

Appendix B: Foodstore Provision in NW Cambridge - Summary of Representations to Options Report

S - 5155 - 1197 - 1.1 - None

5155 Support

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Orchard Park Community Council welcomes the proposals in the consultation, particularly that the retail provision in Orchard Park should be limited to the local retail centre proposed in the masterplan for the site.

Orchard Park Community Council supports the retail objectives (Question 1) and prefers option B as the more long term sustainable option for North West Cambridge as a whole as well as the three specific sites.

Summary: Orchard Park Community Council welcomes the proposals in the consultation, particularly that the retail provision in Orchard Park should be limited to the local retail centre proposed in the masterplan for the site.

Orchard Park Community Council supports the retail objectives (Question 1) and prefers option B as the more long term sustainable option for North West Cambridge as a whole as well as the three specific sites.

O - 5041 - 1169 - Question 1: - None

5041 Object

3. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Question 1:

Respondent: Chris Brown [1169] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The retail objectives should also include
* Support for local producers and retailers who wish to sell into these populations
* Allow sustainable communities to access local produce and small producers without travelling to access it.
* Allow communities to produce and market their own produce.

Summary: The retail objectives should also include
* Support for local producers and retailers who wish to sell into these populations
* Allow sustainable communities to access local produce and small producers without travelling to access it.
* Allow communities to produce and market their own produce.

S - 5078 - 1181 - Question 1: - None

5078 Support

3. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Question 1:

Respondent: Catherine Belsey [1181] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I agree

Summary: I agree

5114 Support

3. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Question 1:

Respondent: Cambridgeshire County Council (Mrs Kathy Baldwin) [1193]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: In order to create communities which are sustainable in the long term it is important that they should be planned with a sufficient quantity and quality of facilities to enable residents to meet their needs locally as far as possible.

Summary: In order to create communities which are sustainable in the long term it is important that they should be planned with a sufficient quantity and quality of facilities to enable residents to meet their needs locally as far as possible.

5132 Comment

3. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Question 1:

Respondent: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) [230]

Agent: Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Ms Claire Morrison) [1199]

Full Text:

Summary: On the basis that the retail provision in the NW quadrant is aimed at serving local needs, and primarily food shopping, USS considers that the word 'food' should be included after 'of' and before 'shopping'. USS considers there should be more emphasis and controls placed on any retail development within the NW quadrant to ensure that the policy basis and objectives for the area are maintained via the delivery of associated food shopping development to meet local needs.

5175 Support

3. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Question 1:

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207]

Agent: Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]

Full Text: We support the Council's intention to facilitate a level of retail development that will meet the needs of the growing NW Cambridge population. The proposed retail objectives present a strategic framework for sustainable retail development, without being overly prescriptive, and are considered to be broadly appropriate.

Summary: We support the Council's intention to facilitate a level of retail development that will meet the needs of the growing NW Cambridge population. The proposed retail objectives present a strategic framework for sustainable retail development, without being overly prescriptive, and are considered to be broadly appropriate.

5193 Support

3. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Question 1:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Orchard Park Community Council welcomes the proposals in the consultation, particularly that the retail provision in Orchard Park should be limited to the local retail centre proposed in the masterplan for the site.

Orchard Park Community Council supports the retail objectives (Question 1) and prefers option B as the more long term sustainable option for North West Cambridge as a whole as well as the three specific sites.

Summary: Orchard Park Community Council welcomes the proposals in the consultation, particularly that the retail provision in Orchard Park should be limited to the local retail centre proposed in the masterplan for the site.

Orchard Park Community Council supports the retail objectives (Question 1) and prefers option B as the more long term sustainable option for North West Cambridge as a whole as well as the three specific sites.

5208 Support

3. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Question 1:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:****Summary:**

With the following amendments:

To create sustainable communities with appropriate provision of shopping and services, to serve the needs of the new and existing population.

To establish an appropriate hierarchy of centres having regard to the wider retail hierarchy.

To secure high quality of design in centres, and ensure that they reinforce the vitality and viability of the centre and integrate well with the surroundings.

To secure a high degree of sustainable design and construction for the retail units. Seeking to secure BREEAM Excellent or an equivalent.

To maximise the opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use to access the centres by carefully considering the location and accessibility of each centre.

5196 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.15

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:**

A 75% convenience/25% comparison split is not appropriate for stores of 2,000m² net as the supermarket operators would not be able to provide their full convenience core offer. Supermarket operators will only start to offer comparison goods in stores of a minimum of 2,500m² net. There are no examples provided in Appendix 1 of the consultation document to support this position. Of the stores identified in Appendix 1, all of those up to 2400m² net floorspace, and some larger stores, comprise almost entirely convenience space.

Summary:

A 75% convenience/25% comparison split is not appropriate for stores of 2,000m² net as the supermarket operators would not be able to provide their full convenience core offer. Supermarket operators will only start to offer comparison goods in stores of a minimum of 2,500m² net. There are no examples provided in Appendix 1 of the consultation document to support this position. Of the stores identified in Appendix 1, all of those up to 2400m² net floorspace, and some larger stores, comprise almost entirely convenience space.

5146 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.20

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:**

The University agrees that none of the convenience floorspace levels identified in this paragraph would provide a large enough store to meet the main food shopping needs of existing and future residents within the primary catchment area. It is not clear, however, where the 1,625m² originates from. The North West Cambridge Area Action Plan does not specify the figure.

Summary:

The University agrees that none of the convenience floorspace levels identified in this paragraph would provide a large enough store to meet the main food shopping needs of existing and future residents within the primary catchment area. It is not clear, however, where the 1,625m² originates from. The North West Cambridge Area Action Plan does not specify the figure.

5223 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.24

Respondent: Ms Vanessa Kelly [1219]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The current 'less sustainable travel patterns' would be helped by new buses serving the Bar Hill and Milton Tesco stores. Having worked on both the Personal Travel Planning projects in Orchard Park and King's Hedges, I know there are many current residents who would support bus services to supermarkets. Will this sort of initiative be part of the planning for NW Cambridge or will the might of Stagecoach and Tesco/Sainsbury prevent it (financially unrewarding)?

Summary: The current 'less sustainable travel patterns' would be helped by new buses serving the Bar Hill and Milton Tesco stores. Having worked on both the Personal Travel Planning projects in Orchard Park and King's Hedges, I know there are many current residents who would support bus services to supermarkets. Will this sort of initiative be part of the planning for NW Cambridge or will the might of Stagecoach and Tesco/Sainsbury prevent it (financially unrewarding)?

5147 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.25

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Occupiers at the University site are likely to have low car usage as well as low car ownership.

Summary: Occupiers at the University site are likely to have low car usage as well as low car ownership.

5165 Comment (W/drawn 2010-10-20)

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.32

Respondent: Impington Parish Council (Ms Vanessa Kelly) [448]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The Transport Study states that the negative impact on key junctions will need looking at as part of the Transport Assessments for the developments and any 'mitigating measures' would need to be funded by the developments. Outline Planning Permission has been granted for the NIAB development which included the new junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads. How can further 'mitigating measures' be added to these junctions, ie relieving congestion, without impacting on more sustainable modes?

Summary: The Transport Study states that the negative impact on key junctions will need looking at as part of the Transport Assessments for the developments and any 'mitigating measures' would need to be funded by the developments. Outline Planning Permission has been granted for the NIAB development which included the new junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads. How can further 'mitigating measures' be added to these junctions, ie relieving congestion, without impacting on more sustainable modes?

5227 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.32

Respondent: Ms Vanessa Kelly [1219]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The Transport Study states that the negative impact on key junctions will need looking at as part of the Transport Assessments for the developments and any 'mitigating measures' would need to be funded by the developments. Outline Planning Permission has been granted for the NIAB development which included the new junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads. How can further 'mitigating measures' be added to these junctions, ie relieving congestion, without impacting on more sustainable modes?

Summary: The Transport Study states that the negative impact on key junctions will need looking at as part of the Transport Assessments for the developments and any 'mitigating measures' would need to be funded by the developments. Outline Planning Permission has been granted for the NIAB development which included the new junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads. How can further 'mitigating measures' be added to these junctions, ie relieving congestion, without impacting on more sustainable modes?

5204 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE 4.35

Respondent: **Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Mrs A Young)** Agent: **N/A**
[216]

Full Text:

Summary: In 4.35 of the conclusion of the Transport Study, the overall effect is stated as "slight". However there appear to be no specific details of the effect of these proposals on an already overcrowded Histon Road**5205 Comment**

4. EVIDENCE BASE 4.36

Respondent: **Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Mrs A Young)** Agent: **N/A**
[216]

Full Text:

Summary: In 4.36 of the conclusion it is noted that the effect would be the greatest in the evening peak period. Again the effect is considered as "minor", presumably as if you are queuing down the Histon Road of an evening, another fifteen minutes is neither "here nor there". The current Citi7 ten minute service is notoriously unreliable during the evening peak period, with delays of 30-60 minutes happening regularly. No information is provided on the effect on the public transport system out of the city.**5206 Comment**

4. EVIDENCE BASE 4.40

Respondent: **Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Mrs A Young)** Agent: **N/A**
[216]

Full Text:

Summary: The traffic study seems to concentrate more on the carbon reduction from the shortening of trips between the northern and southern sides of the city as an argument and lacks the full discussion of the increase in movements within the northern edge that would ensue. Especially as there does not seem to be any in depth discussion on the effect on Histon Road.

5185 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.47

Respondent: William Morrisons Supermarkets [1210]**Agent:** Peacock and Smith (Mr Steve Buckley) [1209]

Full Text: The sections entitled Design (paras 4.41 to 4.47) and Sustainable Design and Construction (paras 4.48 to 4.56), both appear to have design merits, but allowance should be included to allow for a holistic design solution whereby such issues are balanced with securing the wider objectives of the town/local centre and ensuring that any supermarket which would anchor the centre would be commercially viable (including securing appropriate parking provision). Reference should be included to encouraging/requesting a series of design team meetings to discuss the design parameters be held with the preferred foodstore operator to allow the operator to work in partnership with the LPA and other relevant stakeholders.

Summary: Design and Sustainable Design and Construction Sections both appear to have design merits, but allowance should be included to allow for a holistic design solution whereby such issues are balanced with securing the wider objectives of the town/local centre and ensuring that any supermarket which would anchor the centre would be commercially viable (including securing appropriate parking provision). Reference should be included to encouraging/requesting a series of design team meetings to discuss the design parameters be held with the preferred foodstore operator to allow the operator to work in partnership with the LPA and other relevant stakeholders.

5184 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.56

Respondent: William Morrisons Supermarkets [1210]**Agent:** Peacock and Smith (Mr Steve Buckley) [1209]

Full Text: The sections entitled Design (paras 4.41 to 4.47) and Sustainable Design and Construction (paras 4.48 to 4.56), both appear to have design merits, but allowance should be included to allow for a holistic design solution whereby such issues are balanced with securing the wider objectives of the town/local centre and ensuring that any supermarket which would anchor the centre would be commercially viable (including securing appropriate parking provision). Reference should be included to encouraging/requesting a series of design team meetings to discuss the design parameters be held with the preferred foodstore operator to allow the operator to work in partnership with the LPA and other relevant stakeholders.

Summary: Design and Sustainable Design and Construction Sections both appear to have design merits. However, allowance should be included to allow for a holistic design solution whereby such issues are balanced with securing the wider objectives of the local centre and ensuring that any supermarket which would anchor the centre would be commercially viable. Reference should be included to encouraging/requesting a series of design meetings to discuss design parameters with the preferred foodstore operator and to work in partnership with the LPA and other relevant stakeholders.

5151 Comment (W/drawn 2010-10-20)

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.63

Respondent: Impington Parish Council (Ms Vanessa Kelly) [448] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Given the campaigns against Tesco in Mill Road and Shelford, and the popularity of Cambridge market and farmers' markets in the necklace villages, will there be provision for this sort of alternative shopping in NW Cambridge? Perhaps the People's Supermarket could be persuaded to open a branch on one of the three sites? See article: <http://www.ameliasmagazine.com/earth/the-peoples-supermarket-a-new-approach-to-food-shopping/2010/06/14/>

Summary: Given the campaigns against Tesco in Mill Road and Shelford, and the popularity of Cambridge market and farmers' markets in the necklace villages, will there be provision for this sort of alternative shopping in NW Cambridge? Perhaps the People's Supermarket could be persuaded to open a branch on one of the three sites? See article: <http://www.ameliasmagazine.com/earth/the-peoples-supermarket-a-new-approach-to-food-shopping/2010/06/14/>

5225 Comment

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.63

Respondent: Ms Vanessa Kelly [1219]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Given the campaigns against Tesco in Mill Road and Shelford, and the popularity of Cambridge market and farmers' markets in the necklace villages, will there be provision for this sort of alternative shopping in NW Cambridge? Perhaps the People's Supermarket could be persuaded to open a branch on one of the three sites? See article: <http://www.ameliasmagazine.com/earth/the-peoples-supermarket-a-new-approach-to-food-shopping/2010/06/14/>

Summary: Given the campaigns against Tesco in Mill Road and Shelford, and the popularity of Cambridge market and farmers' markets in the necklace villages, will there be provision for this sort of alternative shopping in NW Cambridge? Perhaps the People's Supermarket could be persuaded to open a branch on one of the three sites? See article: <http://www.ameliasmagazine.com/earth/the-peoples-supermarket-a-new-approach-to-food-shopping/2010/06/14/>

O - 5042 - 1169 - Question 2 - None

5042 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Chris Brown [1169]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I do not support new big name supermarkets at any of these new sites; I believe that better provision can be offered through a selection of local retailers and market space. Any big name supermarket will make it impossible for these local retailers to compete on price and hence the provision of a supermarket will cause local retailers to be unviable businesses.

