From: Oddy, Roxanne <Roxanne.Oddy@pins.gsi.gov.uk> on behalf of Team P13 <TeamP13@pins.gsi.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 June 2013 12:55
To: Team P11
Subject: FW: Planning Inspectorate: Ref 2195862: Unit 10, Chalex Industrial Estate, Manor Hall Road, Southwick, BN42 4NH
Attachments: SOC v2.pdf

FAO: Jenni Ball

Thank you

Roxy

———

From: Ian Woodward-Court [mailto:ian@plainview.co.uk]
Sent: 10 June 2013 12:54
To: Team P13
Cc: Oliver Wright; miles key
Subject: Re: Planning Inspectorate: Ref 2195862: Unit 10, Chalex Industrial Estate, Manor Hall Road, Southwick, BN42 4NH

Dear Sirs,

Please find attached our Statement of Case for the above appeal.

Confirmation of receipt would be appreciated.

Kind regards,

Ian

--
Ian Woodward-Court
Plainview Planning Ltd

Phone || 01242 501003 Mobile || 07983 608383

Cheltenham || 5 Strand Court, Bath Road, Cheltenham, GL53 7LW || 01242 501003
Horsham || The Courtyard, 30 Worthing Road, Horsham, RH12 1SL || 01403 330737
London || 1 Warwick Row, London SW1E 5ER || 0203 3769547

Web || www.plainview.co.uk <http://www.plainview.co.uk/>
Twitter || www.twitter.com/PlainviewUK

On 29 April 2013 12:41, Team P13 <TeamP13@pins.gsi.gov.uk> wrote:

<<101 - WR Start Letter - to Appellant 29_04_2013.pdf>>

****

Correspondents should note that all communications to or from the Planning Inspectorate may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMEsweeper for the presence of computer viruses.

www.clearswift.com

****

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) On leaving the GSi this email was certified virus free.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of

problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

PLAINVIEW
PLANNING

Statement of Case

APP/Y3805/A/13/2195862

Unit 10

Chalex Works

Manor Hall Road

Southwick, West Sussex

30th April 2013

Appeal against Adur District Council, Ref: AWDM/1530/12 Notice Issued: 12th March 2013

Ref: 0452/OWIWC/v1

Plainview Planning Ltd, 5 Strand Court, Bath Road, Cheltenham, GL53 7LW
T 01242 501003 **E** info@plainview.co.uk
www.plainview.co.uk

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION **1**

2. LOCAL POLICY POSITION **2**

3. JUSTIFIED LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT SITE **3**

4. PROVISION OF HEALTH SERVICES **4**

5. HIGHWAYS **6**

6. SUITABLE CONDITIONS **8**

7. CONCLUSION **9**

APPENDICIES

AMR 2011/2012 A

West Sussex County Council Commercial and Leisure Land Availability Survey 2012 B

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Statement of Case has been prepared in support of an appeal seeking to overturn a decision by Adur District Council to refuse a change of use application from B1/B8 to D2 (personal training studio)

1.2 This should be read in conjunction with our original Planning Statement and Grounds of Appeal.

1.3 To reiterate, our Grounds of Appeal are:

- The premises has been marketed for a sufficient amount of time;
- The development represents efficient use of a vacant site;
- Long term protection of employment sites is not supported by NPPF;
- The change of use will generate employment possibilities;
- Development of leisure and sporting facilities is backed by local and national planning policies;
- The refusal includes reasons that are based on revoked or out-of-date policy;
- The proposal is not for a typical gym, but instead a personal training centre with an appointment system;
- There will be no adverse impact on highways. The proposed use will not attract HGV or other large commercial vehicles, something the current use requires;
- There is a lack of appropriate D2 floorspace in the local area;
- There are several similar precedents in the local area.

2. LOCAL POLICY POSITION

2.1 The Adur District Local Plan was adopted in 1996. Although preparation has started on the new development plan, it has not been submitted for examination.

2.2 Although the Draft Adur Local Plan was made available for consultation from 19th September to 31st October 2012 it was not a Regulation 18 version. It had been intended to undertake further Regulation 18 consultation on a Revised Draft Adur Local Plan in June/July 2013. However, this has been delayed until later this year.

