Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge

Analysis of Public Consultation Responses and Proposed Approach for Developing Informal Planning Policy Guidance

1 Introduction

1.1 The Options Report on Foodstore Provision in North West Cambridge produced by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) and with input on transport matters from Cambridgeshire County Council, was subject to public consultation for a six week period between 6th September and 18th October 2010. This report provides a summary and analysis of the representations received and sets out officer views on the proposed response to the representations and the proposed approach to developing the Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG).

2 Summary of Consultation

2.1 The consultation was carried out in line with that approved at the City Council's Development Plan Scrutiny Sub Committee on 13th July 2010, and South Cambridgeshire's Portfolio Holder's Committee Meeting also on 13th July. It involved writing to statutory and general consultees about the consultation, a Public Notice in the Cambridge Evening News on 6th September 2010, an article in Cambridge Matters magazine, which is delivered to all households in Cambridge, and South Cambs Magazine, which is delivered to all households in South Cambridgeshire. The Options Report was available on both Councils' websites, the City Council's Customer Service Centre, SCDC's offices, Cambridge Central Library and libraries in proximity to the sites in NW Cambridge (Milton Road Library and Arbury Library).

2.2 Exhibitions were provided at the City Council's Customer Access Centre, SCDC's offices and Orchard Park Community Centre for the six week consultation period. A Drop-in Event was held at Orchard Park Community Centre on the evening of 22nd September 2010. This was a North West Community Forum event and included an exhibition about the NW Cambridge Foodstore Options Report and an exhibition about a draft SPD on Orchard Park produced by SCDC. Approximately 60 people attended and officers were on hand to provide further information and answer questions. In addition, SCDC's Development Officer discussed the options for foodstores with young people in the age range 11-13 at sessions on the mobile Connections Youth Bus as it toured villages in the district, including Histon & Impington. The young people seemed to find it difficult to engage with an issue that they did not feel was very relevant to them and the main comments made were that they wanted to see foodstores in their local villages.

2.3 In total 172 representations were received. There were 51 objections, 50 supports and 71 comments. The representations were from 41 respondents, of which 25 were private individuals and 16 were organisations or groups.

3 Key Issues for Consideration

3.1 The Options Report included nine questions to be considered by the public. The majority of the representations were in relation to these questions, with just a few linked to individual paragraphs of the document. The greatest number of representations was received in relation to the four foodstore options which were presented in the report:

- Option A – Planned Development Only i.e. local foodstores in each of the three Local Centres (this is the policy baseline situation, with the committed and pipeline floorspace and no further foodstore provision)
- Option B – Two supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net floorspace (1,500 sq m net convenience), one at the University site and one at NIAB and the committed floorspace at Orchard Park.
- Option C – One superstore of 3,500 sq m net floorspace (2,500 sq m net convenience), at the University site and the committed / pipeline floorspace at NIAB and Orchard Park
- Option D – One superstore of 3,500 sq m net floorspace (2,500 sq m net convenience), at the NIAB site and the committed / pipeline floorspace at the University Site and Orchard Park.

3.2 An analysis of the representations received in relation to the four options is provided in the tables below. A proposed approach for taking forward the Informal Planning Policy Guidance is given for discussion. Following this, other key issues that have been raised are discussed.

Option A: **Planned Development Only (this is the policy baseline situation, with the committed and pipeline floorspace and no further foodstore provision)**
Number of Representations: There were a relatively equal number of representations supporting and objecting to Option A. Support – 10 Object – 10 Comment – 2
Summary of Support: A number of representations of support for option A were received from local residents, whom would prefer to see small stores. Issues raised included: • Support for local retailers - supermarket provision will undermine demand for local shops. • Smaller supermarkets will draw less trade away from existing independent

traders.

- Support for independent food stores as they support local workers and produce. Social benefits from a more personalised service which can aid community development and reverse the supermarket culture. They will have a smaller environmental impact and be more sustainable.
- Traffic movements for a smaller foodstore are significantly less than in comparison to a larger format retailer, reducing the overall impact on the highways network.
- 3 smaller shops preferred to encourage shorter journeys by sustainable modes such as walking, cycling and public transport.
- Assist in reducing the carbon footprint of the development as less movement of goods from producers, packers and transport into local stores compared to a supermarket.
- City Council needs to stimulate options for localisation of food sales and production by making it easier for small businesses to start selling local food by offering small units at reasonable prices.

Summary of Objections:
Objections were received from a small number of residents and also from Barrett Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners, Waitrose, Asda Stores Ltd, Orchard Park Community Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, and the University of Cambridge. Issues raised included:

- The Councils must ensure an appropriate level of services to meet the needs of a growing community.
- Small stores are considered to be inconvenient and people need a place to be able to purchase food and basic necessities.
- Need for additional retail provision to serve the North West area as a whole.
- This option does not provide to keep people on the sites; they would then have to go elsewhere for shopping.
- This option would perpetuate the current position in North West Cambridge of expenditure leakage and unsustainable car journeys to larger supermarkets outside of the area for weekly shopping and would therefore not meet the identified qualitative retail need for a bulk food shopping facility to serve this quadrant of the City.
- Objection to the implication that other Options would lead to more localised traffic problems. There may be localised traffic increases but it has not been demonstrated that they would lead to problems for all options. The Retail Transport Study concludes that non-car share modes are better for the other options than Option A, because a large proportion of trips to the new stores would originate from the local area.
- This option would not deliver the size and quality of foodstore necessary to enable residents to undertake a main food shop locally, thus exacerbating problems of expenditure leakage to stores in Cambridge and the surrounding area.
- This option would not deliver a foodstore of 2,500 sq m floorspace for which there is already an existing qualitative need. Option A is not

supported by the evidence base and would be contrary to both PPS4 and PPG13.
- Students and employees based at the University site without access to cars would have no access to adequate retail provision.

Summary of Comments

Comments were received from Madingley Parish Council and Foxton Parish Council. Points raised included:

- Preference for a series of small shops rather than a superstore.
- Option A does not fully meet the identified need.

Analysis:

The Councils acknowledge the support for small shops and independent traders. However, in wider sustainability terms there is a need to provide existing and new residents within North West Cambridge with adequate facilities to prevent the continuation of unsustainable travel patterns to out of centre superstores and it is important to consider whether small shops would achieve that objective.

The Councils commissioned consultants to provide an evidence base to support this work in the form of the Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) and the Transport Study. The SRS has shown that there is both a quantitative and qualitative need for main foodstore provision in North West Cambridge. At present only 16% of all convenience expenditure is retained within the primary catchment area and 5% from the secondary catchment area. This shows that there is a considerable leakage of trade to out of centre main stores. In particular the Tesco stores at Bar Hill and Milton are the main draws, with travel likely to be by car.