Summary: I do not support new big name supermarkets at any of these new sites; I believe that better provision can be offered through a selection of local retailers and market space. Any big name supermarket will make it impossible for these local retailers to compete on price and hence the provision of a supermarket will cause local retailers to be unviable businesses.

S - 5051 - 1172 - Question 2 - None

5051 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Miss Jade Lauren Cawthray [1172]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I believe that having smaller independant stores to provide food, will be more beneficial to the local economy, it will support local food producers and workers. Smaller independant stores also have a social benefit as they provide a more personalised service to customers and therefore the local community. They will have also have a smaller environmental impact than the larger superstores.

Summary: I believe that having smaller independant stores to provide food, will be more beneficial to the local economy, it will support local food producers and workers. Smaller independant stores also have a social benefit as they provide a more personalised service to customers and therefore the local community. They will have also have a smaller environmental impact than the larger superstores.

S - 5052 - 1173 - Question 2 - None

5052 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Ms Anne Jackson [1173]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I support small localised shopping. Smaller supermarkets will not draw trade from other independent retailers. They will not attract car traffic from outside the area and they will also, hopefully, attract less traffic from large delivery lorries. They are more in keeping with a sustainable ethic for this development.

Summary: I support small localised shopping. Smaller supermarkets will not draw trade from other independent retailers. They will not attract car traffic from outside the area and they will also, hopefully, attract less traffic from large delivery lorries. They are more in keeping with a sustainable ethic for this development.

5058 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Duncan Brooks [1174]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Inconvenient.**Summary:** Inconvenient.**5059 Support**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Alison Finn [1175]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Development of local community - people meeting when shopping, building up neighbourliness. More sustainable over the long term.**Summary:** Development of local community - people meeting when shopping, building up neighbourliness. More sustainable over the long term.**5063 Object**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Dr Philippa Brice [62]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Where would all these people but their food and basic necessities? Bound to increase traffic!**Summary:** Where would all these people but their food and basic necessities? Bound to increase traffic!**5069 Support**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Mrs Nicola Davies [1178]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** That will be enough shops as Bar Hill and Milton Tesco are within easy reach**Summary:** That will be enough shops as Bar Hill and Milton Tesco are within easy reach

5070 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: miss lindsey berends [1179]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Having local businesses and shops in these areas is much needed to buffer our supermarket culture. Not only would it provide jobs, it would provide an opportunity for residents to interact thus enhancing a community feel which is hard to come by these days. It would also allow diversity amongst shops providing people with choice and there would be potential to sell local produce from farms, allotments and even gardens. Furthermore, encouraging people to shop at a smaller shops may prevent people from buying and then wasting large amounts unnecessarily. In terms of convenience (and enjoyment), walking down a row of a few shops would take no longer than locating your car in a huge supermarket car park. I feel this is too good of an opportunity to miss for these future communities.

Summary: Local shops would provide new residents with a community feel and the opportunity to source local produce - that which supermarkets do not.

5079 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Catherine Belsey [1181]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: There is not enough here to keep people on the sites. they will have to go into the city centre (or elsewhere) for their needs.

Summary: There is not enough here to keep people on the sites. they will have to go into the city centre (or elsewhere) for their needs.

5086 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Mr Barnabas Baggs [1183]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: A local shop becomes a hub for a community, large super markets do not. Community building should be encouraged at every opportunity. 3 smaller shops is therefore the only sensible option here if you want to put your money where your mouth is.

Not having a car makes trips to large super markets impossible, therefore if we want to discourage their use we must promote local shorter journeys via more sustainable transport methods ie foot and bicycle.

Summary: A local shop becomes a hub for a community, large supermarkets do not. Community building should be encouraged at every opportunity. 3 smaller shops is therefore the only sensible option here if you want to put your money where your mouth is.

Not having a car makes trips to large supermarkets impossible, therefore if we want to discourage their use we must promote local shorter journeys via more sustainable transport methods ie foot and bicycle.

5097 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Anne Lally [1186]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: There is no reason that a well-stocked array of smaller stores, well located in a region would give rise to flight to other food stores. If transportation is designed to support use of public and bikes, good local stores are especially valuable. If Cambridge seeks true sustainability, this is the only reasonable option.

Summary: There is no reason that a well-stocked array of smaller stores, well located in a region would give rise to flight to other food stores. If transportation is designed to support use of public and bikes, good local stores are especially valuable. If Cambridge seeks true sustainability, this is the only reasonable option.

5108 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Ms Ceri Galloway [1187]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Option A: Local food stores (such as co-operatives) at all three areas.

my choice option is A. I feel the evidence based information you have outlined is biased towards the supermarkets and encourages people away from choosing option A. because it does not take the embedded carbon footprint of the movement of goods to from producers, packers and transport by supermarkets into consideration and when explaining this option A. it does not explain to people what option A. could mean as part of a strategy for reducing carbon.

If the city council is going to take climate change and peak oil seriously it needs to 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.

See Growing Communities model as outlined below as an attachment (in particular look at page 2 of the food zone as it shows how much food needs to be grown locally) This model has been in action for 10 years and they and Organiclea are making movement towards more sustainable food production for Hackney. Rob Hopkins "Can Totnes feed itself" is useful source to explore these issues.

Additionally People will go to the supermarket of their choice not the one you put in their community. So if you put a Tesco in one area there's not guarantee that people will use it. If they prefer Sainsbury's or ASDA on cost or quality they will go there. So your argument that people won't have to go far to their supermarket is flawed.

Option B: Two supermarkets, one of the Cambridge Uni site and on at the NIAB site (national institute of agricultural botany). Each slightly larger than the Sainsburys city centre store.

Option C: One supermarket at the Cambridge Uni site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Option D: One supermarket at the NIAB site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Summary: My choice option is A. If the city council is going to take climate change and peak oil seriously it needs to 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. Additionally people will go to the supermarket of their choice not the one you put in their community. So if you put a Tesco in one area there's not guarantee that people will use it. If they prefer Sainsbury's or ASDA on cost or quality they will go there. So your argument that people won't have to go far to their supermarket is flawed.

5113 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Mr Dave Jackson [1191]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I am writing to support Option A. When as a nation we need to drastically reduce our carbon footprint it is imperative that we have stores supplying local food which are easily accessible by foot/bicycle rather than having supermarkets which generate large amounts of road traffic. Any saving people using supermarkets make will be a false economy in the long run and when oil gets scarcer as it will in the near future costs of supermarkets will rise and if we do not have a thriving local economy there will be no other choice.

Summary: I am writing to support Option A. When as a nation we need to drastically reduce our carbon footprint it is imperative that we have stores supplying local food which are easily accessible by foot/bicycle rather than having supermarkets which generate large amounts of road traffic. Any saving people using supermarkets make will be a false economy in the long run and when oil gets scarcer as it will in the near future costs of supermarkets will rise and if we do not have a thriving local economy there will be no other choice.

5115 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Cambridgeshire County Council (Mrs Kathy Baldwin) [1193]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: This would not be a favoured option as the evidence suggests that it would not meet sufficient of the locally generated shopping needs. It would thus tend to perpetuate the current position in north west Cambridge of residents needing to travel by car to larger supermarkets for weekly shopping.

Summary: This would not be a favoured option as the evidence suggests that it would not meet sufficient of the locally generated shopping needs. It would thus tend to perpetuate the current position in north west Cambridge of residents needing to travel by car to larger supermarkets for weekly shopping.

5119 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Madingley Parish Council (Mrs Gail Stoehr) [1195]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

Summary: Would prefer to see a series of small shops on the NIAB/NW Cambridge site rather than a superstore

5144 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Foxton Parish Council (Dr Colin Grindley) [1003]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: This proposal does not fully meet the local needs identified for this development.

Summary: This proposal does not fully meet the local needs identified for this development.

5149 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The University objects to Option A, which comprises existing planned development, for these reasons:

1. The qualitative need for foodstore provision at North West Cambridge would not be met.
2. North West Cambridge residents would have to shop elsewhere, resulting in the continued outflow of expenditure to other foodstores in Cambridge and the surrounding area.
3. North West Cambridge residents would have to make unsustainable car journeys to those stores.
4. Students and employees based at the University's site without access to cars would have no access to adequate food retail provision.
5. We do not agree with the implication in paragraph 6.3 of the Options Report that other options lead to more localised traffic problems. There may be localised traffic increases but it has not been demonstrated that these would lead to problems for all options. A conclusion from the Retail Transport Study (paragraph 5.3) is that the non-car mode shares achieved from options for new stores - especially at the University site - are better than for Planned Development (Option A) because a large proportion of trips to the new stores would originate from the local area. This would help to mitigate the effects of traffic increases.

Summary: The University objects to Option A:

1. The qualitative need for foodstore provision at North West Cambridge would not be met.
2. North West Cambridge residents would have to shop elsewhere, resulting in the continued outflow of expenditure to other foodstores in Cambridge and the surrounding area.
3. North West Cambridge residents would have to make unsustainable car journeys to those stores.
4. Students and employees based at the University's site without access to cars would have no access to adequate food retail provision.
5. We do not agree with the implication in paragraph 6.3 of the Options Report that other options lead to more localised traffic problems.

5156 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The options report clearly shows there is a need for additional retail provision to serve North West Cambridge area as a whole.

Summary: The options report clearly shows there is a need for additional retail provision to serve North West Cambridge area as a whole.

5176 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207]**Agent:** Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]**Full Text:** We object to Option A, which proposes maintenance of the existing policy baseline situation.

Additional housing proposed for the three large scale development sites, the NIAB, University and Orchard Park sites, means population growth in the NW of Cambridge will be significantly higher than initially forecast. The Councils must respond accordingly to ensure an appropriate level of services can be delivered to meet the needs of these growing communities.

The Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) and Retail Transport Study (RTS) recently completed on behalf of the Council demonstrate a deficiency of retail provision in the NW of Cambridge. There is currently no main foodstore in this part of the City, which means that a high proportion of existing residents travel out of NW Cambridge to shop at larger out-of-centre stores, primarily the Tesco superstores at Bar Hill and Milton, which have a larger range and variety of products. This results in considerable leakage of expenditure and unsustainable travel patterns as residents travel out of Cambridge to undertake their main food shopping.

The existing policy position will not deliver the quality or size of foodstore necessary to enable residents to undertake their main food shopping locally, thus exacerbating the problems of expenditure leakage and unsustainable car journeys. The Councils should therefore proceed with one of the alternative Options B, C or D, which seek to provide for additional retail development at both or either the University or NIAB sites at a level that is appropriate to the needs of the community.

Summary: Additional housing proposed for the three large scale development sites means population growth in the NW of Cambridge will be significantly higher than initially forecast.

The recent retail/transport studies show that there is a deficiency of retail provision in the NW of Cambridge which results in considerable leakage of expenditure and unsustainable travel patterns as residents travel out of Cambridge to undertake their main food shopping.

The existing policy position will not deliver the quality or size of foodstore necessary to enable residents to undertake their main food shopping locally, thus exacerbating the problems of expenditure leakage and unsustainable car journeys.

5199 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Waitrose Limited (Mr Andrew Vaughan) [1213]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:****Summary:** Waitrose Limited object to Option A, as it would not deliver a foodstore of 2,500sqm floorspace for which there is already an existing qualitative need. Option A is not supported by the existing evidence base and would not provide for a strong retail mix (in terms of range and quality of convenience retail offer) to meet the requirements of the local catchment area, leading to unsustainable travel patterns. This option would therefore be contrary to both PPS4 and PPG13.**5209 Object**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:****Summary:** this option would perpetuate the current unsustainable travel patterns within the area and fail to meet the identified qualitative retail need for a bulk food shopping facility to serve the North West Cambridge Quadrant of the City. Option A is therefore not supported.

5220 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 2

Respondent: Dr Simon Wilson [1216]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: With regard to the above consultation we support Option A for the advantageous reasons set out in the report. We do not support the over development of Cambridge in principle and where this has to happen, we would rather local services and amenities were integrated into the existing infrastructure.

Summary: With regard to the above consultation we support Option A for the advantageous reasons set out in the report. We do not support the over development of Cambridge in principle and where this has to happen, we would rather local services and amenities were integrated into the existing infrastructure.

S - 5159 - 832 - 6.8, 3 - None

5159 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

6.8, 3

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The level of foodstore provision needs to be suitable to support the urban extensions in addition to offering an alternative to existing larger format retailers in a qualitative sense.

Summary: The level of foodstore provision needs to be suitable to support the urban extensions in addition to offering an alternative to existing larger format retailers in a qualitative sense.

