to meet the requirements of the East Sussex County Council standards which are one space per unit for one and two-bedroom dwellings and two spaces per dwelling with three bedrooms or more. Ideally sufficient space for family cycles should be provided. Providing additional cycle parking will form a Travel Plan measure.

All spaces should be easily and conveniently and independently accessible. Driveways may have to be widened and rear footpaths provided to allow access to cycle parking in rear gardens, for example.

Vehicle Parking

The level of vehicle parking required will need to be in accordance with results obtained from the ESCC Parking Calculator which is based on local car ownership levels and includes an allowance for visitor parking. As the number of spaces is based on the size and numbers of properties proposed an indicative figure cannot be provided as the proposed breakdown is not known.

Parking spaces would need to meet the required minimum dimensions to be counted towards the overall provision. The minimum sizes are as follows:

Parking Spaces: 2.5m x 5m

Car Ports: 2.8m x 5m

Garages: 3m x 6m or 3m x 7m if cycle storage is included.

It should be noted that garages only count towards 1/3 of a parking spaces regardless of size.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points

I will also expect to see provision of Electric Vehicle charging points. Each dwelling should be provided with a facility to enable use of electric vehicles. Details of the applicant's intention with regard to managing EV spaces should be included in any reserved matters application.

Construction Traffic

Should consent be granted then careful consideration would need to be given to how the site can be built in a safe manner minimising highway disruption as much as possible. I will require Construction Traffic Management Plan. A robust plan is particularly important in this location given the direct access onto the A271.

Conclusion

I object to this application for the following reason:

It has not been demonstrated that, the site is suitably accessible by non-car modes, and the impacts of the development at Boship roundabout have not been suitably assessed and mitigated. The development would therefore be contrary to para 111 and 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

While I object to this development as submitted should planning permission be granted, I require that the following obligations and conditions form part of any consent. The obligations and conditions set out here are not exhaustive, subject to further submissions by the applicant.

s106 obligations

- £1100 per dwelling for bus services serving the site

- £12,000 per RTPI sign (4 bus stops)
- £500 per bus stop clearway (4 bus stops)
- TRO fee of £5000 for the implementation of the extended 30mph on the A271
- Travel Plan and Travel Plan Audit fee of £6000

Conditions

1 No development shall be occupied until the vehicular access serving the development has been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing no 332110699_5501_SK001 rev P03 as amended as part of the s278 agreement and detailed design.

Reason: To ensure the safety of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the access and proceeding along the highway

2 The access shall not be used until visibility splays of 2.4m by 90m to the east and 210m to the west of the proposed access are provided in both directions and maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the safety of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the access and proceeding along the highway

3 The development shall not be occupied until parking areas have been provided in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and the areas shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of motor vehicles.

Reason: To ensure the safety of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the access and proceeding along the highway

4 Parking spaces shall measure at least 2.5m by 5m (with an extra added an extra 50cm where spaces abut walls/fences hedges).

Reason: To provide adequate space for the parking of vehicles and to ensure the safety of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the access and proceeding along the highway

5 The development shall not be occupied until cycle parking areas have been provided in accordance with approved plans and details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and the areas shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used other than for the parking of cycles.

Reason: In order that the development site is accessible by non-car modes and to meet the objectives of sustainable development

6 The development shall not be occupied until turning spaces for vehicles likely to visit the site have been provided and constructed in accordance with the plans/details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority in

consultation with the Highway Authority and the turning space shall thereafter be retained for that use and shall not be used for any other purpose.

Reason: To ensure the safety of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the access and proceeding along the highway

7 Prior to the commencement of development details of the proposed surface water drainage to prevent the discharge of surface water from the proposed site onto the public highway and, similarly, to prevent the discharge of surface water from the highway onto the site shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure the appropriate management of surface water on and adjacent to the highway and prevent an increased risk of flooding

8 Prior to the commencement of development, detailed drawings, including levels, sections and constructional details of the proposed roads, and street lighting to be provided, shall be submitted to the Planning Authority and be subject to its approval, in consultation with the Highway Authority with a view to their subsequent adoption as a publicly maintained highway

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and for the benefit and convenience of the public at large

9 The new estate roads shall be designed and constructed to the Highway Authority's standards with a view to their subsequent adoption as a publicly maintained highway.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and for this benefit and convenience of the public at large

10 No development shall take place, including any ground works or works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to in full throughout the entire construction period. The Plan shall provide details as appropriate but not be restricted to the following matters.

- the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,
- the method of access and egress and routeing of vehicles during construction,
- the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors,
- the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste,
- the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding,
- the provision and utilisation of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders),
- details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the area

Informatives

This Authority's requirements associated with this development proposal will need to be secured through Section 106 and Section 278 Legal Agreements between the applicant and East Sussex County Council. The applicant is requested to contact the Transport Development Control Team (01273 482254) to commence this process. The applicant is advised that it is an offence to undertake any works within the highway prior to the agreement being in place.

The applicant will be required to obtain a permit for any highway works in accordance with the requirements of the Traffic Management Act, 2004. The applicant should contact East Sussex Highways (0345 60 80 193) to commence this process. The applicant is advised that it is an offence to undertake any works within the highway prior to the permit being in place.

In the event that roads are not offered for adoption, the Highway Authority would wish to see the roads within the site laid out and constructed to standards at, or at least close to, adoption standards.

The applicant is advised that as the estate roads are to remain private/unadopted, the Highway Authority would require provisions in any s106 agreement to confirm that the estate roads would not be offered for adoption at a later date and wording included to ensure that the carriageways, footways and parking areas are properly constructed, surfaced, drained and where appropriate lit and that the works are appropriately certified from a suitably qualified professional confirming the construction standard.

The applicant should be made aware that the creation/alteration of this access will require the compliance with the Traffic Management Act 2004 and that the contractor will have to book road space with the East Sussex Highways Network Co-ordination team (0845 6080193).

Due to the nature of the highway in the vicinity of the site, construction traffic could damage the carriageway/verges/footways. The Highway Authority will require the applicant to reimburse their legitimate expenses in making good any such damage. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant should contact East Sussex County Council's Transport Development Control team on 01273 482254 to arrange a photographic survey and joint inspection of the local highway network.

Signed: Claire Warwick

Date: 13 April 2023

On behalf of the Highway Authority
For Director of Communities, Economy and Transport (sent by email)