2.3 The draft Local Plan policy 24 which is alluded to in the officer's report is not likely to be adopted until mid-2015 at the earliest.

2.4 Emerging policy holds more weight the closer to adoption it gets (NPPF para 216). Given the timetable identified above, and the fact that there has been no formal test of 'soundness', we respectfully consider that the emerging Local Plan holds minimal weight at this point.

2.5 The Adur Local Plan 1996 contains no specific policies to restrict the principle of a change of use from B1/B8 to D2. The site is also not bound by any specific allocation.

2.6 In both reasons for refusal, policies from the South East Plan are used as justification. The Secretary of State laid a statutory instrument to partially revoke the South East Plan in February 2013. This was to come into force on the 25th March 2013. The policies stated in the reasons for refusal have been revoked.

2.7 Full weight should be given to NPPF if old local plan policies are not in accordance with these latest national policies (see para 214 and 215).

2.8 We consider that policies AE2 and AE4 are not consistent with paragraph 22 of the NPPF. The local plan policies only permit B1, B2 and B8. The NPPF makes clear that long term protection of employments sites should be avoided without justification.

3. JUSTIFIED LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT SITE

3.1 The site has now been vacant for 19 months.

3.2 The appeal property had been marketed by Oakley Commercial, a reputable local agent with a wide catchment area. The agent states *"considering our extensive marketing campaign and the properties visibility on our own website and more recently social media sites, we are of the opinion that the demand for business units in the area is very low"*

3.3 Oakley Commercial is a very large agency hence why the property is being marketed through them. Oakley Commercial is listed on the Adur Commercial Property Register as a 'Main Commercial Property Agent'. Oakley Commercial has been marketing the property since September 2011.

3.4 Paragraph 22 of the NPPF states "*planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose"*

3.5 The framework is clear, when there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits in having regards to the market signals.

3.6 Furthermore, the latest Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) states that a total of 5.25 hectares of land remains available for employment B1, B2 and B8 use (see Appendix A). This proposal will only change the use of 129 sq m which equates to 0.002% of the stock.

3.7 Finally, given the length of vacancy and lack of other D2 sites available, we consider that the development represents an efficient use of the site.

4. PROVISION OF HEALTH SERVICES

4.1 The Proposal is for a personal training centre and not a typical gym. This entails a lower number of clients, with set appointment times and operates outside normal working hours. We consider that much of this can be controlled by condition if necessary.

4.2 The change of use will allow for the continued employment of 5 personal trainers all of whom are from the local area, and will allow for future employment possibilities.

4.3 The planning system can play an important role in creating healthy communities and the proposal is backed by local and national planning policies;

- NPPF – Chapter 8 focuses on promoting healthy communities.
- NPPF – Para 35 states planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.
- NPPF -Para 17 lists the 12 core planning principles, one of which is to take account of and support local strategies to improve health.
- Adur Local Plan Policy AR7 – seeks to promote recreational facilities in built up areas.

4.4 There is a lack of appropriate D2 floorspace in the local area. The appellant spent a year searching for appropriate premises. No vacant sites had D2 permission, so he wisely only viewed commercial properties that had been on the market for in excess of 12 months.

4.5 On 30th April 2013 we searched the Estates Gazette Property Link for available leisure uses within a 5 mile radius of the local vicinity. No D2 sites were available. The 4 results that were returned related to cafes in Hove.

4.6 It is also telling that all the alternative sites suggested by the Economic Development Officer all required a change of use application.

4.7 In summary, there appears to be no available land for the provision of health services and the appeal site has been marketed for its current use for 19 months. This suggests a clear disparity between demand and supply.

4.8 In the past Adur District Council appear to have shown flexibility when D2 uses have been proposed on industrial estates. We fully appreciate that every case should be judged on its own merits, but equally consistency in decision making is important.

