The Planning Inspectorate

An Executive Agency in the Department of the Environment and the Welsh Office

D/524/JBL/P

Room 1404
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line 0272-218927
Switchboard 0272-218811
Fax No 0272-218769
GTN 1374

Mr R V Roberts
Mill Lodge
25 Downview Road
WORTHING
West Sussex
BN11 4QN

Your Ref:
RVR/3335
Our Ref:
T/APP/Y3805/A/92/202768/P8

Date: 9 JUL 92

Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
APPEAL BY: WADES (LANCING) LTD
APPLICATION NO: L/15/92/TP/XX

1. As you know I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine this appeal which is against the decision of the Adur District Council to grant outline planning permission subject to conditions for redevelopment with car showroom and 2 self contained 2 bedroom flats above at 337 Brighton Road, Lancing. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council including those made directly to the Council and forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 26 May 1992.

2. The condition in dispute is No 4 which provides that "No vehicles which are for sale (or awaiting repair or preparation) shall be parked, displayed or stored on the site outside the building hereby permitted and the area in front (south) of the building shall be reserved solely for customer car parking incidental to the use of the proposed showroom and the area at the rear reserved for the exclusive use of the residents of the proposed flats and their visitors." The reason for the condition is "To ensure that adequate and satisfactory provision is made for the accommodation of vehicles clear of the highway".

3. From my visit to the site and its surroundings I consider that the determining issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would lead to unacceptable congestion and traffic hazard on the public highway.

4. The appeal site lies on the north side of Brighton Road (A259) in a generally residential area. Adjoining the site on its eastern side is your client's car showroom and to the west of the site is a newsagents shop. There is a pedestrian crossing and the zig zag road markings extend along the road in front of the site. There is a bus stop nearby. Your client's proposal is for a building with car showroom on the

ground floor and flats above. Access to the flats and to the rear parking area would be via an access on the west side of the proposed building. A parking area would be available in front of the showroom.

5. I saw during my visit that Brighton Road is a well used road with a 40 mph speed limit. There are no restrictions on waiting or loading along much of this section of Brighton Road. There are parallel line markings along the centre of the road and there are 2 traffic lanes in each direction. I noted there was occasional kerbside parking along the road which has the effect of keeping traffic in the 2 centre lanes. The traffic tended to be at or near the speed limit but while road safety is important I consider that the parking of 4 vehicles for sale on the forecourt would not be very noticeable and would be unlikely to distract drivers and so risk causing an accident. In coming to this view I have borne in mind that there are already cars displayed on your client's premises and no indication has been given that these have led to accidents. However I remain concerned with regard to customer parking.

6. The proposal is for a mixed use of the site ie car showroom and flats. Although your plan is indicative only it is clear to me that the site is relatively restricted in size. I consider it to be important that appropriate parking areas are maintained for both the car showroom and the flats to avoid the possibility of cars parking on Brighton Road. If the forecourt area were to be used for car sales there would be no space available on site for customers' cars, with the result that from time to time there would be parking on the highway which could lead to congestion and traffic hazard on this busy road. I therefore consider that the condition is appropriate.

7. The Council suggest conditions specifying the number of spaces to be allocated to the showroom and flats but I consider that this is a matter to be dealt with at the detailed application stage when details of parking are to be submitted for approval as provided by condition 3. I have considered all the other matters raised in the representations but none outweigh the factors that have led me to my conclusion that the disputed condition is justified.

8. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant



R B MUSK BA CEng MICE MIStructE
Inspector