Whilst the current planning policy framework for the developments in NW Cambridge is for three local centres with local foodstores, it is recognised that the scale of development is greater than was originally envisaged when the Councils started preparing their plans. The SRS highlights the unsustainable nature of current shopping patterns in this part of Cambridge and the provision of three new local centres just with local foodstores would not stop that pattern of shopping for main weekly shopping, although it would provide for day to day needs. The consultation document identified retail objectives for this work, which include the importance of creating sustainable new communities with appropriate provision of shopping and other facilities within the local centres to reduce the need to travel elsewhere and also to enable the potential use of more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport.

The SRS provides evidence that there is a qualitative need for main foodstore provision as this part of Cambridge is poorly served by main foodstores. This would keep a greater proportion of food shopping expenditure within the local area and on that basis the SRS identifies capacity for an additional 3,791 sq m net convenience floorspace by 2021 in addition to the proposed pipeline convenience (assuming the higher average sales density for one of the major foodstore providers, it would be double this if it was for a smaller format foodstore by a smaller operator which has a lower sales density). Existing shops in this area are mainly catering for top-up shopping, leading to the high outflow of shoppers for main food shopping. The Councils recognise the value of providing a range of local shops in a local centre to provide for day to day needs and there is no intention to change the existing policies requiring the provision of local centres in each of the three major developments alongside whatever size of foodstore is provided. Indeed a specific issue addressed in the SRS was securing provision of the three local centres. Whilst a larger foodstore is likely to have implications for the type of smaller shops in the local centres, there could still be scope for service orientated functions such as hairdresser, estate agent, bank or café and smaller specialist food shops if there is a local market for them.

The evidence is showing that currently a large proportion of the existing population of North West Cambridge are choosing to shop in supermarkets or superstores outside the area and this situation will become much worse with the additional population at the development sites unless adequate main food shopping is provided. The proposed floorspace in Option A would not meet the identified qualitative need for the developments and would therefore lead to more journeys outside the primary catchment area.

The Councils are also mindful of the deliverability of the local centres in the early stages of the development. Experience from Cambourne and Orchard Park show that it is extremely difficult to deliver small shops in the early stages of development and as a result the population does not have any other choice but to travel elsewhere and unsustainable travel patterns are established.

Local shops often rely on passing trade. The local centres are proposed in the centre of the new developments and so there will be relatively little passing trade in the early stages of the development. The development of a main foodstore will prove more of a draw and will help to establish a local centre early in the development to give life to the new community. This will also allow for increased footfall in the local centre and therefore other retail units to be developed which benefit from the linked trips to the foodstore.

The size of stores being proposed in the other options, (particularly Option B, but to some extent the superstore proposed in Options C and D) are still relatively modest in size compared to existing stores in Cambridge and the surrounding area, which can be seen in Appendix 1 of the Options Report. They are intended to meet the qualitative and quantitative demand in North West Cambridge and not to draw a significant number of car borne trips from outside the area. Other areas of the City already have good access to existing main foodstores.

The Councils believe that Option A would not provide those without cars, particularly on the University site, with access to adequate food retail

provision. It is acknowledged that a high number of students and employees based on the University site will not have access to cars and therefore need adequate main food retail provision within walking and cycling distance. The SRS looks at the potential impact of new main foodstores on existing centres. It states that a main foodstore is most likely to impact on other similar foodstore facilities as people change their main food shopping destinations. The SRS also looks at local centres in the area. The centres most likely to be affected are Histon Road Local Centre and Histon and Impington Rural Centre. Health checks of these centres show that they are vital and viable centres. Within Histon Road Local Centre the greatest impact is likely to be on the Aldi, Iceland and Co-op stores. These are currently performing well and as such the SRS states that there would not be an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the local centre. The stores in the Histon and Impington Rural Centres serve a local top-up shopping function and this role is unlikely to change or be reduced by the provision of main-food shopping facilities in the North West of Cambridge, and hence the stores will still be a viable and vital service to these local settlements.
Proposed Approach: It is proposed to reject Option A for the reasons set out above. However, the objective remains to deliver a range of small shops in each Local Centre alongside the anchor foodstore. Opportunities could be explored with the developers in the detailed design of the Local Centres for designing space for outdoor temporary markets (also see section on local food producers later in the report).

Option B: **Two supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net floorspace - one at the University site and one at NIAB, and the committed floorspace at Orchard Park.**
Number of Representations: This option attracted the greatest number of representations in support. Support – 16 Object – 5 Comment – 1
Summary of Support: Support was received from local residents and Stratfield Close and Tavistock Road Residents Association, Cambridgeshire County Council, Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd, Cambridgeshire County Council Liberal Democrat Group, County Councillor for Castle Ward, Foxton Parish Council, University of Cambridge, Orchard Park Community Council, Lidl UK, and Asda Stores Limited. Issues raised included: • Support for Option B as the most sensible form of provision, providing easy access for non-car modes and choice of retail stores. Also this option would

be easier to incorporate into the design of the local centres than a superstore (Option C and D).

- This option allows for better design integration with the Local Centre allowing for other retail and local centre uses. The Local Centre at the University site will provide an amenity and social focus for the community both visually and in terms of activity. A supermarket of 2,000 sq m net would allow for a number of small shops to be provided in the local centre, adding to the variety, sense of place and creating linked trips.
- Impact of comparison goods on the viability and vitality of other existing centres could be met by an 80% convenience 20% comparison floorspace breakdown. Limited Assortment Discounter stores (LADs) (eg Lidl) could meet this threshold without impact on the vitality and viability of existing centres.
- This size of supermarket would be adequate to address the needs of the community and would attract a range of smaller shops offering a greater range of products.
- The option would provide for the retail needs in the NW quadrant, including the future developments on the University and NIAB land.
- It will provide a good choice of where to shop and will not be too dominant on the local area and therefore less likely to prevent local businesses from starting up. This should stop people travelling out of the local area and provides the best balance in economic, social and environmental sustainability terms.
- Would promote a balanced distribution of stores in the three centres, with no one centre dominant.
- Option B would prevent one large operator having a monopoly on the area and would be most convenient for people living in the new developments.
- Support for this option as the superstores (Options C and D) are likely to provide more comparison shopping that will compete directly with the City Centre and will not meet the overall policy objective of North West Cambridge to provide facilities to meet the needs of the new and existing population.
- Support for option B as the most viable and sustainable option, more emphasis should be given to access by non-car modes of transport. This option is the most sensible and far better than the superstores suggested in Options C and D. Agreement that Orchard Park does not need more than the planned provision due to the nearby Tesco Milton and Histon Road shops.
- The proviso for two supermarkets of 2,000sqm net is that very nearly all of the space will be used for convenience goods. National supermarket operators have revealed that for a store of this size very little space would be comparison.
- Need for provision of a local centre at Orchard Park. The provision of medium foodstores at both NIAB and the University site will meet the shopping needs of those developments as well as together meeting the unmet retail provision for North West Cambridge area as a whole.
- Whilst stores of this scale are unlikely to meet all of the main food shopping needs of each urban expansion area they would provide residents with a viable local shopping destination and reduce the current loss of expenditure