S - 5170 - 832 - 6.8, 7 - None

5170 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

6.8, 7

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: This is crucial since the level of comparison goods could directly impact upon existing centres. At a strictly 80% convenience and 20% comparison level, Lidl would meet this need comfortably and without impact on the vitality and viability of existing centres.

Summary: This is crucial since the level of comparison goods could directly impact upon existing centres. At a strictly 80% convenience and 20% comparison level, Lidl would meet this need comfortably and without impact on the vitality and viability of existing centres.

S - 5171 - 832 - 6.8, 10 - None

5171 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

6.8, 10

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The traffic movements of a smaller foodstore, particularly a LAD, are much less in comparison to a larger format retailer which, coupled with only one HGV delivery per day, significantly reduces the overall impact on the highway network.

Summary: The traffic movements of a smaller foodstore, particularly a LAD, are much less in comparison to a larger format retailer which, coupled with only one HGV delivery per day, significantly reduces the overall impact on the highway network.

5173 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

6.9, 2

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: As stated previously, the traffic movements for a LAD retailer, such as Lidl, are significantly less than for a larger format retailer. It has been widely agreed by many local authorities that there is minimal additional impact on the existing network due to lower traffic levels.

Summary: As stated previously, the traffic movements for a LAD retailer, such as Lidl, are significantly less than for a larger format retailer. It has been widely agreed by many local authorities that there is minimal additional impact on the existing network due to lower traffic levels.

5152 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

6.9, 4

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** OBJECTION TO PHASING PROPOSAL

The University objects to the proposal to hold back the second supermarket until the small supermarket at Orchard Park had been delivered. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to phase the timing of delivery of two 2,000m² supermarkets.

Our representation is supported by an analysis of the Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) Supplementary Retail Study:

- Taking into account the qualitative need for main foodstore provision in NW Cambridge and existing commitments for additional convenience floorspace in the area, the NLP Study identifies surplus expenditure in the region of Â£6.9m by 2016. Assuming a large foodstore operator achieving a sales density of Â£10,000 per m² this would translate into floorspace capacity for an additional 680m² net. However this is based on a constant market share and NLP recognise that, given existing deficiencies and subsequent levels of trade leakage, this is not entirely realistic.
- In NLP's view, the most realistic scenario assumes a main foodstore in NW Cambridge would achieve a similar market share similar to those achieved by other main foodstores in Cambridge. NLP test an increase in market share of 16% from the PCA and 8% from the SCA which consequently increases surplus available expenditure at 2016 to Â£30.9m. In floorspace terms, this suggests capacity to support an additional 3,044m² net convenience floorspace by 2016, increasing to 3,791m² net by 2021 (assuming a large store sales density of Â£10,000 per m² net). This is over and above existing commitments and development in the pipeline which include small convenience store provision at both the University and NIAB sites.
- The pipeline proposals at the University site assume a small supermarket of c.1,625m² net which would achieve an estimated turnover of Â£8.3m at 2016. However, the University is now proposing a larger store comprising 2,000m² net convenience goods floorspace and the estimated turnover would be in the region of Â£20.3m at 2016 based on a sales density of Â£10,000 per m² and assuming 0.3% growth in sales efficiency post 2011. If we assume that a larger store with a turnover of Â£20.3m would also come forward at the NIAB site (2,000m² net) in addition to existing commitments (Â£3.9m) there will still be a surplus of available expenditure in the region of Â£4.5m at 2016 and capacity to support an additional 443m² net convenience goods floorspace.
- If we adopt a more cautious approach and apply a higher average sales density of Â£12,000 per m² to the University and NIAB stores the estimated turnover of each would be Â£24.4m at 2016 (Â£48.8m combined). After also taking into account the estimated turnover generated by existing commitments (Â£3.9m), this would result in a modest deficit of Â£3.7m and only a very marginal oversupply of floorspace in the region of -364 m² net. Given existing deficiencies and quantitative need for foodstore provision in the area this level of oversupply is not considered significant.
- Furthermore, this modest oversupply of floorspace is only identified in the worst case scenario assuming a store at both the University and at the NIAB site will achieve a sales density of Â£12,000 per m². In reality, if both stores were delivered simultaneously we would expect some level of competition to occur between the two and it may be the case, in the short-term at least, that the stores do not achieve the high turnovers estimated. In any event, our analysis demonstrates that there is likely to be sufficient capacity to support both stores and committed development in the short-term (by 2016).

We expect that the two supermarket opportunities will be operated by different retailers and 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 compared with other options, both within the primary catchment area and also for trips originating within the new developments in North West Cambridge. It is important that travel behaviour for these trips is influenced 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 forward at an early stage on each of the sites.

Summary: OBJECTION TO PHASING PROPOSAL

The University objects to the proposal to hold back the second supermarket until the small supermarket at Orchard Park had been delivered. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to phase the timing of delivery of two 2,000m² supermarkets.

5174 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

6.9, 4

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Phasing may not be necessary if a LAD format store is a preferable option since there is a wealth of evidence that this type of retail format does not compete with existing local/town/city centres due to the level of offering and range of goods sold.

Summary: Phasing may not be necessary if a LAD format store is a preferable option since there is a wealth of evidence that this type of retail format does not compete with existing local/town/city centres due to the level of offering and range of goods sold.

5153 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

6.9, 5

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The University objects to the proposal to hold back the second supermarket until the small supermarket at Orchard Park had been delivered. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to phase the timing of delivery of two 2,000m2 supermarkets.

If, however, the Councils are minded to pursue the phasing recommendation, the first foodstore should be delivered at the University's site for the following reasons:

- The North West Cambridge AAP also requires that the provision of community services and facilities are 'provided at an early state in the development to ensure that the new community has the opportunity to be sustainable by using local services rather than travelling to use those provided outside its area'. It is important that the informal guidance is consistent with adopted policy and proposals in the Area Action Plan.
- The University has responded positively to the Councils' planning policies and proposals and changed its phasing strategy for the site to bring forward the local centre in Phase 1. The supermarket is an essential component of that first phase.
- As the Local Centre now forms the first phase of development on the University's site, it is essential that the supermarket element which will anchor the Local Centre is built within that First Phase. Early delivery of the supermarket is fundamental to our strategy of establishing the local centre from the outset. The strategy for the University site is to establish a sense of place through completion of as much frontage on the Madingley Road / Huntingdon Road link as possible, so that there is a real sense of a new place rather than a few hundred houses built in the corner of a very large field. This latter approach is the norm amongst residential developers, although is the strategy that has caused so much criticism from officers and the public.
- The 2,000m2 supermarket contributes around 15% of the development value generated by Phase 1 of the University's development. Even with the supermarket, Phase 1 will still result in a net financial deficit, given the very heavy cost of infrastructure. It is therefore essential that development values in Phase 1 are maintained. Phasing of the supermarket to a later stage would result in a substantial increase to the deficit of Phase 1.
- The University site has better levels of internalisation than the NIAB site (see Tables 3.3 and 3.4 of the Retail Transport Study)

Summary: The University objects to the proposal to hold back the second supermarket until the small supermarket at Orchard Park had been delivered. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to phase the timing of delivery of two 2,000m2 supermarkets.

If, however, the Councils are minded to pursue the phasing recommendation, the first foodstore should be delivered at the University's site.

5043 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Chris Brown [1169]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I do not support new big name supermarkets at any of these new sites; I believe that better provision can be offered through a selection of local retailers and market space. Any big name supermarket will make it impossible for these local retailers to compete on price and hence the provision of a supermarket will cause local retailers to be unviable businesses.

Summary: I do not support new big name supermarkets at any of these new sites; I believe that better provision can be offered through a selection of local retailers and market space. Any big name supermarket will make it impossible for these local retailers to compete on price and hence the provision of a supermarket will cause local retailers to be unviable businesses.

5053 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Ms Anne Jackson [1173]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** This would be my second preferred option, if Option A is not possible, keeping size smaller and localised.**Summary:** This would be my second preferred option, if Option A is not possible, keeping size smaller and localised.**5057 Object**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Duncan Brooks [1174]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Inconvenient.**Summary:** Inconvenient.**5064 Object**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Dr Philippa Brice [62]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Some utility in this option but seems a bit mad to have two limited size stores with limited stock ranges, not suitable for full / weekly family shop, which would have to be done elsewhere. Though handy if people ran out of milk, bread and so on.**Summary:** Some utility in this option but seems a bit mad to have two limited size stores with limited stock ranges, not suitable for full / weekly family shop, which would have to be done elsewhere. Though handy if people ran out of milk, bread and so on.**5081 Support**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Catherine Belsey [1181]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** This seems to me the most sensible form of provision, giving easy access to the majority of people and making trips by other means than cars more probable. It would also provide a choice (or variety) for any residents equidistant from the two. As indicated in the document, supermarkets are easier to incorporate into the design of the whole than superstores. (The example of Morrisons at Cambourne should be avoided at all costs.)**Summary:** This seems to me the most sensible form of provision, giving easy access to the majority of people and making trips by other means than cars more probable. It would also provide a choice (or variety) for any residents equidistant from the two. As indicated in the document, supermarkets are easier to incorporate into the design of the whole than superstores. (The example of Morrisons at Cambourne should be avoided at all costs.)

5098 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Anne Lally [1186]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: While not as strong an option as A, this is also a reasonable option.

Summary: While not as strong an option as A, this is also a reasonable option.

5104 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Stratfield Close & Tavistock Road Residents Association (Dr Gillian Rogers) [1189]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

Summary: Option B seems to me to be the best option. Supermarkets of the envisaged size would surely be adequate, given the example of the Milton Tesco

5116 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Cambridgeshire County Council (Mrs Kathy Baldwin) [1193]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: This option would better provide for retail needs within the north west quadrant, including the future developments on NIAB and University land. The ability to attract smaller shops enabling both centres to offer a greater range is also a positive factor.

Summary: This option would better provide for retail needs within the north west quadrant, including the future developments on NIAB and University land. The ability to attract smaller shops enabling both centres to offer a greater range is also a positive factor.

5120 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I support Option B. That is two supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net floorspace (1,500 sq m net convenience), one at the University site and one on NIAB, and the committed floorspace at Orchard Park. This is just slightly larger than Sainsburys in Sidney Street (1,260sq m net convenience). I think also that non-car modes of transport should be considered in greater detail than they have so far in the process.

Both Option C (that is a superstore of 3,500 net floorspace - 2,500 sq m net convenience, at the University site and the committed/pipeline floorspace at NIAB and Orchard Park - and Option D (one superstore of 3,500 net floorspace - 2,500 sq m net convenience - at the NIAB site and the committed/pipeline floorspace at the University Site and Orchard Park) would be wholly unacceptable to residents in Castle ward.

Last year, on behalf Castle ward residents I campaigned against a huge superstore (which would have been slightly larger than Option C) on the University site and gave evidence at an Inspector's hearing on its likely impact of traffic on the grounds of noise and air quality. The Inspector responded favourably to our objections. A huge supermarket on NIAB would be even worse, and my residents are already unhappy about the lack of infrastructure on NIAB. So it is clear that a huge supermarket on either the NW Site or NIAB would be wholly unacceptable to residents and would meet with great opposition.

Orchard Park is quite close to Milton Tesco on one side, and Histon Rd shops on the other, and so has access to a supermarket for weekly shopping and therefore does not need more than the planned foodstore provision. If more food provision is needed than that which was originally planned in NW Cambridge then Option B is the most sensible position at this stage.

Summary: I support Option B. That is two supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net floorspace (1,500 sq m net convenience), one at the University site and one on NIAB, and the committed floorspace at Orchard Park. This is just slightly larger than Sainsburys in Sidney Street (1,260sq m net convenience). I think also that non-car modes of transport should be considered in greater detail than they have so far in the process.

5121 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The most viable and sustainable option.

Summary: The most viable and sustainable option.

5128 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Mr John Batchelor [1196]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: This option best meets the requirements of the area. Attracting a range of smaller shops would add interest.

Summary: This option best meets the requirements of the area. Attracting a range of smaller shops would add interest.

5133 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS)
[230]

Agent: Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Ms Claire Morrison) [1199]

Full Text:

Summary: USS supports Option B which provides for supermarket development only. Superstore options are more likely to include comparison shopping that will compete directly with the city centre, and will not meet the overall objectives set out in the adopted and emerging policy for NW Cambridge, which seeks to provide for facilities being provided which meets the needs of the new and existing population.

5140 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Cambs. County Council Liberal Democrat Group
(Dr Michael Williamson) [1201]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: This option was discussed by the group on Friday and unanimously agreed to be the preferred option

Summary: This option was discussed by the group on Friday and unanimously agreed to be the preferred option

5141 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Foxton Parish Council (Dr Colin Grindley) [1003]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Option B is considered more self sufficient as a local centre development, and should have less impact on the local highway network.

Summary: Option B is considered more self sufficient as a local centre development, and should have less impact on the local highway network.