LPA Reference & address	**Officer's report comment**
ADC/0369/10 Unit 2, Chartwell Road, Lancing BN15 8TU **Approved**	CHANGE OF USE FROM CLASS B8 STORAGE TO GO-KART CENTRE *"On balance, weighing the provisions of policies AR7 against AE2 and AE4, it is considered that the benefit to the community of providing the proposed recreational facility, plus the desirability of finding a use for this long-vacant unit, outweighs the loss of business floorspace in this instance."*
ADC/0305/10 Unit 10 Chartwell Business Centre, Chartwell Road Lancing BN15 8TU **Approved**	CHANGE OF USE OF UNIT 10 FROM GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (CLASS B2) TO GYMNASTICS FACILITIES (CLASS D2) *"The proposed development is within the built-up area and would help meet the need for sports and leisure facilities within the District without resulting in significant loss of business floorspace and without detracting from the local environment…. Consequently, although not in accordance with policies AE2 and AE4 of the Adur District Local Plan, having regard to policies AG1 and AR7, it is not considered that the proposal would conflict materially with the policies of the Local Plan"*
AWDM/0375/11 76 Manor Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0HD **Approved**	CHANGE OF USE FROM USE CLASS A2 TO D2 *"The proposed 'non gym' will not operate along the same lines as a standard gym."* (Personal condition applied as LPA considered other D2 uses may not be appropriate).

ADC/0044/11 1 Freshbrook Road, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 8DA **Approved**	TEMPORARY CHANGE OF USE (MAX 3 YEARS) FROM STORAGE/OFFICE (B1/B8) TO A BOXING GYM AND KEEP FIT FACILITY (D2) *"The site is sustainably located within the built-up area and the proposed use would help meet the local need for sports and recreational provision without detracting from highway safety".*

4.9 The above sites were all sourced from the West Sussex County Council Commercial and Leisure Land Availability Survey 2012 (Survey Period 01/04/2011 to 31/03/2012). This document is included in Appendix B.

5. HIGHWAYS

5.1 The second reason for refusal relates to impact on the highway. The refusal states that parking demand generated by a D2 gym would have a material harm on the highway operations and activities of existing users of the site.

5.2 In the first instance the application did not seek to create a typical gym in which users can come and go as they please during opening times. The proposal is to create a personal training studio which operates only between the hours of 6-9am and 5.30 – 8.30pm, and has specific appointments.

5.3 The proposed opening time are outside normal working hours where it is considered the industrial estate will naturally be less busy and more parking will be available.

5.4 There is a currently unrestricted use at the B1/B8 unit that will attract HGV and other commercial vehicles to the area and the access arrangements are existing. There is an opportunity to control the use via condition, with session times, occupancy conditions etc.

5.5 The personal training centre will attract clientele from the surrounding residential area. Clients will be encouraged to arrive by sustainable means, including cycling, walking and using public transport.

5.6 There seems to be no formal objection from the local highway authority, or at least no reference is made to them in the officer's report.

5.7 Furthermore, the NPPF states that *"development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe".*

5.8 A report from Mayer Brown, highway consultants, is included in Appendix C. The key findings are:

(i) The site is suitably located within a residential area, that benefits from a range of infrastructure appropriate for encouraging sustainable travel to the site;

(ii) The net traffic impact resulting from the development proposal will result in an immaterial increase in trip generation to the site compared with the historic use;

(iii) The site access arrangement, whilst noted to be designed primarily for use by industrial uses, is considered to be appropriate for use by new employees and visitors associated with the proposed D2 use. This relates to both new vehicle and pedestrian trips;

(iv) Parking on-site is considered appropriate to cater for the low anticipated increase in demand during peak operational periods. Off-peak, outside of typical employment working hours (8am-6pm), there is considered to be sufficient parking capacity to cater for the introduction of the new D2 use. Additional parking capacity is observed to be available on Manor Hall Road at all times.



It is therefore concluded that the proposed change of use at the site will not result in a significant level of increase in trip generation to the site to the detriment of highway safety or capacity, and the existing site layout and access arrangement are appropriate for the proposed use.

6. SUITABLE CONDITIONS

6.1 The suggested conditions below are based of good practice guidance taken from circular 11/95 Use of conditions in planning permission.

"The power to impose conditions when granting planning permission is very wide. If used properly, conditions can enhance the quality of development and enable many development proposals to proceed where it would otherwise have been necessary to refuse planning permission"

- A travel Plan should be submitted to the LPA which encourages the use by staff and all other users of alternative modes of transport to the motor car.

