

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
PLANNING SERVICES CONSULTATION**

DATE: 25th September 2017

**FROM: Tim Townsend TO: Arun District Council
FAO: Mrs. A. Gardner**

SUBJECT: LU/140/17/PL - Change of use from light industrial (B1 Business) to van sales (Sui Generis).

LOCATION: Unit 9 Minster Court Business Park, Courtwick Lane, Littlehampton, BN17 7RW.

Amendment received.

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 19th July 2017

RECOMMENDATION:

Advice	☐	Modification	☐	More Information	☒
Objection	☐	No Objection	☐	Refusal	☐

S106 contribution total (see below for breakdown): £

This is the second WSCC highways and transport response to the planning application. It follows consideration of additional information provided by the applicant to the LPA.

Appraisal of site for proposed use.

The Highway Authority previously appraised the application site (Unit 9) with main focus on parking provision for the COU. As explained in its earlier report, Unit 9 is one of 10 business units on the Business Park. The site is arranged with the buildings erected along both the east and west boundaries of the site with car/vehicle parking in the centre and to the north of the site.

The applicant is seeking COU from B1 Business Use to car sales (Sui Generis) in Unit 9. Earlier drawings supplied by the applicant and those used to appraise the application by the Highway Authority showed that they proposed to use 22 spaces within the overall car park (not including any on-curtilage parking) and these were shown within red edging on the parking plan (No.'s 28-32, 90-99, 100-105 and 106-110). However, the latest information provided in undated email from Gavin Donnelly to Tom Legg (appended to email dated 12th September 2017 from Stephen Legg to Anita Gardner, Tom Legg and Gavin Donnelly) refers to parking spaces 18-32 and 106-100 as those being allocated and shown on an accompanying plan edged in red. The email then also refers to parking spaces 28-32 and 110-116, albeit with additional reference to those latter spaces being made available on a 'licence' basis whereby they could be removed at short notice.

Firstly the plans are not of sufficient quality to accurately determine what spaces are which and how many are proposed to be provided. Secondly, concern is expressed that some of this parking could – at short notice – be removed from the applicant, thereby reducing what he/they have available to them. Finally, the email does not fully answer all the questions posed by the Highway Authority in its response to the LPA of 19th July 2017 – particularly where it asked about details of parking within the building etc.

Conclusion.

The CHA require sight of a clearer plan showing parking provision that would be available to the applicant for the life of any COU – including that within the building and on its curtilage (including numbers of parking spaces). This should also be clearly marked for the purposes intended – e.g. display/sales, visitor and staff parking etc. and all within the confines of the Business Park site. Also, written confirmation from the landlord stating that the parking spaces applied for will be made available for specific use by the applicant all the time

the site is used for van sales should be provided. Finally, further explanation about the 'licence' arrangements for some of the parking should be provided.

Please re-consult.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
Planning Services