5150 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: SUPPORT FOR TWO SUPERMARKETS OF 2,000M M2 NET FLOORSPACE

The University supports the provision of two supermarkets of 2,000m2 net floorspace, one at the University site and one at the NIAB site, on the proviso that all, or very nearly all, of the space at the University's site is for convenience retail space. From the discussions we have held with the national supermarket operators, a 2,000m2 net supermarket would primarily be for the sale of convenience goods with a very small element of comparison goods, dependent upon the actual operator.

Following discussions with all the national supermarket operators, a 2,000m2 net floorspace foodstore is being included in an outline planning application which is currently being prepared for the University's development proposal. The intention, however, is for nearly all of that space to be for convenience retail, without any significant provision of comparison retail.

Two supermarkets of 2,000m2 are supported for these reasons:

Design

1. Supermarket sized stores have better integration with the design of local centres. The design concept for the University's scheme includes a public square that is framed by the supermarket entrance, other retail uses and other local centre uses, as per the illustration in Figure 3 of the consultation Report.
2. The local centre at the University's site at North West Cambridge will provide a focus for both development at North West Cambridge and the wider North West Quadrant. As the amenity and social focus for the growing community, the local centre is located at the convergence of main routes, the orbital public transport route and the Ridgeway cycle & pedestrian way forming the movement spine of the scheme and ensuring sufficient access for the community as well as key links to NIAB and the West Cambridge Site.
3. The creation of a market square within the local centre will provide a visual and activity focus, with key retail, social and community buildings forming the edges of the square - community centre, school, health centre, hotel, foodstore and shops, all integrated into the scheme.
4. 2000m2 net floorspace supermarkets would not be over-sized in relation to the rest of the local centres at the University and NIAB sites.
5. A number of small shops could still be provided with a 2,000m2 net sized store, adding to the variety of the centre, the creation of a sense of place, and facilitating linked trips.

Transport and Access

6. 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 and small supermarket.
7. 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 University policy. It is important that local access is provided on site to a foodstore which is sized to cater for more than just top-up shopping.
8. The supporting Retail Transport Study (Atkins June 2010) supports this and demonstrates that internalisation of trips within the University is greater under the tests that include a foodstore on the University site.
9. The transport report also states that sites accessed from Huntingdon Road had the greatest number of pass by trips, hence reducing the number of new trips on the network for the University foodstore.
10. Increases to CO2 emissions and vehicle travel distances are identified in the Options Report as a disadvantage with Option B, but we do not believe that the difference is sufficiently great to be classed as significant or therefore as a disadvantage. The Retail Transport Study (Table 4.10) shows that the increases to CO2 emissions and vehicle kilometers are small in relation to Planned Development (Option A) and especially when compared with the greater increases that would result from tests relating to Options C and D. A conclusion in the Study is that 'the percentage differences between each Test and the Planned Development Only scenario are very small' (paragraph 4.6).

Development Distribution

11. There would be a balanced distribution of foodstores in the three centres, with no one centre dominant.

OBJECTION TO PHASING PROPOSAL

The University objects to the proposal to hold back the second supermarket until the small supermarket at Orchard Park had been delivered. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to phase the timing of delivery of two 2,000m2 supermarkets.

Our representation is supported by an analysis of the Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP) Supplementary Retail Study:

- Taking into account the qualitative need for main foodstore provision in NW Cambridge and existing commitments for additional convenience floorspace in the area, the NLP Study identifies surplus expenditure in the region of Â£6.9m by 2016. Assuming a large foodstore operator achieving a sales density of Â£10,000 per m2 this would translate into floorspace capacity for an additional 680m2 net. However this is based on a constant market share and NLP recognise that, given existing deficiencies and subsequent levels of trade leakage, this is not entirely realistic.
- In NLP's view, the most realistic scenario assumes a main foodstore in NW Cambridge would achieve a similar market share similar to those achieved by other main foodstores in Cambridge. NLP test an increase in market share of 16% from the PCA and 8% from the SCA which consequently increases surplus available expenditure at 2016 to Â£30.9m. In floorspace terms, this suggests capacity to support an additional 3,044m2 net convenience floorspace by 2016, increasing to 3,791m2 net by 2021 (assuming a large store sales density of Â£10,000 per m2 net). This is over and above existing commitments and development in the pipeline which include small convenience store provision at both the University and NIAB sites.

- The pipeline proposals at the University site assume a small supermarket of c.1,625m² net which would achieve an estimated turnover of Â£8.3m at 2016. However, the University is now proposing a larger store comprising 2,000m² net convenience goods floorspace and the estimated turnover would be in the region of Â£20.3m at 2016 based on a sales density of Â£10,000 per m² and assuming 0.3% growth in sales efficiency post 2011. If we assume that a larger store with a turnover of Â£20.3m would also come forward at the NIAB site (2,000m² net) in addition to existing commitments (Â£3.9m) there will still be a surplus of available expenditure in the region of Â£4.5m at 2016 and capacity to support an additional 443m² net convenience goods floorspace.

- If we adopt a more cautious approach and apply a higher average sales density of Â£12,000 per m² to the University and NIAB stores the estimated turnover of each would be Â£24.4m at 2016 (Â£48.8m combined). After also taking into account the estimated turnover generated by existing commitments (Â£3.9m), this would result in a modest deficit of Â£3.7m and only a very marginal oversupply of floorspace in the region of -364 m² net. Given existing deficiencies and quantitative need for foodstore provision in the area this level of oversupply is not considered significant.

- Furthermore, this modest oversupply of floorspace is only identified in the worst case scenario assuming a store at both the University and at the NIAB site will achieve a sales density of Â£12,000 per m². In reality, if both stores were delivered simultaneously we would expect some level of competition to occur between the two and it may be the case, in the short-term at least, that the stores do not achieve the high turnovers estimated. In any event, our analysis demonstrates that there is likely to be sufficient capacity to support both stores and committed development in the short-term (by 2016).

We expect that the two supermarket opportunities will be operated by different retailers and 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 compared with other options, both within the primary catchment area and also for trips originating within the new developments in North West Cambridge. It is important that travel behaviour for these trips is influenced 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 forward at an early stage on each of the sites.

If, however, the Councils are minded to pursue the phasing recommendation, the first foodstore should be delivered at the University's site for the following reasons:

- The North West Cambridge AAP also requires that the provision of community services and facilities are 'provided at an early state in the development to ensure that the new community has the opportunity to be sustainable by using local services rather than travelling to use those provided outside its area'. It is important that the informal guidance is consistent with adopted policy and proposals in the Area Action Plan.

- The University has responded positively to the Councils' planning policies and proposals and changed its phasing strategy for the site to bring forward the local centre in Phase 1. The supermarket is an essential component of that first phase.

- As the Local Centre now forms the first phase of development on the University's site, it is essential that the supermarket element which will anchor the Local Centre is built within that First Phase. Early delivery of the supermarket is fundamental to our strategy of establishing the local centre from the outset. The strategy for the University site is to establish a sense of place through completion of as much frontage on the Madingley Road / Huntingdon Road link as possible, so that there is a real sense of a new place rather than a few hundred houses built in the corner of a very large field. This latter approach is the norm amongst residential developers, although is the strategy that has caused so much criticism from officers and the public.

- The 2,000m² supermarket contributes around 15% of the development value generated by Phase 1 of the University's development. Even with the supermarket, Phase 1 will still result in a net financial deficit, given the very heavy cost of infrastructure. It is therefore essential that development values in Phase 1 are maintained. Phasing of the supermarket to a later stage would result in a substantial increase to the deficit of Phase 1.

- The University site has better levels of internalisation than the NIAB site (see Tables 3.3 and 3.4 of the Retail Transport Study)

Summary: The University supports the provision of two supermarkets of 2,000m² net floorspace, one at the University site and one at the NIAB site, on the proviso that all, or very nearly all, of the space at the University's site is for convenience retail space.

Option B is supported in relation to a number of reasons relating to design, transport and access, and the balanced distribution of development

The University objects, however, to the proposal to hold back the second supermarket to a later stage. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to phase the timing of delivery of two 2,000m² supermarkets.

S - 5157 - 1197 - Question 3: - None

5157 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: There is a need for a local centre at Orchard Park. The provision of "medium" foodstores at both NIAB and the University sites 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.

Summary: There is a need for a local centre at Orchard Park. The provision of "medium" foodstores at both NIAB and the University sites 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.

5167 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: This is a much more justified approach as opposed to a centre anchored by a major food retailer who will draw trade from throughout the City. It helps to promote the idea of smaller, more centralised retailers, such as Lidl, who provide a smaller, yet essential offering which is lacking under-represented within the City.

Summary: This is a much more justified approach as opposed to a centre anchored by a major food retailer who will draw trade from throughout the City. It helps to promote the idea of smaller, more centralised retailers, such as Lidl, who provide a smaller, yet essential offering which is lacking under-represented within the City.

5172 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The importance of two retailers would be increased choice only if the retailers operated from differing ends of the retail spectrum, such as Sainsburys and Lidl for example. To provide two retailers with very similar offerings, such as Tesco and Morrisons for example, is to miss a great opportunity to provide the people of Cambridge with alternative food shopping destinations. To restrict the range and number of goods sold via a unilateral agreement would be the most appropriate means of curtailing excess competition with other centres and expansion. It must be very much a local provision.

Summary: The importance of two retailers would be increased choice only if the retailers operated from differing ends of the retail spectrum, such as Sainsburys and Lidl for example. To provide two retailers with very similar offerings, such as Tesco and Morrisons for example, is to miss a great opportunity to provide the people of Cambridge with alternative food shopping destinations. To restrict the range and number of goods sold via a unilateral agreement would be the most appropriate means of curtailing excess competition with other centres and expansion. It must be very much a local provision.

5177 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207]**Agent:** Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]

Full Text: 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 would help reduce the current loss of expenditure from NW Cambridge, primarily to competing out-of-centre destinations. They would encourage more localised shopping trips, allowing the use of more sustainable modes of travel such as cycling or walking.

Option B represents a positive response to the increased growth projections for NW Cambridge and the associated qualitative and quantitative need that has been identified for increased foodstore provision in this area.

Summary: 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 would help reduce the current loss of expenditure from NW Cambridge, primarily to competing out-of-centre destinations. They would encourage more localised shopping trips, allowing the use of more sustainable modes of travel such as cycling or walking.

Option B represents a positive response to the increased growth projections for NW Cambridge and the associated qualitative and quantitative need that has been identified for increased foodstore provision in this area.

5210 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:**

Summary: Again, as with Option A, we do not consider that this is a realistic option since there will remain a considerable quantitative and qualitative need for a new main food shopping facility within the North West Cambridge Quadrant as identified within paragraph 3.61 of the SRS which highlights the qualitative need for "a large format foodstore provision within North West Cambridge".

In summary, the SRS highlights the qualitative need for "a large format foodstore provision within North West Cambridge" (paragraph 3.61). This Option would fail to meet this identified need and would therefore perpetuate the current unsustainable travel patterns within the area. Consequently, Option B is therefore not supported.

5229 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Dr Ann Mullinger [1218]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Option B: Supermarket on NIAB and University sites.

I support option B, with a small supermarket on both the University site and the NIAB site (either NIAB 1 or NIAB 2) because they would provide for most of the regular foodstore needs of local residents on both sites. Also, having supermarkets on both sites would lead to less vehicular traffic into and out of the sites than Options A, C and D.

Options C and D: Superstore on NIAB site or Univeristy site

I do not support these options which would represent over-development and be out of scale. The associated car parking would take up too much land on these sites, thus threatening other community facilities and/or leading to increased housing densities on the sites. They would also attract more traffic from outside the local areas. A superstore on one site would not be convenient for residents of the other site. There is no need for a store providing non-food items.

Question 6 Other Issues

1. The amount of space required for associated car parks for supermarkets and superstores should be taken into consideration and numbers of dwellings reduced accordingly. Space must not lead to reduction in other community facilities provided on the sites.

2. Shopping patterns will depend on which particular supermarkets are provided. Many people have strong preferences for particular companies.

Summary: I support option B, with a small supermarket on both the University site and the NIAB site (either NIAB 1 or NIAB 2) because they would provide for most of the regular foodstore needs of local residents on both sites. Also, having supermarkets on both sites would lead to less vehicular traffic into and out of the sites than Options A, C and D.

5233 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: K Heinemann [1220]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:**

Summary: Option B is the best and most equable way of providing foodstores in the proposed new developments:

- i) It would prevent one large company from having a monopoly in this area.
- ii) It would reduce the need for more car journeys and associated pollution and road congestion.
- iii) It would be most convenient for people living in the proposed new developments

5234 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 3:

Respondent: Mr Andrew Phillips [1221]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

Summary: I support Option B as I believe it will give people a good choice of where to shop, provide local places for people to shop without being too dominant on the local area and is less likely to prevent local business from starting up/operating in the other localities.
This option should also ensure - more than the other options mentioned - local shopping and stop people travelling outside of their local area to buy basic goods.
I consider Option B to have the best balance in economic, social and environmental sustainability terms.

5044 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Chris Brown [1169]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: I do not support new big name supermarkets at any of these new sites; I believe that better provision can be offered through a selection of local retailers and market space. Any big name supermarket will make it impossible for these local retailers to compete on price and hence the provision of a supermarket will cause local retailers to be unviable businesses.