- The premises shall not be open for use other than between the hours of 6-9am and 5.30 – 8.30pm daily.

6.2 Although we consider a personal condition not to be necessary, the appellant is willing to accept one if appropriate. This would result in the permission not being tied to the building in perpetuity removing the concern over long term loss of B1 (we note a personal condition was used in LPA ref: AWDM/0375/11).

6.3 During the course of the application we also raised the possibility of a mixed use B1/B2/D2 controlled by condition. This is an approach that we have used successfully in London on a number of recent 'change of use' applications. It means that employment floorspace is not lost and increases flexibility for future tenants. In the cases that we

have used it there is normally the following condition and informative on the decision notice:

- If this permission is implemented any further change specifically permitted by this consent must be carried out within a period of 10 years from the date of this permission. **Reason**: To accord with the provisions of Class E, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. **Informative** The applicant is advised that if implemented, the alternative use permission hereby granted gives flexibility of use for 10 years from the date of this permission, After 10 years, the lawful use shall revert to whichever of the uses is taking place at the time.

6.4 It would appear that such a flexible permission is preferable to temporary or personal conditions.

6.5 The government are clearly trying to make commercial changes of use easier given the latest amendments to the General Permitted Development Order. This change in emphasis provides additional support for a flexible permission on the site.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1 This is a genuine case of a small local business trying to invest in the local area. The property has been on the market for 19 months and has generated limited interest from B2/B8 occupiers.

7.2 There is no vacant D2 space in the Adur region, and so the appellant has wisely chosen a unit which has been vacant in excess of 12 months.

7.3 Due to the proposed operating times, the change of use will not increase levels of traffic or pressure on parking provisions within the industrial estate.



7.4 We consider that both the Local and National planning policy support the change of use.

7.5 We respectfully ask that the appeal be allowed.

PLAINVIEW

AMR 2011/2012

Appendix A

Annual Monitoring Report

1st April 2011 — 31st March 2012





Adur District Council
December 2012

Adur & Worthing councils

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

The new employment floorspace completed in 2011/2012 was provided at Ricardos – Shoreham Technical Centre (600sqm of light industrial space), Chartwell Business Centre, Lancing and Chapel Road, Fishersgate (640sqm).

Indicator BD2 – Total amount (square metres) of employment floorspace on previously developed land – by type

Employment type	Total gross 2011-2012
B1 Offices	**0**
B1 Research and development	**0**
B1 Light industry	**353**
B1 Mixed (designed for any B1 use)	**0**
B2 General industry	**154**
B8 Storage & Distribution	**0**
Sui generis (employment uses not covered by the above use classes e.g. motor vehicle sales)	**0**
Total	**507**

As can be seen from the above table, of the 1107sqm of employment floorspace developed in the district in this monitoring year, only 46% was on previously developed land. The 600 square metres of employment floorspace completed at Ricardos was on greenfield land outside of the built-up area. Previous years have generally seen the majority of employment development on previously developed land.

Indicator BD3 - Employment land available - by type

Employment type	Total (ha) 2009-10	Total (ha) 2010-11	Total (ha) 2011-12
B1 Offices	**0.15**	**0.11**	**0.19**
B1 Research and development	**0**	**0**	**0**
B1 Light industry	**0.01**	**0.04**	**0.04**
B1 Mixed Uses	**1.19**	**1.09**	**1.09**
B2 General industry	**3.80**	**3.79**	**3.79**
B8 Storage & Distribution	**0.49**	**0.10**	**0.14**
Sui generis (employment uses not covered by the above use classes e.g. motor vehicle sales)	**0**	**0**	**0**
Total	**5.64**	**5.13**	**5.25**