from NW Cambridge, primarily to competing out of centre destinations. This would encourage more localised shopping trips, allowing the use of sustainable modes. This option represents a positive response to the qualitative and quantitative need identified for increased foodstore provision in the area. • Justified approach as compared to a centre anchored by a major food retailer who will draw trade from throughout the City. It helps promote the idea of smaller more centralised discount retailers, who provide a smaller yet essential offering which is underrepresented in the City. • Option B is considered to be more self sufficient as a local centre development, and should have less impact on the local highway network. • Supermarket sized stores would lead to more localised trips with shorter journey distances and enabling travel by sustainable modes, including cycling and walking, and lower carbon emissions from travel compared with a superstore or small supermarket. • The University development will have significantly less car use than other developments, a result of the nature of the occupiers on site and the requirements of planning and the University policy. It is important to provide local access to a store which is able to cater for more than top up shopping. The Atkins Transport Study supports this and demonstrates that the internalisation of trips is greater under the tests that include a foodstore on the University site. • Do not believe that Option B would create vehicle travel distances of a significantly great disadvantage. The differences between the options test and planned scenario are very small – Atkins Transport Study. • This option would lead to having less vehicular traffic into and out of the sites, when compared to the other options.
Summary of Objections: Objections were received from local residents and Barrett Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners and Lidl UK. Issues raised included: • Support for local retailers ahead of supermarkets, as the supermarket will mean that local traders are unable to compete on price. • Not large enough for a full weekly/family shop which would still need to be done elsewhere, these supermarkets are too small and therefore inconvenient. • This option means that a considerable quantitative and qualitative need for a main food store in NW Cambridge will remain. Paragraph 3.61 of the Supplementary Retail Study highlights the qualitative need for 'large format foodstore provision within North West Cambridge'. This option would not meet the need and therefore perpetuate the current unsustainable travel patterns within the area. • The two retailers should operate from the differing ends of the retail spectrum. To provide two similar operators would miss an opportunity to provide an alternative food-shopping destination such as a Limited Assortment Discount store. The range and numbers of goods could be restricted by a local unilateral agreement.

Summary of Comments One comment was received from a local resident, which stated that Option B was the second most preferable choice after Option A as it would keep the store size smaller and localised.
Analysis: There is considerable support for this option from the local community and other organisations, notably the University of Cambridge who are the developer of one of the sites in the North West of Cambridge where one of the two supermarkets would be located. The Councils agree with many of the comments in support. The size of store proposed in Option B will be easier to design into the creation of successful local centres. This option provides an anchor store that will cater for the food needs of the community, but will also enable the development of other shops and services in the local centre such as banking, estate agents, hairdressing, café etc. This combination will lead to a more vibrant centre. The supermarkets proposed under Option B will provide mainly for convenience or food products and not non-food, which would be found in a superstore. The Councils want foodstores in Local Centres in these locations to mainly cater for food needs and not detract from the sale of non-food items such as books, clothes and electrical items, which are found in the City Centre. A store of around 2,000 sq m net is in design terms easier to wrap and cap into the local centre than a significantly larger store. Another advantage is that a store of this size would require less car parking spaces than the superstores in options C and D. The two stores would create a choice of foodstore providers between the centres and provide options for residents of the existing and new communities. Having two supermarkets, each within the local centre at the heart of the larger new communities, would reduce the distance residents would need to travel to access one of the stores and could encourage more trips by walking and cycling. The store at NIAB would provide an alternative for residents of Orchard Park to Milton. The evidence in the Transport Study also shows that whilst the two supermarkets would each have smaller catchments than a larger store, having two stores each with their own catchment, maximises the number of residents that are close to a store, which presents greater opportunities for non-car travel. However, it does also say that this is because the size of the two stores means that they are more likely to be used for top-up shopping as opposed to the superstore options which would claw-back a greater number of main food trips to within NW Cambridge, which would typically be by car. Option B (which is Test 4 in the Transport Study) comes out as marginally the favoured option in the Transport Study, although there is very little difference between the options. The main issue with this option is whether it will adequately address the main

food shopping needs of North West Cambridge. The Supplementary Retail Study does state that stores of 2,000 sq m net are unlikely to satisfy the qualitative need for main food shopping and to fully compete with the existing main foodstores in the City. However, it goes on to say that it is possible that the market could respond by providing large supermarkets of this size given the recent trend to be more flexible over the size of provision (paragraph 4.68). The SRS states that two stores of this size will meet much but not all of the main food shopping needs in North West Cambridge. The stores would be closer in size to that contemplated in local centres and there would be a more balanced provision of foodstores in the three local centres. Further discussion about the most appropriate provision of floorspace and the amount of convenience / comparison split is provided in Section 4 of this report below. It is important to be aware that one of the potential problems with allowing two stores is that both operators may want to extend their stores in the future. However, any such proposals would have to be judged on the individual planning merits of the scheme at the time, and have regard to the SRS or any more up to date evidence that the Councils may have produced and detailed retail assessments accompanying the planning application. The Options Report highlights that in terms of building a highly sustainable building, it is better that stores are not extended as this could affect the sustainability measures in place such as use of natural daylighting and encroach upon landscaping, cycle parking or recycling facilities.
Proposed Approach: Take forward Option B, two stores of 2,000 sq m net floorspace, one at the University site and one at NIAB, into the Informal Planning Policy Guidance as the preferred approach to foodstore provision in North West Cambridge. The majority of the floorspace should be for the sale of food (convenience floorspace).

Option C: **One superstore of 3,500 sq m net floorspace at the University Site, and the committed / pipeline floorspace at NIAB and Orchard Park.**
Number of Representations: This option has a large number of objections and little support. The greatest numbers of objections are in relation to this option and Option D. Support – 3 Object – 14 Comment – 1
Summary of Support: Support was received from one local resident, Asda Stores Limited and William Morrisons Supermarkets. Issues raised included: • This option would deliver a main foodstore which would be able to compete

effectively with other main foodstores in the City. The superstore would meet main food shopping needs and would reduce the propensity to travel by car outside the North West Cambridge Area. Leakage of expenditure from the core catchment area would significantly reduce.

- Foodstore would be of a scale to be commercially viable and could compete with existing provision and would provide additional consumer choice.
- Primary importance should be to support present food shopping centres along Histon Rd including the post office & pharmacy. The pipeline convenience development at NIAB should be of a high quality design and meet BREEAM standards.
- The location of a superstore on the University site will serve a greater area west of the site and should have provisions to expand at a later date. The superstore and pipeline convenience developments should preferably be different brands.