Summary: I do not support new big name supermarkets at any of these new sites; I believe that better provision can be offered through a selection of local retailers and market space. Any big name supermarket will make it impossible for these local retailers to compete on price and hence the provision of a supermarket will cause local retailers to be unviable businesses.

5056 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Duncan Brooks [1174]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Inconvenient.

Summary: Inconvenient.

5065 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Dr Philippa Brice [62]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Not convenient for NIAB residents. Hiring bike trailers all very well in theory, but delaying in practice, if you have to make two trips to return them; also, you cannot easily transport children AND large amounts of shopping this way. If there is to be one big supermarket it would be better placed on NIAB.

Summary: Not convenient for NIAB residents. Hiring bike trailers all very well in theory, but delaying in practice, if you have to make two trips to return them; also, you cannot easily transport children AND large amounts of shopping this way. If there is to be one big supermarket it would be better placed on NIAB.

5082 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Catherine Belsey [1181]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** I support option B.**Summary:** I support option B.**5096 Object**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Ms Anne Jackson [1173]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** I purchase my shopping from a variety of sources - Tesco at Milton, local shops in Histon Road, city centre market and small supermarkets (e.g. M&S, Sainsbury in Sidney St). I believe my patterns would change once the NIAB development has been completed, if the options were really an improvement. I would certainly only envisage shopping there on foot/by bike. Another superstore such as Tesco Bar Hill would be a disaster and unnecessary (if I want the kinds of things I can only get in a superstore I go by car anyway).**Summary:** Another superstore such as Tesco Bar Hill would be a disaster and unnecessary (if I want the kinds of things I can only get in a superstore I go by car anyway).**5099 Object**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Anne Lally [1186]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** This is an unsustainable option.**Summary:** This is an unsustainable option.**5105 Object**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Stratfield Close & Tavistock Road Residents Association (Dr Gillian Rogers) [1189]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:****Summary:** One supersized store in either the University or the NIAB sites would not solve the problem of car movements between the 2 sites, because people would not be able to carry a weeks shop manually from whichever site was chosen

5117 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Cambridgeshire County Council (Mrs Kathy Baldwin) [1193]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Thid would not be the preferred option as it would be more difficult to integrate into the local centre design and could adversely affect the ability to attract other smaller retailers.

Summary: Thid would not be the preferred option as it would be more difficult to integrate into the local centre design and could adversely affect the ability to attract other smaller retailers.

5122 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: unsustainable and unpopular

Summary: unsustainable and unpopular

5123 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: unsustainable

Summary: unsustainable

5129 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I support Option B. That is two supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net floorspace (1,500 sq m net convenience), one at the University site and one on NIAB, and the committed floorspace at Orchard Park. This is just slightly larger than Sainsburys in Sidney Street (1,260sq m net convenience). I think also that non-car modes of transport should be considered in greater detail than they have so far in the process.

Both Option C (that is a superstore of 3,500 net floorspace - 2,500 sq m net convenience, at the University site and the committed/pipeline floorspace at NIAB and Orchard Park - and Option D (one superstore of 3,500 net floorspace - 2,500 sq m net convenience - at the NIAB site and the committed/pipeline floorspace at the University Site and Orchard Park) would be wholly unacceptable to residents in Castle ward.

Last year, on behalf Castle ward residents I campaigned against a huge superstore (which would have been slightly larger than Option C) on the University site and gave evidence at an Inspector's hearing on its likely impact of traffic on the grounds of noise and air quality. The Inspector responded favourably to our objections. A huge supermarket on NIAB would be even worse, and my residents are already unhappy about the lack of infrastructure on NIAB. So it is clear that a huge supermarket on either the NW Site or NIAB would be wholly unacceptable to residents and would meet with great opposition.

Orchard Park is quite close to Milton Tesco on one side, and Histon Rd shops on the other, and so has access to a supermarket for weekly shopping and therefore does not need more than the planned foodstore provision

If more food provision is needed than that which was originally planned in NW Cambridge then Option B is the most sensible position at this stage.

Summary: Last year Castle ward residents campaigned against a huge superstore on the University site and gave evidence at an Inspector's hearing on its impact of traffic on the grounds of noise and air quality. The Inspector responded favourably to our objections. A huge supermarket on NIAB would be worse, and residents are already unhappy about the lack of infrastructure on NIAB. A huge supermarket on either NW Site or NIAB would meet with great opposition. Orchard Park is close to Milton Tesco, and Histon Rd shops, so has access to a supermarket for weekly shopping and therefore does not need more than the planned foodstore provision

5134 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) [230]**Agent:** Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Ms Claire Morrison) [1199]**Full Text:**

Summary: Superstore options are more likely to include comparison shopping that will compete directly with the city centre, and will not meet the overall objectives set out in the adopted and emerging policy for NW Cambridge, which seeks to provide for facilities being provided which meets the needs of the new and existing population.

5143 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Foxton Parish Council (Dr Colin Grindley) [1003]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Superstore proposal is in conflict with need for self sufficient flourishing local centre.

Summary: Superstore proposal is in conflict with need for self sufficient flourishing local centre.

5154 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The University supports the provision of stores of 2,000m² net retail floorspace at both the University site and the NIAB site, together with committed floorspace at Orchard Park (Option B). We are not including 3,500m² net floorspace superstore in preparation of the outline planning application for the site.

If, however, the Councils are minded to support the provision of a superstore/small supermarket combination then the superstore should be provided at the University's site, for these reasons:

1. The University site has a high level of qualitative need for foodstore development as it is very poorly provided for by existing main foodstores.
2. The site has very good existing and proposed accessibility by public transport, car, walking and cycling.
3. Of the sites examined, the University site is the most centrally located to benefit from access to the entire NW Quadrant, but principally NIAB and West Cambridge via an integrated public transport and vehicle route.
4. The University site has a higher level of trip internalisation and is well placed to encourage pass by trips from Huntingdon Road.
5. As stated within the Transport Study, when considering phasing of the food stores, lower average trip costs and lower car mode shares can be achieved where development density is higher. The University development has a higher housing density than the other sites and with a Phase 1 that includes high density residential surrounding the local centre.

Summary: The University supports the provision of stores of 2,000m² net retail floorspace at both the University site and the NIAB site, together with committed floorspace at Orchard Park (Option B). We are not including 3,500m² net floorspace superstore in preparation of the outline planning application for the site.

If, however, the Councils are minded to support the provision of a superstore/small supermarket combination then the superstore should be provided at the University's site.

5158 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: A "large" superstore development at the University site would both dominate the retail provision within the site and impact adversely on surrounding local centres, including those planned for Orchard Park and NIAB site.

Summary: A "large" superstore development at the University site would both dominate the retail provision within the site and impact adversely on surrounding local centres, including those planned for Orchard Park and NIAB site.

5179 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207]**Agent:** Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]

Full Text: We support Options C and D, which propose one superstore of 3,500 sqm net floorspace at either the University site or the NIAB site respectively. Either of these Options would deliver a substantial main foodstore to NW Cambridge of a size that could compete effectively with other main foodstores in the City. This would allow residents to meet their main food shopping needs locally thus reducing the propensity to travel out of the NW Cambridge area to shop. The provision of a large format foodstore in NW Cambridge would significantly reduce leakage of expenditure from the core catchment area as well as providing additional consumer choice and reducing the need for car travel. We consider either Option C or D would provide an appropriate and sustainable level of retail development to meet the needs of the growing NW Cambridge population.

Summary: Both Options C or D would deliver a substantial main foodstore to NW Cambridge of a size that could compete effectively with other main foodstores in Cambridge. This would allow residents to meet their main food shopping needs locally thus reducing the propensity to travel out of NW Cambridge.

A new large format foodstore in NW Cambridge would significantly reduce leakage of expenditure from the core catchment area, provide additional consumer choice and reduce the need for car travel.

Both Options would provide appropriate and sustainable level of retail development to meet the needs of the growing NW Cambridge population

5187 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: William Morrisons Supermarkets [1210]**Agent:** Peacock and Smith (Mr Steve Buckley) [1209]

Full Text: My client considers 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. We consider that only Option C and D incorporating a larger foodstore are considered suitable. In terms of whether Option C or D is most appropriate, much will rest with ensuring that a scheme can be delivered which meets modern retailer requirements including a suitable level of car parking balanced against the design objectives of the LPA and the wider local centre provision.

Summary: My client considers 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. We consider that only Option C and D incorporating a larger foodstore are considered suitable. In terms of whether Option C or D is most appropriate, much will rest with ensuring that a scheme can be delivered which meets modern retailer requirements including a suitable level of car parking balanced against the design objectives of the LPA and the wider local centre provision.

5211 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:**

Summary: we consider that whilst the amount of convenience floorspace proposed under Option C is appropriate to meet the identified qualitative need, the location of such a store within the NIAB Local Centre would more adequately serve the needs of the North West Cambridge Quadrant. It is considered that this would be more deliverable and would provide a better fit with existing shopping provision within the wider area such that it would provide for the most sustainable shopping patterns and create sustainable communities. Accordingly, Option C is therefore not supported.

5222 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Lilian Rundblad [1217]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:**

Summary: The written justification for support of Option C with comments outline the main issues. Primary importance is to support the present food shopping centre along Histon Rd including the Post Office and Pharmacy. The pipeline convenience development at NIAB should be given high quality design for the centre and the parking facilities and should meet the BREEAM standards. The location of the 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 the pipeline convenience developments should preferably have different brands.

5230 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 4:

Respondent: Dr Ann Mullinger [1218]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Option B: Supermarket on NIAB and University sites.

I support option B, with a small supermarket on both the University site and the NIAB site (either NIAB 1 or NIAB 2) because they would provide for most of the regular foodstore needs of local residents on both sites. Also, having supermarkets on both sites would lead to less vehicular traffic into and out of the sites than Options A, C and D.

Options C and D: Superstore on NIAB site or Univeristy site

I do not support these options which would represent over-development and be out of scale. The associated car parking would take up too much land on these sites, thus threatening other community facilities and/or leading to increased housing densities on the sites. They would also attract more traffic from outside the local areas. A superstore on one site would not be convenient for residents of the other site. There is no need for a store providing non-food items.

Question 6 Other Issues

1. The amount of space required for associated car parks for supermarkets and superstores should be taken into consideration and numbers of dwellings reduced accordingly. Space must not lead to reduction in other community facilities provided on the sites.

2. Shopping patterns will depend on which particular supermarkets are provided. Many people have strong preferences for particular companies.

Summary:

I do not support these options which would represent over-development and be out of scale. The associated car parking would take up too much land on these sites, thus threatening other community facilities and/or leading to increased housing densities on the sites. They would also attract more traffic from outside the local areas. A superstore on one site would not be convenient for residents of the other site. There is no need for a store providing non-food items.

5045 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Chris Brown [1169]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: I do not support new big name supermarkets at any of these new sites; I believe that better provision can be offered through a selection of local retailers and market space. Any big name supermarket will make it impossible for these local retailers to compete on price and hence the provision of a supermarket will cause local retailers to be unviable businesses.

Summary:

I do not support new big name supermarkets at any of these new sites; I believe that better provision can be offered through a selection of local retailers and market space. Any big name supermarket will make it impossible for these local retailers to compete on price and hence the provision of a supermarket will cause local retailers to be unviable businesses.

5055 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Duncan Brooks [1174]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Convenience.

Summary:

Convenience.

5060 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Mrs Yvonne Forman [381]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: There is a need for a large supermarket in this area as those shops near to this area are only small and limited in what they have to offer. A supermarket here would help the elderly and carless to purchase shopping at a good price. Also less traffic would be travelling to supermarkets further afield such as at Milton or towards the Beehive Centre area.

Summary: There is a need for a large supermarket in this area as those shops near to this area are only small and limited in what they have to offer. A supermarket here would help the elderly and carless to purchase shopping at a good price. Also less traffic would be travelling to supermarkets further afield such as at Milton or towards the Beehive Centre area.

5062 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Dr Philippa Brice [62]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: This option would be most central to the different developments, and most convenient for me as a local resident. Also, there is already a small Co-op near here, with a very limited range of stock. Another small outlet with a limited range would not remove the need to travel further to alternative large supermarkets with a good selection of products.

Summary: This option would be most central to the different developments, and most convenient for me as a local resident. Also, there is already a small Co-op near here, with a very limited range of stock. Another small outlet with a limited range would not remove the need to travel further to alternative large supermarkets with a good selection of products.

5083 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Catherine Belsey [1181]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I support option B.

Summary: I support option B.

5094 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Mr Wayne Boucher [1185]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text:

Summary: Option D makes the most sense. The middle class (i.e. rich) people who live in the Huntingdon Road area do not want a supermarket. The ordinary people in Arbury and Kings Hedges do. So put it on the NIAB site and towards the northern edge. And make sure there is enough parking (well that is a forlorn hope).

5095 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Ms Anne Jackson [1173]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I purchase my shopping from a variety of sources - Tesco at Milton, local shops in Histon Road, city centre market and small supermarkets (e.g. M&S, Sainsbury in Sidney St). I believe my patterns would change once the NIAB development has been completed, if the options were really an improvement. I would certainly only envisage shopping there on foot/by bike. Another superstore such as Tesco Bar Hill would be a disaster and unnecessary (if I want the kinds of things I can only get in a superstore I go by car anyway).