West Sussex County Council Commercial and Leisure Land Availability Survey 2012

Appendix B

CIDS Code	Plan App	Occupier	Address	Floorsace Gain m² (rooms for C1)	MainUse Lost	Floorspace Lost m² (rooms for C1)	Site Area (Ha)
Adur							
Previously Developed Land							
B8: Storage & Distribution							
SW-045-03	SW/0203/11	Unknown (Spa Shop?)	The Pilot Station Road Southwick BN42 4AE	183		0	0.04
			Summary for	**183**			**0.04**
A1: Retailing							
Occupied							
SU-003-09	SU/0437/10	Giant Bicycle Sales/Rentals	Blocks B & C Ropetackle Shoreham	380		0	0.04
SU-053-08	SU/0389/10	Next plc	Holmbush Centre (Homebase) Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham	1030		0	0.10
SU-090-01	SU/0478/10	Pets Corner UK Ltd	120 High Street Shoreham	199	B2	199	0.02
			Summary for Occupied	**1609**			**0.16**
Development Started							
SU-053-09	SU/0316/08	Marks & Spencer	Holmbush Centre Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham	2370		0	0.25
			Summary for Development Started	**2370**			**0.25**
Permitted							
L-075-01	L/0252/10	PDH Garages Ltd	Lancing Manor Service Station Old Shoreham Road (A27) Lancing	90	A1	24	0.20
SU-053-07	SU/0290/10	Tesco Stores Ltd	Holmbush Centre Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham	374		0	0.03
SW-045-01	SW/0203/11	Unknown (Spa Shop?)	The Pilot Station Road Southwick BN42 4AE	250		0	0.04
			Summary for Permitted	**714**			**0.27**
D2: Leisure							
L-052-08	L/0369/10	Formula 1 Karting	Chartwell Road (U2) Churchill Industrial Estate Lancing	3665	B8	3665	0.40
			Summary for	**3665**			**0.40**
Occupied							
L-047-11	L/0305/10	Wickers Gymnastics Club	Chartwell Bus Centre (U10) Chartwell Road Lancing	535	B2	535	0.05
L-089-01	L/0375/11	Bodyshapers of Sussex	76 Manor Road Lancing BN15 0HD	98	A2	98	0.01
SU-007-04	S/U560/11	GYSO Discos Ltd	Former Parcelforce building 79-81 Brighton Road Shoreham by Sea BN43 6RE	2165	B8	2165	0.22
			Summary for Occupied	**2798**			**0.28**
Permitted							
L-033-01	L/0044/11	Adur District Boxing Club	Enterprise House 1 Freshbrook Road Lancing	170	B8	170	0.02
			Summary for Permitted	**170**			**0.02**



Transport Statement from Mayer Brown

Appendix C

Project: Land off Manor Hall Road, Southwich, West Sussex
On behalf of: Plainview Planning
Subject: Grounds of Appeal – Change of Use Application (B2 to D2)
Date: June 2013
Prepared by: Adam Padmore (Bristol Manager)

A. Introduction

In his report, the case officer stated that the introduction of a D2 use in the estate would significantly increase the flow of vehicular traffic and pedestrian footfall, which would impact on existing tenants within the industrial estate. As a consequence of the anticipated significant increase in trip generation, the officer recommended refusal to the application on grounds of substandard access and parking provision.

However, it is noted that no detailed traffic generation and impact assessment was previously submitted as part of the planning application. The information set out below is therefore considered to provide a platform in order to assess whether the change of traffic generation is likely to be 'significant' and ultimately whether any net changes are considered to be 'severe' on their impact on local highway safety and congestion, to a level that should result in a highways objection to this planning application.

B. Site Location and Description

The planning application site concerns a change of use to a unit situated within an industrial estate, on land off Manor Hall Road in Southwick, West Sussex. Within the vicinity of the site, the local area is observed to comprise predominantly residential development, with a number of residential roads/streets accessed via junctions from Manor Hall Road (and Shelldale Road), in addition to footway crossover junctions providing access to driveways supporting detached and semi-detached properties.

The local highway network is considered appropriate for pedestrians and cyclists, and also benefits from bus services and a railway station.

Access

The access road carriageway into the site ranges from between 5m wide adjacent to the junction with Manor Hall Road, to 4.1m on the tangent to the first bend as you enter the site. In addition, the carriageway on the eastern side is abutted by a footway measuring approximately 1m wide. This footway is not raised above the carriageway and only a flat surface treatment demarks the separation between the road and footway. Therefore, the road affectively is offered as a shared-surface arrangement, and at no point does the width narrow below 4.8m, which is the industry guideline (Manual for Streets (MfS)) width considered suitable for a car to pass a large (delivery) vehicle.