Summary of Objections:
Objections were received from a number of local residents (many who supported either Option A or Option B) and also Stratfield Close and Tavistock Road Residents Association, Cambridgeshire County Council, County Councillor for Castle Ward, University Superannuation Scheme Ltd, Foxton Parish Council, Orchard Park Community Council, Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners. Issues raised included:

- Would be over-developed and out of scale, better provision can be delivered through a selection of local retailers and market space. The associated car parking would take up too much land, thus threatening community facilities and leading to increased housing densities on site.
- A superstore on one site would not be convenient for residents of the other sites.
- Would attract more traffic and lead to congestion. This would not solve the problem of car movements between the two sites as people would need to transport a weekly shop by car. It is unsustainable.
- There is no need to sell non-food items.
- Is inconvenient and unsuitable for residents.
- The option is appropriate to meet the qualitative need, however a store located on the NIAB site would be more convenient, serve residents needs better and provide more sustainable communities and shopping patterns.
- It would dominate retail provision within the site and impact on planned sites at Orchard Park & NIAB.
- It would conflict with the need for self-sufficient flourishing local centres and adversely affect small businesses that would be unable to compete on price.
- Superstores are more likely to include comparison shopping which will compete directly with city centre provision and will therefore not meet the policy objectives for NW Cambridge.
- It will not meet the overall objectives set out in the adopted and emerging policy for NW Cambridge.

- Shopping patterns will depend on which supermarkets are provided, as many have strong preferences for particular retailers.
- It would be difficult to incorporate this option into the design of a local centre.
- Hiring bike trailers will not solve the transport issue.

Summary of Comments:

The University of Cambridge made a comment on this option as they support Option B. They comment that if the Councils are minded to support the provision of a superstore, then it should be at the University site because the site is poorly provided for by existing main foodstores, the site has good and proposed accessibility by sustainable modes of transport, the site is centrally located to West Cambridge and NIAB via an integrated public transport and vehicle route, the University has a higher level of trip internalisation, and the University site has a higher housing density than other sites particularly around the Local Centre which will enable travel by sustainable modes.

Analysis:

There is support for the larger sized superstore from two of the national supermarket operators Asda and Morrisons. Their comments apply to both Options C and D and neither has expressed an opinion as to which site they prefer.

The University of Cambridge support Option B, but have commented that if the Councils are minded to support the provision of a superstore, then it should be at the University site for a number of reasons.

The majority of representations are however in objection to the size of the superstore and also to its location at this site (notably from Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners).

The evidence in the SRS shows that this size of store would provide the 'best fit' in terms of meeting the qualitative and quantitative need for convenience retail floorspace. However, it is not the only option and Option B is also an alternative way of providing the floorspace. An advantage of the single larger superstore over the two supermarket option is that the superstore would be able to compete effectively with other main foodstores in the City, being of a similar size and thus having a similar range of goods. Therefore there would be less need for people to travel elsewhere to access the full range of products available in a superstore, although brand loyalty will always affect customer behaviour.

The objections talk about the dominance of one of the centres and that it would not be convenient for residents of the other two developments. The dominance of one of the centres would be of concern to the Councils as it may make it difficult to establish or maintain viable Local Centres at the other two sites. It may be difficult to find operators for the pipeline stores if they would be in direct competition with a superstore. This could also put at risk

the viability of other small shops and community facilities in the local centres, which would not benefit from linked trips. There is also opposition to selling of non-food goods which would be found in a superstore. The Councils' objectives for foodstore provision in NW Cambridge set out in the Options Report are to provide a retail offer for main food shopping, and not comparison goods which should be located in the City Centre. Therefore the Councils prefer an option where the majority of floorspace is convenience with only very limited comparison floorspace, as in the two supermarket option in Option B. The only consideration is whether the amount of floorspace provided for convenience shopping in Option B would be sufficient to provide the range of goods and products necessary to carry out a main weekly food shop. The Councils also agree with the objections that it would be more difficult to incorporate a superstore and its associated parking into the design of a Local Centre, as highlighted in the Options Report. Barrett Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners support this size of store but argue that this site is less suitable than Option D where the store is located on the NIAB site. The reasons they give are that the site is less centrally located within the North West Cambridge quadrant and would not adequately serve the majority of the new and existing population within the quadrant, particularly given the low population density currently residing within the western part of the City. They also state that the potential for improving the food shopping situation for existing residents is of equal importance to the future schemes and that NIAB 1 is much further along the planning process (outline planning permission subject to finalising section 106 agreement) than the University site which doesn't have any planning status at the moment and as such the deliverability is more open to question. They go on to state that the University site is located away from the majority of the existing residents in NW Cambridge and would thus not act to reduce the level of car borne trips.
Proposed Approach: To not take forward this option into the IPPG for the reasons set out above relating to the size of the store.

Option D: **One superstore of 3,500 sq m net floorspace at the NIAB Site, and the committed / pipeline floorspace at the University Site and Orchard Park.**
Number of Representations: This option has a large number of objections and some support. The greatest number of objections are in relation to this option and Option C. This option has more support than Option C.

Support – 8 Object – 13 Comment – 0
Summary of Support: Support was received from local residents, Asda Stores Limited, William Morrisons Supermarkets, Waitrose and Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners. Issues raised included: • This option would deliver a main foodstore which would be able to compete effectively with other main foodstores in the City. The superstore would meet main food shopping needs and would reduce the propensity to travel by car outside the North West Cambridge Area. Leakage of expenditure from the core catchment area would significantly reduce. • Foodstore would be of a scale to be commercially viable and could compete with existing provision and would provide additional consumer choice. • There is a need for a large supermarket in this area as the local shops are small and limited in their offer. A superstore would help the elderly and car-less to purchase good value shopping and less traffic would travel to destinations further a field such as Milton and the Beehive Centre. • This option would be most central to the different developments and convenient to existing residents. Smaller outlets would not remove the need to travel to other larger supermarkets for a good selection of products. • There is a need for this in the Arbury/Kings Hedges area, so put it on the NIAB site and towards the Northern edge and ensure enough car parking. • Both superstore options would be commercially viable and provide an appropriate and sustainable level of retail development to meet the needs on the growing population. • Car parking requirements should be balanced against design objectives of the Local Planning Authority and wider local centre provision. • This is the best location qualitatively to serve the new and existing population. The size of the superstore located on the NIAB site should be limited to 2,323sqm net sales (25,000 sq feet). • The NIAB site is the most appropriate location for this option as it is the most centrally located and accessible to the new and existing population within the catchment
Summary of Objections: Objections were received from a number of local residents (who supported either Option A or Option B) and also Stratfield Close and Tavistock Road Residents Association, Cambridgeshire County Council, County Councillor for Castle Ward, University Superannuation Scheme Ltd, Foxton Parish Council, Orchard Park Community Council, University of Cambridge and Histon and Impington Parish Councils. Issues raised included: • Do not support big name supermarkets; local retailers and market space could offer better provision. Any big name supermarket would make it impossible for local retailers will not be able to compete on price. • There is no need/demand for a large superstore. Another store like Bar Hill

would be a disaster and unnecessary.