Summary: Another superstore such as Tesco Bar Hill would be a disaster and unnecessary (if I want the kinds of things I can only get in a superstore I go by car anyway).

5100 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Anne Lally [1186]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: This is an unsustainable option.

Summary: This is an unsustainable option.

5106 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Stratfield Close & Tavistock Road Residents Association (Dr Gillian Rogers) [1189]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:**

Summary: One supersized store in either the University or the NIAB sites would not solve the problem of car movements between the 2 sites, because people would not be able to carry a weeks shop manually from whichever site was chosen

5118 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Cambridgeshire County Council (Mrs Kathy Baldwin) [1193]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: This is not a preferred option as it could prove difficult to incorporate into the design of the local centre and may affect the ability to attract other smaller retailers.

Summary: This is not a preferred option as it could prove difficult to incorporate into the design of the local centre and may affect the ability to attract other smaller retailers.

5124 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** unsustainable**Summary:** unsustainable**5130 Object**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I support Option B. That is two supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net floorspace (1,500 sq m net convenience), one at the University site and one on NIAB, and the committed floorspace at Orchard Park. This is just slightly larger than Sainsburys in Sidney Street (1,260sq m net convenience). I think also that non-car modes of transport should be considered in greater detail than they have so far in the process.

Both Option C (that is a superstore of 3,500 net floorspace - 2,500 sq m net convenience, at the University site and the committed/pipeline floorspace at NIAB and Orchard Park - and Option D (one superstore of 3,500 net floorspace - 2,500 sq m net convenience - at the NIAB site and the committed/pipeline floorspace at the University Site and Orchard Park) would be wholly unacceptable to residents in Castle ward.

Last year, on behalf Castle ward residents I campaigned against a huge superstore (which would have been slightly larger than Option C) on the University site and gave evidence at an Inspector's hearing on its likely impact of traffic on the grounds of noise and air quality. The Inspector responded favourably to our objections. A huge supermarket on NIAB would be even worse, and my residents are already unhappy about the lack of infrastructure on NIAB. So it is clear that a huge supermarket on either the NW Site or NIAB would be wholly unacceptable to residents and would meet with great opposition.

Orchard Park is quite close to Milton Tesco on one side, and Histon Rd shops on the other, and so has access to a supermarket for weekly shopping and therefore does not need more than the planned foodstore provision

If more food provision is needed than that which was originally planned in NW Cambridge then Option B is the most sensible position at this stage.

Summary: Last year Castle ward residents campaigned against a huge superstore on the University site and gave evidence at an Inspector's hearing on its impact of traffic on the grounds of noise and air quality. The Inspector responded favourably to our objections. A huge supermarket on NIAB would be worse, and residents are already unhappy about the lack of infrastructure on NIAB. A huge supermarket on either NW Site or NIAB would meet with great opposition. Orchard Park is close to Milton Tesco, and Histon Rd shops, so has access to a supermarket for weekly shopping and therefore does not need more than the planned foodstore provision

5135 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) [230]**Agent:** Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Ms Claire Morrison) [1199]**Full Text:**

Summary: Superstore options are more likely to include comparison shopping that will compete directly with the city centre, and will not meet the overall objectives set out in the adopted and emerging policy for NW Cambridge, which seeks to provide for facilities being provided which meets the needs of the new and existing population.

5142 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Foxton Parish Council (Dr Colin Grindley) [1003] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Superstore proposal is in conflict with need for self sufficient flourishing local centre.

Summary: Superstore proposal is in conflict with need for self sufficient flourishing local centre.

5160 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: A larger foodstore development at the NIAB site would both dominate the retail provision within the site and impact adversely on surrounding local centres, including those planned for Orchard Park and University site. As the NIAB1 and NIAB extra are will be located off Histon Road a larger foodstore on either of these may affect the viability of the local centre at Orchard Park.

Summary: A larger foodstore development at the NIAB site would both dominate the retail provision within the site and impact adversely on surrounding local centres, including those planned for Orchard Park and University site. As the NIAB1 and NIAB extra are will be located off Histon Road a larger foodstore on either of these may affect the viability of the local centre at Orchard Park.

5161 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: No

Summary: I object to Option D

5166 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:**

The University objects to the option for a 3,500m² net floorspace superstore at the NIAB site (built in phases) and 1,625m² net floorspace small supermarket at the University site, for these reasons:

1. It is assumed that the turnover of the small supermarket on the University's site would have a sales density to support only a budget retailer or independent store. Provision of that type of offer at the University's site would be inadequate given that it will have a resident population of approximately 6,500 plus 2,000 students, and around 6,300 employees working in academic and University-related research buildings and at service buildings.
2. 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 relating to these uses being made from the University site to the NIAB site.
3. Provision of a superstore in the NIAB local centre would undermine the potential to create an attractive local centre with a range of smaller shops at that site.
4. A phased approach to provision of a superstore would not be as sustainable as provision of space in one phase.
5. The NIAB site has lower levels of trip internalisation than the University site, and the University site is well placed to encourage pass by trips from Huntingdon Road.
6. As stated within the Transport Study, when considering phasing of the food stores, lower average trip costs and lower car mode shares can be achieved where development density is higher. The NIAB development has a lower housing density than the University site around the respective local centres, with less opportunity to reduce trip costs and car mode shares compared with the University site.

Summary:

The University objects to Option D for these reasons:

1. A small budget retailer or independent store would be inadequate at the University's site.
2. The NIAB site does not have student housing or the same level of employment generation and daytime uses as the University site.
3. Provision of a superstore would undermine the potential to create an attractive local centre at the NIAB site.
4. A phased approach to provision of a superstore would not be as sustainable.
5. The NIAB site has lower levels of trip internalisation than the University site.
6. The NIAB development has a lower housing density than the University site around its local centres.

5178 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207]**Agent:** Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]**Full Text:**

We support Options C and D, which propose one superstore of 3,500 sqm net floorspace at either the University site or the NIAB site respectively. Either of these Options would deliver a substantial main foodstore to NW Cambridge of a size that could compete effectively with other main foodstores in the City. This would allow residents to meet their main food shopping needs locally thus reducing the propensity to travel out of the NW Cambridge area to shop.

The provision of a large format foodstore in NW Cambridge would significantly reduce leakage of expenditure from the core catchment area as well as providing additional consumer choice and reducing the need for car travel.

We consider either Option C or D would provide an appropriate and sustainable level of retail development to meet the needs of the growing NW Cambridge population.

Summary:

Both Options C or D would deliver a substantial main foodstore to NW Cambridge of a size that could compete effectively with other main foodstores in Cambridge. This would allow residents to meet their main food shopping needs locally thus reducing the propensity to travel out of NW Cambridge.

A new large format foodstore in NW Cambridge would significantly reduce leakage of expenditure from the core catchment area, provide additional consumer choice and reduce the need for car travel.

Both Options would provide appropriate and sustainable level of retail development to meet the needs of the growing NW Cambridge population

5186 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: William Morrisons Supermarkets [1210]

Agent: Peacock and Smith (Mr Steve Buckley) [1209]

Full Text: My client considers 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. We consider that only Option C and D incorporating a larger foodstore are considered suitable. In terms of whether Option C or D is most appropriate, much will rest with ensuring that a scheme can be delivered which meets modern retailer requirements including a suitable level of car parking balanced against the design objectives of the LPA and the wider local centre provision.

Summary: My client considers 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. We consider that only Option C and D incorporating a larger foodstore are considered suitable. In terms of whether Option C or D is most appropriate, much will rest with ensuring that a scheme can be delivered which meets modern retailer requirements including a suitable level of car parking balanced against the design objectives of the LPA and the wider local centre provision.

5198 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Waitrose Limited (Mr Andrew Vaughan) [1213]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

Summary: The provision of a superstore at the NIAB Site is strongly supported by Waitrose Limited, as it will meet an identified qualitative need for a larger supermarket within the area and provide the best location qualitatively to serve the existing and new population. The size of superstore supported on the NIAB site would be limited to 25,000sq ft sales (2,323sq m) 38,000sq ft gross (3,531 sqm).

5200 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Mrs A Young) [216]

Agent: N/A

Full Text:

Summary: This will attract shoppers and therefore vehicles from outside the development. The traffic study seems to concentrate more on the carbon reduction from the shortening of trips between the northern and southern sides of the city as an argument and lacks the full discussion of the increase in movements within the northern edge that would ensue. Especially as there does not seem to be any in depth discussion on the effect on Histon Road. A large retail unit would affect traffic flows in Histon Road, where there is already an Aldi store. It would have a large effect on the Communities of Histon & Impington

5212 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:**

Summary: it is necessary to make provision for a new convenience store of 2,500 sq m net convenience sales floorspace in order to meet the identified need for main food shopping facilities within North West Cambridge. Of the two options which could meet this requirement, the NIAB site is the most appropriate site on which to meet the need as:

- It is centrally located and most accessible to 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.

Option D is supported as the most appropriate means of meeting ongoing shopping needs within NWCambridge.

5231 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 5:

Respondent: Dr Ann Mullinger [1218]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Option B: Supermarket on NIAB and University sites.

I support option B, with a small supermarket on both the University site and the NIAB site (either NIAB 1 or NIAB 2) because they would provide for most of the regular foodstore needs of local residents on both sites. Also, having supermarkets on both sites would lead to less vehicular traffic into and out of the sites than Options A, C and D.

Options C and D: Superstore on NIAB site or Univeristy site

I do not support these options which would represent over-development and be out of scale. The associated car parking would take up too much land on these sites, thus threatening other community facilities and/or leading to increased housing densities on the sites. They would also attract more traffic from outside the local areas. A superstore on one site would not be convenient for residents of the other site. There is no need for a store providing non-food items.

Question 6 Other Issues

1. The amount of space required for associated car parks for supermarkets and superstores should be taken into consideration and numbers of dwellings reduced accordingly. Space must not lead to reduction in other community facilities provided on the sites.

2. Shopping patterns will depend on which particular supermarkets are provided. Many people have strong preferences for particular companies.

Summary: I do not support these options which would represent over-development and be out of scale. The associated car parking would take up too much land on these sites, thus threatening other community facilities and/or leading to increased housing densities on the sites. They would also attract more traffic from outside the local areas. A superstore on one site would not be convenient for residents of the other site. There is no need for a store providing non-food items.

5046 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Chris Brown [1169]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Support for local producers and retailers has not been considered, and must be to allow the community to be fully sustainable. Although you are considering 'green bling', such as green roofs, etc, you are not considering the environmental impact of the products which are being consumed from these supermarkets/superstores. Ultimately, provision of these local supermarkets/superstores will result in more items being purchased, which will be likely to be highly packaged and sourced non-locally, harming the environment in their production, transportation.

Summary: Support for local producers and retailers has not been considered, and must be to allow the community to be fully sustainable. Although you are considering 'green bling', such as green roofs, etc, you are not considering the environmental impact of the products which are being consumed from these supermarkets/superstores. Ultimately, provision of these local supermarkets/superstores will result in more items being purchased, which will be likely to be highly packaged and sourced non-locally, harming the environment in their production, transportation.

5049 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Mr Tom Playford [1170]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: The West Cambridge site desperately needs shops. Ideally a butcher, baker and a grocers - however I suspect a supermarket, please not Tesco's, would have to do.

Also, a pub or two is needed too. It is probably the only reason the Cavendish Laboratory hasn't had a Nobel prize since it moved to the new site.

Summary: The West Cambridge site desperately needs shops. Ideally a butcher, baker and a grocers - however I suspect a supermarket, please not Tesco's, would have to do.

Also, a pub or two is needed too. It is probably the only reason the Cavendish Laboratory hasn't had a Nobel prize since it moved to the new site.

5066 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Dr Philippa Brice [62]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: A supermarket OTHER than Tesco would add to the local choices and be likely to get more local support - there are no local Asda, Sainsbury's Waitrose or Morrisons...

Summary: A supermarket OTHER than Tesco would add to the local choices and be likely to get more local support - there are no local Asda, Sainsbury's Waitrose or Morrisons...

5084 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Catherine Belsey [1181]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: I'm not sure how other retail outlets fit in here, but I would support independent provision of a pharmacy, dry cleaners, cafes. In other words, the supermarkets should not be expected to cover everything. It is important that people should be able to do day-to-day shopping and socialising without going into the overcrowded city centre. Supermarkets are functional but don't provide much interaction.

Summary: I'm not sure how other retail outlets fit in here, but I would support independent provision of a pharmacy, dry cleaners, cafes. In other words, the supermarkets should not be expected to cover everything. It is important that people should be able to do day-to-day shopping and socialising without going into the overcrowded city centre. Supermarkets are functional but don't provide much interaction.

5101 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Anne Lally [1186]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: It is important to support local stores -- for sustainability and the financial viability of Cambridge. So an option that focuses on local food sources should be considered.

Summary: It is important to support local stores -- for sustainability and the financial viability of Cambridge. So an option that focuses on local food sources should be considered.