In reality, due to the low number of large vehicle movements generated by the existing industrial site in real terms, occasions of conflict caused by passing vehicles on the access road are anticipated

to be highly infrequent, and pedestrians will use the whole of the available carriageway to access the site, but can move onto the footway section if desired.

The internal site layout is observed to be spacious with a wide shared surface estate road, suitable for accommodating all the necessary vehicle movements considered necessary to serve a site of this nature. Pedestrians (employees/visitors) are observed to move around within the site with no conflict with vehicles or site uses.

Visibility

Visibility from the site access junction on to Manor Hall Road is observed to be in excess of 2.4m x 43m, which is considered appropriate for a road restricted by a 30mph speed limit, as set out within MfS guidance. Due to permitted on-street car parking occurring on Manor Hall Road, road speeds are generally observed to be below the 30mph speed limit.

Parking

Parking is observed to be available on-site on an adhoc basis, and typically under-utilised across the site. During periods before the AM peak period (pre-8/9am) and after the PM peak period (6pm onwards), parking capacity on site increases as employees associated with industrial uses depart from the site to go home.

In addition, it is noted that surplus parking opportunities are afforded on Manor Hall Road, where on-street parking is largely un-restricted and used intermittently by residents and visitors to local businesses.

There is therefore considered to be sufficient capacity to cater for the existing land use, plus any increase resulting from an insignificant rise in trip generation to the site. Further details on this are set out below.

C. Trip Generation Assessment

In order to assess whether the reasons for refusal raised by the planning officer should be considered material, in terms of whether the proposal results in a significant increase in trip generation to the detriment of them, it is essential to carry out a net trip impact assessment of the existing and proposed land uses. A full assessment is provided below.

Existing Land Use – B2

Until recently the site has been occupied and operating as B2 land use, comprising a total Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 127sq.m. There is therefore an accepted level of trip attraction to the site, occurring during network peak periods and throughout the day.

In the absence of traffic surveys, a TRICS analysis has been carried out to estimate both the peak hour and daily traffic flows to and from the existing site. A summary of the trip rates and resultant traffic flows are set out in **Table 1** below.

Site Use	Time	Existing Trip Generation – B2 Use					
		Trip Rates			Estimate Traffic Flows		
		Arrivals	Departures	Two-way Flow	Arrivals	Departures	Two-way Flow
B2 (127sq.m)	AM Peak (0800-0900)	0.842	0.267	1.053	1	0	1
	PM Peak (1700-1800)	0.316	1.263	1.579	0	2	2
	Daily Total	**7.579**	**7.896**	**15.475**	**10**	**10**	**20**

Table 1 – Existing Trip Generation (B2 Use)

Table 1 indicates that there could be up to 1 and 2 two-way traffic movements in the AM and PM network peak periods. Throughout the day, the site could also have been associated with up to 20 two-way trips.

Proposed Change of Use to D2 – Personal Training Facility

A change of use at the site would impact on the level and dynamic of trip attraction to the facility. As TRICS has no comparable land use in which to generate an average trip rate for the site, a first principles approach has been adopted to forecast traffic generation, based on staff levels and forecast attendance. Based on the proposed operational periods, an estimate of the 'person' trip attraction is set out on **Table 2** below, which is then subsequently considered in line with anticipated modal split.

Time	Forecast Person Trip Generation						
	Staff / Trainers		Visitors		Combined Flows		
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	Total Flow
0600-0700	2	0	2	2	6	4	10
0700-0800	0	0	2	2	4	4	8
0800-0900	0	2	2	2	4	6	10
Break							
1730-1830	2	0	2	2	6	4	10
1830-1930	0	0	2	2	4	4	8
1930-2030	0	2	2	2	4	6	10
Daily Total	**4**	**4**	**12**	**12**	**28**	**28**	**56**

Table 2 – Forecast Person Trip Generation (First Principles Approach)

Table 2 indicates that there could be up to between 8 and 10 two-way 'person' trips in the AM and PM network peak periods, and a daily total of 56 person trips. Approximately a third of new trips are predicted to occur during the evening in the off-peak period.