- Will impact adversely on noise and air quality.
- It would be difficult to incorporate this option into the design of a local centre.
- The proposal is in conflict with the need for a self-sufficient flourishing local centre and would affect the ability to attract smaller retailers. As NIAB1 and NIAB extra will be located off Histon Road a larger foodstore on either of these may affect the viability of the local centre at Orchard Park.
- Provision of a superstore would undermine the potential to create an attractive local centre at the NIAB site.
- Orchard Park is close to Milton Tesco and therefore does not need more foodstore provision.
- Superstores are more likely to include comparison shopping which will compete directly with city centre provision. It will not meet the overall objectives set out in the adopted and emerging policy for North West Cambridge, which seeks to provide facilities, which meet the needs of the existing population.
- This would represent overdevelopment and be out of scale, the associated car parking would take up to much land thus threatening community facilities or leading to higher housing densities. There is no need for a store selling non-food items.
- A small budget retailer or independent store would be inadequate at the University's site.
- The NIAB site does not have student housing or the same level of employment generation and daytime uses as the University site.
- A superstore will attract shoppers and therefore vehicles from outside the development. The traffic study concentrates on carbon reduction from the shortening of trips, rather than considering the increase in movement from the northern edge of the city. Would affect traffic flows on Histon Road and on Histon and Impington.
- This size of store on either site would not solve the unsustainable problems of car movements between the two sites, as people would be unable to carry shopping manually.
- A phased approach to provision of a superstore would not be as sustainable.
- This option assumes that the turnover of the small supermarket on the University site would only have a sales density to support a budget retailer or independent store. Provision of that type would be inadequate given the resident population of 6,500 plus 2,000 students and 6,300 employees. NIAB does not have the same level of student housing and employment generation and day time uses, thus trips would have to be made to NIAB.
- NIAB has a lower level of trip internalization than the University site, the University site is well placed to encourage pass by trips from Huntingdon Road.
- The Transport Study states that lower average trip costs and car mode shares can be achieved where development density is higher. NIAB has a lower density than the University site around the respective local centres, with less opportunity to reduce trip costs and car mode shares when compared to the University site.

Analysis: There are a few more representations of support for this option than Option C from local residents whom would find it convenient to have a superstore and to have it located on the NIAB site. There is also support from Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners who are the developers of the NIAB site. They have submitted a report in support of their representation which goes into a lot of detail. In summary they believe that this size of store would meet the identified need for main food shopping facilities in NW Cambridge. They say the NIAB site is more suitable because it is centrally located and most accessible to both the new and existing population within the catchment, it can physically accommodate the floorspace in a satisfactory manner, it is deliverable with clear interest from supermarket operators. Waitrose also support this site, but have specified that the size of the superstore should be limited to 2,323sqm net sales and 3,531 sq m gross. A counter argument is provided by the University of Cambridge which states that the NIAB site does not have student housing or the same level of employment generation and daytime uses as the University site. Option D would result in trips from the University site to NIAB as the pipeline supermarket at the University site would be inadequate to support 6,500 residents, plus 2,000 students and around 6,300 employees. There is a similar level of objection to this option as for Option C, many of which are from local residents and are exactly the same as those made to Option C in relation to the size of the superstore and its dominant effect and the preference for local shops. With regards to the size of the store the same analysis for Option C above applies and the Councils would have concerns about the deliverability of the other Local Centres, the successful integration of a superstore into the design of a Local Centre and the proportion of non-food goods provided in a superstore.
Proposed Approach: To not take forward this option into the IPPG for the reasons set out above (and provided under Option C) relating to the size of the store.

4 Other Issues Raised

Floorspace

4.1 Several representations have been received about floorspace levels under all of the Options. A summary is provided below:

- The University of Cambridge have said that in discussion with national retailers a 2,000 sq m net store would be primarily for the sale of convenience goods with a very small element of comparison goods, depending upon the operator. Also that supermarket operators will only start to offer comparison goods in stores of a minimum of 2,500 sq m net.

- The University of Cambridge are proposing to include a 2,000 sq m net floorspace foodstore in their outline planning application, with the intention that nearly all of that space will be for convenience retail, without any significant provision of comparison retail.
- Waitrose Limited support a store on the NIAB site and have stated that this should be limited to 2,300 sq m sales (net) and 3,500 sq m gross.
- Asda Stores Limited support Options C and D which proposes one superstore of 3,500 sq m net. However, they also see the merit of Option B, while acknowledging it is unlikely to meet all of the main food shopping needs of the urban expansion areas, the two supermarkets would provide residents with a viable local shopping destination and would help to reduce the loss of expenditure to competing out of centre destinations.
- William Morrisons Supermarkets support Options C and D because they say that in order for a foodstore to function properly it needs to be of a sufficient scale to be commercially viable in competing with existing provision.
- Barrett Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners state that supermarket operators have made it clear that a minimum of circa 2,500 sq m net convenience floorspace is essential to enable them to effectively compete against the existing stores in the area. They therefore support Option D. They also refer to the fact that the extent of comparison floorspace whilst varying between operators is likely to be generally lower than currently envisaged under Option D. They have therefore also put forward an alternative option, which they state is based on Option D but with more realistic and consistent assumptions regarding the comparison floorspace element. This is a net convenience floorspace of 2,500 sq m (the same as Option D), but a net floorspace of only 3,000 sq m (less than the 3,500 sq m in Option D) and a corresponding lower gross floorspace of 4,500 sq m (5,500 in Option D).
- Lidl UK stress that discounter stores such as Lidl (which are classified as Limited Assortment Discounters (LAD)) have different characteristics to other supermarkets. They state that Lidl stores are strictly 80% convenience and 20% comparison floorspace levels, have only one HGV delivery per day and therefore less traffic impact than other supermarket operators. They also state that there is evidence that a LAD format store does not compete with existing centres due to the level of offering and range of goods sold.
- The Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd supports Option B, and is keen that there are restrictions on the level of comparison floorspace to protect the City Centre from large comparison retail development, which would be contrary to PPS4.

4.2 With regards to the split of 75% convenience to 25% comparison used in the SRS for supermarket sized stores of 2,000 sq m net, the Councils agree that this does seem to be a high level of comparison floorspace for stores of this size, which is likely to be more appropriate for a larger store. When compared to similar sized stores in Cambridge the level is in the region of 90% to 95% convenience to 5% to 10% comparison floorspace split. The quantitative calculations in the SRS were based solely on the need for convenience floorspace giving a figure of 1,500 sq m convenience floorspace. To give a net floorspace, an amount of comparison floorspace was added using the 75:25 split, ie 500 sq m of comparison floorspace giving a total of 2,000 sq m net. Using the SRS figures for convenience floorspace and applying a 95:5 convenience: comparison ratio, would give 1,600 sq m net for both stores. However, this would give a store more similar in size to the proposed pipeline stores in Option A, and would therefore not satisfy the qualitative or quantitative need.