5109 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Ms Ceri Galloway [1187]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Option A: Local food stores (such as co-operatives) at all three areas.

my choice option is A. I feel the evidence based information you have outlined is biased towards the supermarkets and encourages people away from choosing option A. because it does not take the embedded carbon footprint of the movement of goods to from producers, packers and transport by supermarkets into consideration and when explaining this option A. it does not explain to people what option A. could mean as part of a strategy for reducing carbon.

If the city council is going to take climate change and peak oil seriously it needs to 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.

See Growing Communities model as outlined below as an attachment (in particular look at page 2 of the food zone as it shows how much food needs to be grown locally) This model has been in action for 10 years and they and Organiclea are making movement towards more sustainable food production for Hackney. Rob Hopkins "Can Totnes feed itself" is useful source to explore these issues.

Additionally People will go to the supermarket of their choice not the one you put in their community. So if you put a Tosco in one area there's not guarantee that people will use it. If they prefer Sainsbury's or ASDA on cost or quality thy will go there. So your argument that people won't have to go far to their supermarket is flawed.

Option B: Two supermarkets, one of the Cambridge Uni site and on at the NIAB site (national institute of agricultural botany). Each slightly larger than the Sainsburys city centre store.

Option C: One supermarket at the Cambridge Uni site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Option D: One supermarket at the NIAB site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Summary: People will go to the supermarket of their choice not the one you put in their community. So if you put a Tosco in one area there's not guarantee that people will use it. If they prefer Sainsbury's or ASDA on cost or quality thy will go there. So your argument that people won't have to go far to their supermarket is flawed.

5125 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Non car modes of transport have to be considered more than they have so far**Summary:** Non car modes of transport have to be considered more than they have so far**5136 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS)
[230]**Agent:** Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Ms Claire Morrison) [1199]**Full Text:****Summary:** Whichever options are taken forward, the IPPG should include restrictions on the amount of comparison floorspace proposed to protect the city centre from large comparison retail development which would be contrary to PPS4. These restrictions should also be included in any future decision notices for any foodstore development. USS would suggest the following wording for such a condition:
Superstore: "Upon completion of the foodstore hereby approved, no more than 30% of the net floorspace of the store shall be used for the display or sale of comparison shopping including items such as clothing, footwear, household and recreational goods".**5137 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS)
[230]**Agent:** Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Ms Claire Morrison) [1199]**Full Text:****Summary:** Whichever options are taken forward, the IPPG should include restrictions on the amount of comparison floorspace proposed to protect the city centre from large comparison retail development which would be contrary to PPS4. These restrictions should also be included in any future decision notices for any foodstore development. USS would suggest the following wording for such a condition:
Supermarket: "Upon completion of the foodstore hereby approved, no more than 25% of the net floorspace of the store shall be used for the display or sale of comparison shopping including items such as clothing, footwear, household and recreational goods".

5145 Object

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: A 75% convenience/25% comparison split is not appropriate for stores of 2,000m2 net as the supermarket operators would not be able to provide their full convenience core offer. Supermarket operators will only start to offer comparison goods in stores of a minimum of 2,500m2 net. There are no examples provided in Appendix 1 of the consultation document to support this position. Of the stores identified in Appendix 1, all of those up to 2400m2 net floorspace, and some larger stores, comprise almost entirely convenience space.

Summary: A 75% convenience/25% comparison split is not appropriate for stores of 2,000m2 net as the supermarket operators would not be able to provide their full convenience core offer. Supermarket operators will only start to offer comparison goods in stores of a minimum of 2,500m2 net. There are no examples provided in Appendix 1 of the consultation document to support this position. Of the stores identified in Appendix 1, all of those up to 2400m2 net floorspace, and some larger stores, comprise almost entirely convenience space.

5168 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Any proposal for larger retail provision in Orchard Park, other in the original masterplan would of necessity involve use of the Q/HRCC site where the original vision would have seen relatively light traffic flow. Main access is restricted to one way ingress off Kings Hedges Road from the west. Other access points from the east through Graham Road and Chieftain Way, and up Chariot Way route traffic past the school and high density residential areas. Non residential traffic should be directed away from these uses and any development should seek to minimise any increase in traffic flow through these areas.

Summary: Any proposal for larger retail provision in Orchard Park, other in the original masterplan would of necessity involve use of the Q/HRCC site where the original vision would have seen relatively light traffic flow. Main access is restricted to one way ingress off Kings Hedges Road from the west. Other access points from the east through Graham Road and Chieftain Way, and up Chariot Way route traffic past the school and high density residential areas. Non residential traffic should be directed away from these uses and any development should seek to minimise any increase in traffic flow through these areas.

5180 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207] **Agent:** Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]

Full Text: No further issues, save for those raised above.

Summary: No further issues, save for those raised above.

5188 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: William Morrisons Supermarkets [1210]**Agent:** Peacock and Smith (Mr Steve Buckley) [1209]

Full Text: The sections entitled Design (paras 4.41 to 4.47) and Sustainable Design and Construction (paras 4.48 to 4.56), both appear to have design merits, but allowance should be included to allow for a holistic design solution whereby such issues are balanced with securing the wider objectives of the town/local centre and ensuring that any supermarket which would anchor the centre would be commercially viable (including securing appropriate parking provision). Reference should be included to encouraging/requesting a series of design team meetings to discuss the design parameters be held with the preferred foodstore operator to allow the operator to work in partnership with the LPA and other relevant stakeholders.

Summary: The sections entitled Design (paras 4.41 to 4.47) and Sustainable Design and Construction (paras 4.48 to 4.56), both appear to have design merits, but allowance should be included to allow for a holistic design solution whereby such issues are balanced with securing the wider objectives of the town/local centre and ensuring that any supermarket which would anchor the centre would be commercially viable (including securing appropriate parking provision). Reference should be included to encouraging/requesting a series of design team meetings to discuss the design parameters be held with the preferred foodstore operator to allow the operator to work in partnership with the LPA and other relevant stakeholders.

5189 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Phasing may not be necessary if a LAD format store is a preferable option since there is a wealth of evidence that this type of retail format does not compete with existing local/town/city centres due to the level of offering and range of goods sold.

Summary: Phasing may not be necessary if a LAD format store is a preferable option since there is a wealth of evidence that this type of retail format does not compete with existing local/town/city centres due to the level of offering and range of goods sold.

5190 Comment (W/drawn 2010-10-20)

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Impington Parish Council (Ms Vanessa Kelly) [448] **Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The Transport Study states that the negative impact on key junctions will need looking at as part of the Transport Assessments for the developments and any 'mitigating measures' would need to be funded by the developments. Outline Planning Permission has been granted for the NIAB development which included the new junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads. How can further 'mitigating measures' be added to these junctions, ie relieving congestion, without impacting on more sustainable modes?

Summary: The Transport Study states that the negative impact on key junctions will need looking at as part of the Transport Assessments for the developments and any 'mitigating measures' would need to be funded by the developments. Outline Planning Permission has been granted for the NIAB development which included the new junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads. How can further 'mitigating measures' be added to these junctions, ie relieving congestion, without impacting on more sustainable modes?

5192 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Orchard Park Community Council welcomes the proposals in the consultation, particularly that the retail provision in Orchard Park should be limited to the local retail centre proposed in the masterplan for the site.

Orchard Park Community Council supports the retail objectives (Question 1) and prefers option B as the more long term sustainable option for North West Cambridge as a whole as well as the three specific sites.

Summary: Orchard Park Community Council welcomes the proposals in the consultation, particularly that the retail provision in Orchard Park should be limited to the local retail centre proposed in the masterplan for the site.**5201 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Mrs A Young) [216]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:****Summary:** The development was put forward with a mix of local retailing facilities including a single retail store of approximately 1200 sq. mtrs. The traffic model was calculated on this basis. Full planning permission was granted for the access to Histon Road from the development on the basis that the effect of the development on the B1049/A14 traffic was "little change". Despite the calculations omitting the extra traffic that will be generated as a result of the increased housing permitted at Orchard Park and the proposed increase of two lanes of traffic in each direction to and from Girton and one extra lane to/from Milton.**5213 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:****Summary:** It is considered important that due consideration is given to how the foodstore provision within North West Cambridge fits with the wider provision within Cambridge and its immediate hinterland. The spatial distribution of the proposed stores and their size and format needs to be considered within this context such that there is a good spatial distribution of a range of stores to meet both top-up and main food shopping needs. It is considered that the NIAB Local Centre provides the best fit with this existing provision as can be seen from the plans enclosed at Appendix 3.

5214 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:**

Summary: The distinction between the main food shopping patterns and top-up food shopping patterns is given insufficient consideration within both GVA Grimley's 2006 Retail Study and 2008 Retail Study Update along with NLP's 2009 SRS. The absence of any evidence within the retail surveys which underpin these reports to distinguish between these different shopping patterns is a significant oversight. It is considered that such an assessment is likely to further emphasise the level of the convenience goods expenditure leakage to stores outside the PCA associated with main food shopping. These trips are more likely to be undertaken by car.

5228 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Ms Vanessa Kelly [1219]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The Transport Study states that the negative impact on key junctions will need looking at as part of the Transport Assessments for the developments and any 'mitigating measures' would need to be funded by the developments. Outline Planning Permission has been granted for the NIAB development which included the new junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads. How can further 'mitigating measures' be added to these junctions, ie relieving congestion, without impacting on more sustainable modes?

Summary: The Transport Study states that the negative impact on key junctions will need looking at as part of the Transport Assessments for the developments and any 'mitigating measures' would need to be funded by the developments. Outline Planning Permission has been granted for the NIAB development which included the new junction designs for Huntingdon and Histon Roads. How can further 'mitigating measures' be added to these junctions, ie relieving congestion, without impacting on more sustainable modes?

5232 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 6:

Respondent: Dr Ann Mullinger [1218]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Option B: Supermarket on NIAB and University sites.

I support option B, with a small supermarket on both the University site and the NIAB site (either NIAB 1 or NIAB 2) because they would provide for most of the regular foodstore needs of local residents on both sites. Also, having supermarkets on both sites would lead to less vehicular traffic into and out of the sites than Options A, C and D.

Options C and D: Superstore on NIAB site or Univeristy site

I do not support these options which would represent over-development and be out of scale. The associated car parking would take up too much land on these sites, thus threatening other community facilities and/or leading to increased housing densities on the sites. They would also attract more traffic from outside the local areas. A superstore on one site would not be convenient for residents of the other site. There is no need for a store providing non-food items.

Question 6 Other Issues

1. The amount of space required for associated car parks for supermarkets and superstores should be taken into consideration and numbers of dwellings reduced accordingly. Space must not lead to reduction in other community facilities provided on the sites.

2. Shopping patterns will depend on which particular supermarkets are provided. Many people have strong preferences for particular companies.

Summary:

1. The amount of space required for associated car parks for supermarkets and superstores should be taken into consideration and numbers of dwellings reduced accordingly. Space must not lead to reduction in other community facilities provided on the sites.

2. Shopping patterns will depend on which particular supermarkets are provided. Many people have strong preferences for particular companies.

5048 Support

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: Chris Brown [1169]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Indoor market areas, with small flexible spaces for independent traders and local producers to offer ranges of foodstuffs, together with staples being provided by a retailer such as Daily Bread or Coop.

Look at traditional city markets in places like Poland, where you can buy anything you desire at competitive prices and yet all the benefit goes to local producers, not to shareholders. Surely this model can be brought up to the 21st Century.

Summary:

Indoor market areas, with small flexible spaces for independent traders and local producers to offer ranges of foodstuffs, together with staples being provided by a retailer such as Daily Bread or Coop.

Look at traditional city markets in places like Poland, where you can buy anything you desire at competitive prices and yet all the benefit goes to local producers, not to shareholders. Surely this model can be brought up to the 21st Century.

5102 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: Anne Lally [1186]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** A local food hub, or other selection of food sources that offer access to good, fresh, affordable, local food.**Summary:**

A local food hub, or other selection of food sources that offer access to good, fresh, affordable, local food.

5110 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: Ms Ceri Galloway [1187]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: Option A: Local food stores (such as co-operatives) at all three areas.

my choice option is A. I feel the evidence based information you have outlined is biased towards the supermarkets and encourages people away from choosing option A. because it does not take the embedded carbon footprint of the movement of goods to from producers, packers and transport by supermarkets into consideration and when explaining this option A. it does not explain to people what option A. could mean as part of a strategy for reducing carbon.

If the city council is going to take climate change and peak oil seriously it needs to 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.

See Growing Communities model as outlined below as an attachment (in particular look at page 2 of the food zone as it shows how much food needs to be grown locally) This model has been in action for 10 years and they and Organiclea are making movement towards more sustainable food production for Hackney. Rob Hopkins "Can Totnes feed itself" is useful source to explore these issues.

Additionally People will go to the supermarket of their choice not the one you put in their community. So if you put a Tosco in one area there's not guarantee that people will use it. If they prefer Sainsbury's or ASDA on cost or quality thy will go there. So your argument that people won't have to go far to their supermarket is flawed.

Option B: Two supermarkets, one of the Cambridge Uni site and on at the NIAB site (national institute of agricultural botany). Each slightly larger than the Sainsburys city centre store.