In terms of modal split, given the nature of the proposed land use, it is anticipated that a number of both staff and visitor trips will be made by walking or cycling. Also, as personal training sessions will be for no more than a maximum of two people per trainer, it is anticipated that participants will know each other and therefore car-sharing will also be prevalent. For the purpose of robustness, no accounting for car-sharing will made. It is therefore assumed that 50% of staff (one employee), and 25% of visitors (one visitor), will either walk or cycle to the site. A summary of the resultant vehicle driver trips is therefore set out in **Table 3** below.

Time	Forecast Person Trip Generation						
	Staff / Trainers		Visitors		Combined Flows		
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures	Total Flow
0600-0700	1	0	3	3	4	3	7
0700-0800	0	0	3	3	3	3	6
0800-0900	0	1	3	3	3	4	7
Break	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1730-1830	1	0	3	3	4	3	7
1830-1930	0	0	3	3	3	3	6
1930-2030	0	1	3	3	3	4	7
Daily Total	**2**	**2**	**18**	**18**	**20**	**20**	**40**

Table 3 – Forecast Vehicle Trips

Comparative Net Impact Resulting from the Change of Use

Based on the results set out in **Table 1** and **3** above, a net comparison of vehicular trip generation has been calculated and a summary of the results are set out in **Table 4** below.

Land Use	Time Period	Net Trip Impact		
		Arrivals	Departures	Two-way Flow
Existing B2 Land Use	AM Peak (0800-0900)	1	0	1
	PM Peak (1700-1800)	0	2	2
	Daily Total	**10**	**10**	**20**
Proposed D2 Use	AM Peak (0800-0900)	3	4	7
	PM Peak (1700-1800)	4	3	7
	Daily Total	**20**	**20**	**40**
Net Trip Impact	AM Peak (0800-0900)	+2	+4	+6
	PM Peak (1700-1800)	+4	+1	+5
	Daily Total	**+10**	**+10**	**+20**

Table 4 – Net Impact Comparison

The results set out in Table 4 above indicate that the proposed change of use from B2 to D2 would result in an increase of no more than 6 two-way trips in the network peak period, and 20 new trips across the daily profile. This equates to approximately one new trip every ten minutes during the peak hours, and on average approximately two new trips per hour throughout the day. This level of increase in considered to be immaterial, and will not have a severe impact on highway safety or capacity.

D. Summary and Conclusions

This Technical Note has considered the reasons given for refusal by the case officer to a planning application for a change of use (B2 to D2) on land off Manor Hall Road, Southwick, West Sussex.

This Note provides a review of the site location and description of the access arrangement, and also a detailed review of trip generation.

The conclusions of this note are as follows;

i. The site is suitably located within a residential area, that benefits from a range of infrastructure appropriate for encouraging sustainable travel to the site;
ii. The net traffic impact resulting from the development proposal will result in an immaterial increase in trip generation to the site compared with the historic use;
iii. The site access arrangement, whilst noted to be designed primarily for use by industrial uses, is considered to be appropriate for use by new employees and visitors associated with the proposed D2 use. This relates to both new vehicle and pedestrian trips;
iv. Parking on-site is considered appropriate to cater for the low anticipated increase in demand during peak operational periods. Off-peak, outside of typical employment working hours (8am-6pm), there is considered to be sufficient parking capacity to cater for the introduction of the new D2 use. Additional parking capacity is observed to be available on Manor Hall Road at all times.

It is therefore concluded that the proposed change of use at the site will not result in a significant level of increase in trip generation to the site to the detriment of highway safety or capacity, and the existing site layout and access arrangement are appropriate for continued use further to the introduction of the D2 use at the site.

PLAINVIEW
PLANNING

www.plainview.co.uk

contact@plainview.co.uk

Feedback

At Plainview Planning we want to help LPA and Inspectorate staff to process our applications and appeals as easily as possible.

In an effort to improve our documentation and processes, we are inviting feedback from all LPA and Inspectorate case officers via a very short online feedback form. All submissions are anonymous.

Go to **www.plainview.co.uk/submissions** to let us know what you think about our applications or appeals.

Thank you.

Copyright

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Plainview Planning Ltd.