4.3 The alternative is to use the 2,000 sq m net figure for the supermarkets in Option B, which was put forward in the Options Report, but to assume that nearly all of this would be for convenience floorspace, therefore giving a slightly larger amount of convenience floorspace than identified in the SRS. The SRS indicates (at paragraph 3.93) that the market share retention of 32% from the primary catchment area is a cautious approach and that the PCA share might actually be between 35% and 40% which would further increase the expenditure capacity available and therefore the amount of floorspace needed. It also assumes a high sales density for the new main foodstore (of £12,400 sq m net in 2021), and so if the main foodstore is not occupied by one of the top five main foodstore operators, the sales density may be lower increasing the potential amount of floorspace that would be required to meet the same level of expenditure.

4.4 Considering the representations received and the fact that the quantitative analysis was based upon conservative levels of trade retention, it is considered that 2,000 net is acceptable, with a low level of comparison floorspace. Taking into account the pipeline floorspaces to give a total convenience floorspace across the three sites, this would give a similar total level of convenience floorspace to Options C and D and therefore wouldn't be unreasonable.

4.5 It is therefore proposed that Option B, two stores of 2,000 net, is taken forward into the IPPG as the most suitable floorspace and that the majority of this floorspace should be for convenience goods. It is also appropriate to consider whether there is a case to be less prescriptive on the levels of convenience and comparison floorspace. From the representations received, at this size of store it is unlikely that retailers would seek to have very much comparison floorspace. However, it would be prudent to set out in the IPPG that only a very small proportion of the floorspace should be for comparison goods but to allow some flexibility in the precise proportion because different operators will have different formats. It is therefore proposed that the figures given in the IPPG for the foodstores are total net floorspace figures, but with the requirement that very little of this floorspace should be for comparison goods (in the order of 5 to 10%). The precise convenience to comparison split will be determined at planning application stage and if necessary secured by legal agreement or planning condition.

4.6 The exact amount of floorspace will be determined at the time a planning application is submitted. The SRS identified the appropriate level of provision on the basis of expenditure and converted this to floorspace using general industry standards, but was clear that different operators trade at different sales floorspace density. Therefore the 2,000 sq m net floorspace figure should be regarded as a guide rather than a prescribed level of provision. Whilst efficient operators will achieve the anticipated turnover on this floorspace, or maybe slightly less, less efficient operators may want slightly more floorspace in order to sell the same product range and achieve the same turnover. The SRS used a sales density of £12,000 per sq m. The differences in store operators can be seen in the example calculation below:

2,000 sq m net x £12, 000 average sales density = £ 24 million benchmark

- Waitrose – Average density £11,601 – for £24 million = 2,070 sq m net
- Sainsbury – Average density £9,744 – for £24 million = 2,463 sq m net

Timing and Phasing

4.7 Objections were received from the University of Cambridge and a comment was received from Lidl UK about the phasing proposals suggested in the Supplementary Retail Study. Representations included:

- It is neither necessary nor appropriate to phase the delivery of the two 2,000sqm net supermarkets. It is not considered to be appropriate to hold back the delivery of the second supermarket until the small supermarket at Orchard Park has been delivered.
- Applying the evidence from the SRS and a realistic market share (given the existing trade expenditure leakage), surplus expenditure of £30.9m would be available from the PCA and SCA by 2016. Even applying a high sales density of £12,000 per sq m, this would lead to only a small over supply of floorspace. As the two supermarkets are likely to be operated by different retailers there is no need to defer the opening of either supermarket.
- The Retail Transport Study demonstrates that Test 4 (equivalent to Option B) delivers the highest levels of internalisation. It is important to influence travel patterns at an early stage so that the demand for travel is managed in favour of sustainable modes of travel. This can

best take place where delivery of the foodstores comes forwards at an early stage on each of the sites.

- If the second supermarket is held back, the first foodstore should be delivered at the University site as the AAP requires provision of community facilities at an early stage to ensure the local community has the opportunity to be sustainable. The supermarket is an essential component of the University's first phase of development. The supermarket is required to anchor the local centre in the first phase from the outset, this store represents 15% of the development value of phase one and even with this delivery of a local centre early would result in a financial deficit for the University. The University has better levels of internalisation than NIAB. It is not considered appropriate to hold back the second supermarket until the small store at Orchard Park has been delivered.
- Phasing would not be necessary if a LAD (Limited Assortment Discounter eg – Lidl, Aldi) were chosen as evidence suggests that this type of retail format does not compete with existing local/town/city centre stores due to the level or offering and range of goods sold.

4.8 The Councils agree that if Option B is preferred, the phasing of the two supermarkets suggested in the SRS creates some difficulties in achieving the Councils' objectives for creating vibrant communities in the early phases of the development. It would be difficult for the Councils to phase the delivery of the supermarkets given that there are two sites owned by different developers and there would need to be a decision as to which would come first and which would be held back.

4.9 In addition the supermarket will be in an allocated Local Centre where retail is an acceptable use, albeit that the scale of the two supermarkets would be larger than would normally be appropriate in a Local Centre. It is agreed that by 2016 two stores would only have a slight oversupply of floorspace. The Councils consider that most main food operators would be able to trade at levels slightly below benchmark in the initial years of the developments ie below the company average for that size of store.

4.10 The University state that the supermarket is an essential part of the initial phase of the development. Early delivery of community facilities and the local centre is also important on the NIAB site in the early phases of that development. The value of the supermarket to anchor a local centre in the early stages and create linked trips to other shops and community facilities is acknowledged as being important in creating a hub for the development.

4.11 The reason for consulting on the phasing approach was the advice in the SRS that if the full scale of main foodstore provision was made ahead of 2021, the date on which the assessments were based, it could be difficult for the market to bring forward the small foodstore in the other local centre or centres. With Option B, the issue focuses on whether it would be possible to deliver a local food shop in the Orchard Park local centre if that has not been provided before the two supermarkets on the other sites. Orchard Park is well advanced, there is significant local desire to see the Local Centre provided as soon as possible, and there is planning permission for a Local Centre. It is therefore likely that the Local Centre, including the local food shop, at Orchard Park will be provided before the other developments are at a stage where a supermarket would be ready to be delivered, which reduces the concern around phasing of the two supermarkets.

4.12 It is therefore proposed that the phasing proposal is not taken forward into the IPPG. However, the IPPG will make clear that the Councils' policies are for the Local Centres in all three developments to be delivered as early as possible in the developments to support the new communities.

