

**Dalton
Warner
Davis**

**RETAIL ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM
MANOR RETAIL PARK**

**STORE PROPERTY INVESTMENTS
LIMITED**

Date: September 2015

Ref: 9349B

Dalton Warner Davis LLP
21 Garsick Hill
London
EC4V 2AU


www.dwdllp.com

Disclaimer

This report has been produced by Dalton Warner Davis LLP (DWD) and is intended for the sole and exclusive use of the instructing client. The report shall not be distributed or made available to any third party or published, reproduced or referred to in any way without the prior knowledge and written consent of DWD. The report does not constitute advice to any third party and should not be relied upon as such. DWD accepts no liability or responsibility for any loss or damage to any third party arising from that party having relied upon the contents of the report in whole or in part.

RETAIL STATEMENT ADDENDUM
SEPTEMBER 2015
REF: 9349B

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES ON PREDICTED TURNOVER.....	2
3.0	SEQUENTIAL TEST	3
4.0	CONCLUSION	5

Revision	Purpose Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
A	Final	SP	SP	SM	SM	10 th Sept
DWD Job Number: 9349B						

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been prepared to support planning applications in respect of land south of the A259 and west of Mill Lane, hereafter referred to as 'Manor Retail Park'. The proposal involves the installation of a mezzanine floor in the retail unit that is proposed to be occupied by Next, together with reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, scale and layout.
- 1.2 Planning permission (A/19/15/PL) was granted in May 2015 for a variation to application A/125/13. The approval included replacements to outline conditions 3, 5, 6 and 8 of the hybrid application and imposed a new dischargeable condition in respect of floor levels (condition 26). The reserved matters application has come forward in accordance with the compliance conditions imposed on decision notice A/125/13 as amended by A/19/15/PL.
- 1.3 On the basis that the hybrid application set a limit on the overall gross external area of the retail development approved, an application has been submitted for full planning permission to install a mezzanine within one of the proposed units.
- 1.4 The purpose of this statement is to provide an addendum to the previous assessment to reflect the following:
 - Submission of reserved matters – there is now greater certainty regarding the split of floorspace and the proposed occupiers and therefore it is possible to more accurately predict the proposed turnover of development;
 - Full application for increased floorspace - to consider the implications of the additional gross external area proposed.
- 1.5 This statement has therefore been submitted to accompany two separate, but related planning applications relating to retail development. We have not sought to update previous assessments in terms of non-retail matters on the basis that the policy framework for the area has not changed since the previous submissions, and the principle of development in this location is well understood.
- 1.6 The scope of this addendum has been discussed and agreed with Arun District Council (and their consultants) prior to submission. In particular it has been agreed that:
 - The retail impact assessment necessitates a re-assessment on the estimated turnover based on the known occupiers and the revised floorspace figures – in the event that the estimated turnover is less than previously tested (taking into account convenience and comparison goods turnovers separately), no further impact work is required;
 - Sequential assessment is required on the basis that the mezzanine floorspace is inseparable from the main unit.

2.0 EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES ON PREDICTED TURNOVER

2.1 The Retail Impact Assessment upon which the A/19/15 application was based provided a robust assessment in terms of the parameters used. The estimated turnover figure was approximately £21 million. The breakdown of turnover was as follows:

- Food - £13.4 million
- Non-food (clothing and footwear) - £5.2 million
- Non-food (bulky goods) - £2.45 million
- Total - £21.05 million

2.2 The Council's retail consultant calculated the turnover slightly differently at £21.43 million (of which £13.44 million is convenience turnover).

2.3 We have sought to replicate the DPDS table below in light of the proposed changes and taking into account DPDS' comments at the scoping stage regarding sales densities:

Component	Net Sales Floorspace	Sales Density	Turnover
Aldi convenience	1,076	£9,000	£9.7 million
Aldi comparison	269	£7,500	£2.0 million
Aldi Total	1,346		£11.7 million
Unit 2 – Bulky Goods	523	£2,500	£1.3 million
Next	1,081	£5,500	£5.9 million
Scheme Total	2,950		£18.9 million

2.4 We consider the attached to be a robust estimate, given the nature of site it is likely that the proposed Aldi unit would trade below company average. For the purposes of the above the following assumptions have been made regarding sales floorspace:

- A net/gross ratio for Aldi of 75% and 60% for non-food units (excluding café);
- A convenience to comparison floorspace split for Aldi of 80% convenience and 20% comparison.

2.5 As the proposed turnover is less than that previously assessed we do not consider that it is necessary for further retail modelling to be undertaken.

3.0 SEQUENTIAL TEST

- 3.1 The Council's retail consultant at the scoping stage agreed that on the basis that the mezzanine floorspace is functionally and physically related to the rest of the Next floorspace that it will be necessary to base the parameters for the assessment on the total GEA floorspace proposed by the Next development – 1,803 square metres.
- 3.2 The table below summarises the sites previously assessed as part of the sequential assessment, and provides an update in light of the current application proposal.

Site	Availability/Suitability	Conclusion
Former Co-op Unit, Rustington	This site was previously noted to be available, however, this has since been occupied by Waitrose and is now considered to be unavailable.	Previously judged to be not suitable, this site is no longer available and therefore continues not to be sequentially preferable.
Chandlers Garage Site	This site was previously considered available within a reasonable time-frame however, it was considered unsuitable for the development proposed.	There have been no changes in respect of the Chandler's Garage site since the previous assessment. This site therefore continues not to be sequentially preferable.
St Martin's Car Park Site	This site was previously noted to be unavailable and unsuitable for comparison led retail development.	It is considered that there have been no developments in respect of the St Martin's car park site that would serve to alter the conclusions in respect of the sequential assessment of this site. The site is considered to be neither available nor suitable.
Rustington Retail Park	This site was previously noted to be unavailable.	The retail park continues to be fully occupied and therefore there is no update in this respect further to the last assessment
Former Waitrose, Littlehampton	This site was considered to be available for retail development within a reasonable time period. However, the site was previously considered not to be suitable for a clothing and footwear retailer owing to its size and the remodelling required in order to	The site was previously considered to be unsuitable for Next as part of the S73 application. Having regard to the increase in the size of the proposed Next unit, it is considered that the proposed unit continues to be unsuitable.

	provide display windows for example. The unit was built as a food supermarket and does not lend itself to fashion occupiers without substantial redevelopment. On the basis of the site constraints previously highlighted we consider that the site would be suitable for a clothing and fashion retailer only in combination with a wider redevelopment as part of the St Martin's car park. Furthermore, Littlehampton has a weak clothing and footwear offer and from this perspective also, without substantial redevelopment the centre is not attractive to retail operators specialising in fashion. Allowing for a reasonable degree of flexibility the site is considerably larger than the proposed Next unit.	
--	--	--

- 3.3 In conclusion therefore it is considered that there are no available and suitable sequential sites that would be available to accommodate the Next unit on a solus basis, nor for the Manor Retail Park development on a cumulative basis.

4.0 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 In conclusion, the proposals are considered to have a lower turnover than that previously assessed at outline stage, and therefore the impacts on nearby centres will be less than previously assessed.
- 4.2 The proposal has been considered against the Development Plan and other material planning considerations. The proposed development is not considered to increase trade diversion having regard to the previous retail impact assessment. There are no sequentially preferable sites that are capable of accommodating the development.