Local Food Producers

4.13 The following representations and ideas for alternative options were received from local residents:

- Support for small businesses selling food from local sources, as the most sustainable form of food sales. Examples given are the City Centre market, farmers markets in the surrounding villages, retailers such as Daily Bread or the Co-op, and the People's Supermarket.
- Start stimulating options in the localisation of food sales and production by making it easier for small business to start selling local food by offering small units at reasonable prices.
- Indoor market areas with flexible spaces for independent traders and local producers should be considered.

4.14 Whilst the Councils acknowledge the benefits of local shops stocking local produce, ultimately they have no powers of control to be able to condition/enforce this on the operator. With regards to local retailers it will be for the site developers and the open market to decide whom the operators will be. The Councils are unable to control the identity of the retailer through the planning system, other than the Use Class in which they fall.

4.15 The retail evidence base shows that a large number of people shop in supermarkets, and small shops would not adequately support the identified quantitative and qualitative need. However, there may be opportunities for selling locally produced food in other small shops located in the Local Centres or potentially through temporary markets.

4.16 It is proposed that the potential for outdoor market space, such as a square at the core of the local centre where farmers markets could set up which would allow the sale of local food produce, will be included within the IPPG and explored with developers of the Local Centres.

Other uses within a Local Centre

4.17 A number of representations were received from local residents about the other uses in the Local Centres:

- A pub should be considered on the site.
- Support for independent provision (i.e. not as part of a supermarket) of a pharmacy, dry cleaners and cafes.
- The amount of space required for supermarket car parks should be considered and removed from the number of homes, not community facilities.

4.18 The Councils agree that other uses should be encouraged within the Local Centres to ensure that they are vibrant and viable, and a key aspect of the IPPG will be that the provision of main foodstores must be alongside well designed local centres that integrate the foodstore with other local shops. Whilst it will ultimately be for market forces to determine what uses will be viable, the Councils will wish to work proactively with developers to achieve a good mix of local shops to serve local needs. The Councils will also give further consideration when drafting the IPPG to the appropriateness of including conditions on any planning permission for a supermarket to limit the services it provides if this is considered the most effective means of securing delivery of a range of local shops in the local centre, whilst balancing this with the risk of key facilities potentially not being provided in the local centre. In addition, developers will be required to consider the mix of uses and ensure that there are active frontages within the Local Centre.

4.19 The community facilities proposed in the Local Centres will not be removed in order to accommodate supermarket car parks. The IPPG will expect a high quality of design in the Local Centres including the supermarkets and associated car parking and in particular the car parking will be required to make efficient use of land and not undermine the creation of a vital and pedestrian friendly local centre (see sections on Design Objectives and CABE document referred to below).

Transport Study

4.20 Some of the representations received expressed concern over the scope of the Transport Study and that it did not fully assess implications of the Options onto the existing highways network, such as Histon and Huntingdon Roads. Concern was expressed that the Councils have already resolved to grant outline permission for the NIAB development, which include junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads, and how further mitigation measures can be added to the junctions without impacting on more sustainable modes.

4.21 The County Council has reviewed these comments. The Retail Transport Study looks at the overall effects of additional retail in NW

Cambridge (compared to the baseline position) for the primary catchment, secondary catchment and Cambridge Urban Area. It considers all traffic movements associated with the additional retail provision. Therefore the statement that it does not fully consider movements in the northern edge of the city is not accepted. Consideration of the detailed impacts on Histon Road is outside the scope of this Transport Study, however traffic assessments would be required to support detailed planning applications for any foodstore on the sites. The capacity of the access junctions to the NIAB site will be re-evaluated following any decision to provide additional retail floorspace on this site. It is considered unlikely that substantial re-design of junctions will be required should it be decided to provide additional retail floorspace on the NIAB site. Measures to encourage sustainable modes of transport will be retained as part of the junction design process.

4.22 In support of their representation Barrett Strategic and the North West Consortium of Land Owners have submitted a technical report by Colin Buchanan consultancy reviewing the Retail Transport Study. The key points made in this report are:

- A single major food store on the NIAB site is the only option to alleviate the existing traffic congestion. If the current trips to Milton and Bar Hill are reduced or made by non-car modes and not via the A14 this would have a major benefit to congestion on the A14.
- The larger store at NIAB (option D) is considered to be the only realistic option to meet existing and future main food shopping needs and therefore reduce the need for trade outflow trips to other stores beyond the Primary Catchment Area.
- An Area Wide Travel Plan covering 10,000 dwellings in north Cambridge will be implemented by NIAB in 2021 and will aim to reduce car trips by existing residents using the A14.
- A major supermarket could internalise the majority of retail trips in the NW of Cambridge and therefore reduce the need for the Ellington to Fen Ditton A14 improvement scheme.
- The conclusion of the Transport Study appears to have little basis in considering Option B preferable.
- The Transport Study made no consideration of the retail shopping peak, which is at the weekend, and therefore the findings of the study are questioned.
- The SRS study has no basis to suggest that the University site will have better access to public transport than NIAB.

4.23 The County Council have considered the Colin Buchanan technical note and make the following points in response:

- The suggestion that Option D would help alleviate traffic congestion on the A14 is not supported by the Transport Study which indicates that a single large store (Option C and D) located at either the NIAB or University Site has very similar effects with respect to travel distances, CO2 emissions and impact on the local road network. Furthermore the Buchanan technical report suggests that Option D would have a beneficial impact on the A14. However, no evidence is presented to demonstrate this and given the Transport Study conclusions, it is considered that the beneficial effect on the A14 is marginal and not sufficient enough to justify this option. Option C will also have a similar effect on the A14, although preparation of the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan found that it has a different relationship with the A14.

- The suggestion that the larger store options (C and D) in combination with the AWTP would reduce the need for improvements on the A14 is considered over optimistic speculation and has not been backed up by any evidence from Buchanan's.
- The point over the Transport Study not including weekend peak modelling and therefore being open to question is not accepted; the transport study is predicted on information obtained from the Cambridge sub-region transport model, which contains weekday information only. It is considered that as the transport study compares the retail options against a common baseline and that the results of the ranking process would be the same even if weekend traffic conditions had been taken into account.

Design Objectives

4.24 A number of comments on design issues were made in the context of the different options, in particular that it would be easier to design successful Local Centres with Options A and B than the larger superstores in Options C and D. The design objectives set out in the Options Report remain important to ensure the delivery of quality local centres and will be incorporated in the IPPG. This will include the importance of community development and a cohesive approach across the whole quadrant to ensure that the delivery of any one Local Centre does not prejudice the delivery of any of the other Local Centres.

Sustainable Design and Construction

4.25 A comment was received from William Morrison Supermarkets that the sustainable design and construction paragraphs have merit, but should be balanced with the objective of ensuring the supermarket anchoring the local centre is commercially viable (including appropriate parking provision). Reference should be made to the need for design meetings with the Local Planning Authority to discuss the parameters.

4.26 The Councils agree that detailed work on the design of each Local Centre, supermarket and access needs to be undertaken in the context of pre-application discussions with the developers of the major sites, having regard to the particular issues and context for that site. Sustainable design and construction, adequate access and parking, along with a viable local centre is critical to the success of the Local

Centres, and it is proposed that the importance of this is stressed within the IPPG.

5 Other Considerations

5.1 Whilst not issues raised directly in representations on the Options Report consultation, there are a number of other factors that should be considered in deciding the way forward for the IPPG.

Opposition to Supermarkets

5.2 In recent years there has been some opposition from local residents in both districts to national food retailers, in particular Tesco. In Cambridge there was a campaign by residents about the opening of a new Tesco Express store on Mill Road. In SCDC there has been concern from residents of Great Shelford about the opening of a Tesco Express Store in the village centre. In both of these cases, the main concern was the fear that existing small shops would be adversely affected, potentially leading to the closure of small local businesses. Planning control is limited to the change of use of a store, and in both cases the premises were already in use as an A1 shop and therefore did not require planning permission to open.

5.3 At SCDC's Council meeting in November 2010, a motion was approved to lobby central Government to make changes to the planning system by allowing the designation of a Dynamic Local Centre where a local centre is deemed to have the necessary food retail provision to serve their local catchment area, and where movement from a non-food use to a food use in Class A1 of the Use Classes Order 2010 will require planning permission where this would duplicate existing retail services. This would give the opportunity to assess the likely impact of a proposal on the viability and sustainability of the Local Centre. However, notwithstanding the Council's decision, SCDC recognises that it must operate within the current planning framework.

5.2 Although not directly related to the development of the IPPG, as this is involved in the development of new Local Centres and in both cases described above the concern was about existing shops in a Local Centre, there have been concerns from local residents that the supermarkets and particularly the superstores would prevent the opening of other small shops in the proposed Local Centres. This has been discussed above under the four options and the Councils believe that Option B is the best option in terms of meeting identified need, but also creating successful Local Centres that include a mix of uses.

CABE document - 'Supermarket-led development: asset or liability?'

5.3 CABE has very recently (November 2010) published a document relating to supermarket-led development (which can be found at this link http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/supermarket-led-development_0.pdf). The report looks at how local planning authorities could work with developers to create schemes which are commercially viable and enhance the place in which they are built. The report provides examples of recent schemes where there has been effort to create an attractive place, but it also states that the majority of schemes that CABE sees use a standard supermarket model which would be used on an out-of-town brownfield site and simply use this approach in a town centre setting which creates a number of problems. A standard solution often leads to a large rectangular building, with a large car park and a design which bears no relationship to the neighbourhood.

5.4 The CABE report sets out five issues that can help to inform discussions between local planning authorities and developers:

1. Relating the building to its neighbourhood
2. Achieving strong environmental credentials
3. Getting the housing right
4. Creating good public realm and reducing car dependency
5. Planning for the long term

5.5 Many of these issues were addressed in the Options Report and in line with the CABE document, local policy such as the IPPG is the perfect opportunity to set out what will be expected in terms of design quality in order to create vibrant new Local Centres in NW Cambridge.

A14 announcements

5.6 Proposed improvements to the A14 have been withdrawn by the new Coalition Government because they are seen as unaffordable. The Department for Transport announced that it recognised the importance of addressing congestion on the A14 to the continued economic success and growth in the area and instead they will undertake a study to identify cost effective and practical proposals which bring benefits and relieve congestion, looking across modes to ensure sustainable proposals are developed.

5.7 The Retail Transport Study, which was produced by Atkins as an evidence base for the Options Report, was based upon modelling which included the proposed improvements to the A14. There are three principal points that need to be considered when evaluating the retail transport report in the light of the recent A14 decision. These are:

i) The retail study is primarily intended to permit the six retail options to be evaluated and ranked against each other, using a common base-line.

ii) The Highways Agency recognises that congestion is a serious problem along the A14 transport corridor and has stated that it remains committed to developing a solution. It is likely that some form of improvement to the A14 will be introduced in the long term, although the timing and form of the improvements will not be known for some time. It was appropriate for the retail transport report to have considered the "with A14 improvements" situation, but it is accepted that it is not known at this time with any certainty whether the improvements will be in place by the report's 2021 assessment year or whether a different form of improvements may be implemented.

iii) Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 in the report show that there will be very little difference in travel distance, for all retail options, over the primary and secondary catchments and the Cambridge Urban Area. This indicates that vehicle trips associated with the increase of retail provision in NW Cambridge will be retained locally, with little leakage to stores further a field eg Tesco at Bar Hill. It appears that the A14 improvements would not encourage leakage - the non-provision of the A14 improvements would not, therefore, appear to be significant with respect to retail travel distances.

5.8 With regards to the preferred option, Option B, the transport study shows that there would be no noticeable difference in traffic behaviour in the primary catchment area, but that there would be a 1% drop in CO_2 emissions and travel distance in the secondary catchment area (compared to the baseline position). This signifies that there would be no increased ‘draw’ from the supermarkets at the University and NIAB sites (compared to the baseline) and there would be a slight reduction in the volume of traffic travelling further afield (including to Bar Hill on the A14). This effect was predicted assuming the A14 improvements. The cancellation of the A14 improvements suggests that the drop in traffic travelling further afield may increase due to the congested highway network discouraging people to travel on it. However, given the scale of congestion on the A14, it is unlikely that any of the Options being considered will have a material impact / benefit to the A14 corridor.

6 Conclusions

6.1 As a result of the analysis of the representations received and evidence from the SRS and Transport Study. It is proposed that the following points are taken forward into developing the IPPG.

- Take forward Option B, two medium sized supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net floorspace, one in the Local Centre at the University site and one in the Local Centre at the NIAB site, and the small supermarket at the Orchard Park Local Centre.
- Provide floorspace figures just as net figures (ie the total sales area), but make it clear that the majority of the floorspace should be for convenience goods (in the order of 90 to 95%).
- Require that developers demonstrate that there will be a mix of uses with active frontages alongside the two medium and one small supermarkets in the Local Centres to help achieve vibrant and viable Local Centres.

- Do not include phasing which would hold back the development of one of the stores. Instead seek early delivery of the Local Centres (and supermarkets) in all three developments to help deliver supporting infrastructure and assist community development early in the creation of the new communities, whilst making clear that delivery of any Local Centre should not be at the expense of delivery of the others in this part of Cambridge.
- Include the possibility of designing space for temporary markets in the Local Centres to sell local food produce.
- Provide guidance on what will be expected from the supermarkets and the development of the Local Centres in terms of design quality and sustainable design and construction.