Option C: One supermarket at the Cambridge Uni site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Option D: One supermarket at the NIAB site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Summary: If the city council is going to take climate change and peak oil seriously it needs to 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. See the Growing Communities model notably the food zone section which shows how much food needs to be grown locally. This model has been in action for 10 years and they and Organiclea are making movement towards more sustainable food production for Hackney. Rob Hopkins "Can Totnes feed itself" is useful source to explore these issues.

5162 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197]

Agent: N/A

Full Text: No

Summary: No

5181 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207]**Agent:** Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]**Full Text:** No further options at this stage.**Summary:** No further options at this stage.**5194 Comment (W/drawn 2010-10-20)**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: Impington Parish Council (Ms Vanessa Kelly) [448] **Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Given the campaigns against Tesco in Mill Road and Shelford, and the popularity of Cambridge market and farmers' markets in the necklace villages, will there be provision for this sort of alternative shopping in NW Cambridge? Perhaps the People's Supermarket could be persuaded to open a branch on one of the three sites? See article: <http://www.ameliasmagazine.com/earth/the-peoples-supermarket-a-new-approach-to-food-shopping/2010/06/14/>**Summary:** Given the campaigns against Tesco in Mill Road and Shelford, and the popularity of Cambridge market and farmers' markets in the necklace villages, will there be provision for this sort of alternative shopping in NW Cambridge? Perhaps the People's Supermarket could be persuaded to open a branch on one of the three sites? See article: <http://www.ameliasmagazine.com/earth/the-peoples-supermarket-a-new-approach-to-food-shopping/2010/06/14/>**5207 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Mrs A Young) [216] **Agent:** N/A**Full Text:****Summary:** Given the massive effect that a large retail unit would have on traffic flows in Histon Road, where there is already an Aldi store, we urge the authorities to think very carefully before imposing such a development on the NIAB land. We would also urge the authorities to ensure that due diligence is undertaken to accurately forecast increased traffic flows onto the development ignoring the current fashion to assume that a significant proportion of non-local household shopping is carried out via 1) The Guided Busway, 2) Bicycle 3) The local bus service 4) Car Sharing, in order to reduce the increases to an acceptable level.

5215 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:**

Summary: An alternative option, based on Option D but with more realistic and consistent assumptions regarding the comparison goods floorspace element could also be appropriate for consideration. This could be based on the floorspace split detailed below.
 University: 1,460 (NC) 1,625 (NSF), 2,500 (GF)
 NIAB: 2,500 (NC), 3,000 (NSF), 4,500 (GF)
 Orchard Park: 590 (NC), 623 (NSF), 958 (GF)
 NC = Net Convenience
 NSF = Net Sales Floorspace
 GF = Gross Floorspace
 This would ensure that a main food store within the NIAB site to serve the North West Cambridge Quadrant could be accommodated but in a manner which would result in a better balance of provision and slightly less retail and traffic impact.

5226 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 7:

Respondent: Ms Vanessa Kelly [1219]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Given the campaigns against Tesco in Mill Road and Shelford, and the popularity of Cambridge market and farmers' markets in the necklace villages, will there be provision for this sort of alternative shopping in NW Cambridge? Perhaps the People's Supermarket could be persuaded to open a branch on one of the three sites? See article: <http://www.ameliasmagazine.com/earth/the-peoples-supermarket-a-new-approach-to-food-shopping/2010/06/14/>

Summary: Given the campaigns against Tesco in Mill Road and Shelford, and the popularity of Cambridge market and farmers' markets in the necklace villages, will there be provision for this sort of alternative shopping in NW Cambridge? Perhaps the People's Supermarket could be persuaded to open a branch on one of the three sites? See article: <http://www.ameliasmagazine.com/earth/the-peoples-supermarket-a-new-approach-to-food-shopping/2010/06/14/>

5047 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Chris Brown [1169]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Daily Bread & Coop in Histon for weekly shops, Impington Farmers Market monthly. Aldi and Tesco Bar Hill every 2 months.

Summary: Daily Bread & Coop in Histon for weekly shops, Impington Farmers Market monthly. Aldi and Tesco Bar Hill every 2 months.

5050 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Mrs Caroline Lillyman [1171]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I would be quite happy with any of the options provided that the supermarket involved was any other than Tesco. We already have to travel to Cambourne or Shelford to get any alternative shops. In our village, Milton, we have the choice of Tesco or Tesco One-stop and three other Tescos near by.

Summary: I would be quite happy with any of the options provided that the supermarket involved was any other than Tesco. We already have to travel to Cambourne or Shelford to get any alternative shops. In our village, Milton, we have the choice of Tesco or Tesco One-stop and three other Tescos near by.

5054 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Ms Anne Jackson [1173]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I purchase my shopping from a variety of sources - Tesco at Milton, local shops in Histon Road, city centre market and small supermarkets (e.g. M&S, Sainsbury in Sidney St). I believe my patterns would change once the NIAB development has been completed, if the options were really an improvement. I would certainly only envisage shopping there on foot/by bike. Another superstore such as Tesco Bar Hill would be a disaster and unnecessary (if I want the kinds of things I can only get in a superstore I go by car anyway).

Summary: I purchase my shopping from a variety of sources - Tesco at Milton, local shops in Histon Road, city centre market and small supermarkets (e.g. M&S, Sainsbury in Sidney St). I believe my patterns would change once the NIAB development has been completed, if the options were really an improvement. I would certainly only envisage shopping there on foot/by bike. Another superstore such as Tesco Bar Hill would be a disaster and unnecessary (if I want the kinds of things I can only get in a superstore I go by car anyway).

5061 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Mrs Yvonne Forman [381]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Normally I travel to the Beehive Centre but would consider changing to a supermarket nearer to me if it offers the same services as Asda.

Summary: Normally I travel to the Beehive Centre but would consider changing to a supermarket nearer to me if it offers the same services as Asda.

5067 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Dr Philippa Brice [62]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Tesco Bar Hill via internet delivery.
Additional shopping at Asda Beehive, and occasionally M&S city centre / Waitrose Trumpington.

Summary: Tesco Bar Hill via internet delivery.
Additional shopping at Asda Beehive, and occasionally M&S city centre / Waitrose Trumpington.

5085 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Catherine Belsey [1181]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I use Tesco at Bar Hill and Waitrose at Trumpington, with occasional supplementation from the city centre. A closer Waitrose (or even Sainsbury's) would certainly make me use my car less.

Summary: I use Tesco at Bar Hill and Waitrose at Trumpington, with occasional supplementation from the city centre. A closer Waitrose (or even Sainsbury's) would certainly make me use my car less.

5111 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Ms Ceri Galloway [1187]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: Option A: Local food stores (such as co-operatives) at all three areas.

my choice option is A. I feel the evidence based information you have outlined is biased towards the supermarkets and encourages people away from choosing option A. because it does not take the embedded carbon footprint of the movement of goods to from producers, packers and transport by supermarkets into consideration and when explaining this option A. it does not explain to people what option A. could mean as part of a strategy for reducing carbon.

If the city council is going to take climate change and peak oil seriously it needs to 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.

See Growing Communities model as outlined below as an attachment (in particular look at page 2 of the food zone as it shows how much food needs to be grown locally) This model has been in action for 10 years and they and Organiclea are making movement towards more sustainable food production for Hackney. Rob Hopkins "Can Totnes feed itself" is useful source to explore these issues.

Additionally People will go to the supermarket of their choice not the one you put in their community. So if you put a Tosco in one area there's not guarantee that people will use it. If they prefer Sainsbury's or ASDA on cost or quality thy will go there. So your argument that people won't have to go far to their supermarket is flawed.

Option B: Two supermarkets, one of the Cambridge Uni site and on at the NIAB site (national institute of agricultural botany). Each slightly larger than the Sainsburys city centre store.

Option C: One supermarket at the Cambridge Uni site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Option D: One supermarket at the NIAB site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Summary: People will go to the supermarket of their choice not the one you put in their community. So if you put a Tesco in one area there's not guarantee that people will use it. If they prefer Sainsbury's or ASDA on cost or quality thy will go there. So your argument that people won't have to go far to their supermarket is flawed.

5163 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Not applicable**Summary:** Not applicable**5182 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207]**Agent:** Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]**Full Text:** N/A**Summary:** N/A**5216 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:****Summary:** The existing and future shopping patterns would change the most under Option D and to a lesser extent Option C. This would be beneficial as it would secure more sustainable shopping patterns by ensuring that main food shopping needs are adequately met within NW Cambridge.

At present, there is no such provision within the North West Cambridge Quadrant and its Primary Catchment Area. As a result the vast majority (65.8%) of existing resident's convenience goods expenditure is spent in large out of centre stores beyond the PCA (See Appendix 3).

5217 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 8:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:**

Summary: The provision of a main food shopping facility within North West Cambridge will mean that there will be less need for residents to travel greater distances to these large out of centre stores to meet their main food shopping needs. The needs of those without a car will also be more readily met. This will result in shorter journeys and a higher proportion of trips by non car modes.

Option D will also help to reduce traffic on the A14 by reducing the number of trips to Milton Tesco and Bar Hill Tesco in particular. Option D is the only Option that delivers these benefits as acknowledged in recent discussions with the Highways Agency.

5068 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Dr Philippa Brice [62]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I'm all for encouraging and supporting bike use but please bear in mind that cars are really extremely useful especially to families and to imagine that everyone will gladly relinquish their use (however desirable this might be) is NOT good future planning. People often need to take children to supermarket, not having anything else to do with them. Residents will not all be students!

Impact of delivery and distribution lorries to new retail units on residents should also be considered.

Summary: I'm all for encouraging and supporting bike use but please bear in mind that cars are really extremely useful especially to families and to imagine that everyone will gladly relinquish their use (however desirable this might be) is NOT good future planning. People often need to take children to supermarket, not having anything else to do with them. Residents will not all be students!

Impact of delivery and distribution lorries to new retail units on residents should also be considered.

5107 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Stratfield Close & Tavistock Road Residents Association (Dr Gillian Rogers) [1189]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:**

Summary: There might be a danger that the planned local centres for these sites would disappear from the agenda

5112 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Ms Ceri Galloway [1187]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Option A: Local food stores (such as co-operatives) at all three areas.

my choice option is A. I feel the evidence based information you have outlined is biased towards the supermarkets and encourages people away from choosing option A. because it does not take the embedded carbon footprint of the movement of goods to from producers, packers and transport by supermarkets into consideration and when explaining this option A. it does not explain to people what option A. could mean as part of a strategy for reducing carbon.

If the city council is going to take climate change and peak oil seriously it needs to 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.

See Growing Communities model as outlined below as an attachment (in particular look at page 2 of the food zone as it shows how much food needs to be grown locally) This model has been in action for 10 years and they and Organiclea are making movement towards more sustainable food production for Hackney. Rob Hopkins "Can Totnes feed itself" is useful source to explore these issues.

Additionally People will go to the supermarket of their choice not the one you put in their community. So if you put a Tosco in one area there's not guarantee that people will use it. If they prefer Sainsbury's or ASDA on cost or quality thy will go there. So your argument that people won't have to go far to their supermarket is flawed.

Option B: Two supermarkets, one of the Cambridge Uni site and on at the NIAB site (national institute of agricultural botany). Each slightly larger than the Sainsburys city centre store.

Option C: One supermarket at the Cambridge Uni site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Option D: One supermarket at the NIAB site the same size as Asda at the Beehive.

Summary: I feel the evidence based information is biased towards the supermarkets and encourages people away from choosing option A. It does not take the embedded carbon footprint of the movement of goods by supermarkets into consideration and when explaining this option A. it does not explain to people what option A. could mean as part of a strategy for reducing carbon.

5126 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: It is important that any supermarket provision should be at Madingley Rd end of the site. For two reasons, residents on the West side of Cambridge are badly served with food shops, and those at Huntingdon Rd end are not far from Bar Hill Tesco

Summary: It is important that any supermarket provision should be at Madingley Rd end of the site. For two reasons, residents on the West side of Cambridge are badly served with food shops, and those at Huntingdon Rd end are not far from Bar Hill Tesco

5131 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Natural England (Janet Nuttall) [1009]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Thank you for consulting Natural England regarding the above options for foodstore provision in North West Cambridge, in your letter dated 2nd September. Our comments are provided below.

Natural England does not have detailed comments to make regarding the foodstore options outlined in the report. We believe the preferred option should be sustainable and seek to minimise environmental impacts as far as possible. Any proposal for Site A: University Site must be able to demonstrate no adverse effect on the geological interest features of Traveller's Rest Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

We very much welcome the proposed consideration of sustainable design and construction standards in developing any future option. We also support the proposal for local centres to be linked to the network of pedestrian and cycle routes, as well as public transport routes, in order to minimise car dependence.

I hope you will find these comments useful, however, please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information.

Summary: Natural England does not have detailed comments to make regarding the foodstore options outlined in the report. We believe the preferred option should be sustainable and seek to minimise environmental impacts as far as possible. Any proposal for Site A: University Site must be able to demonstrate no adverse effect on the geological interest features of Traveller's Rest Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

We very much welcome the proposed consideration of sustainable design and construction standards in developing any future option. We also support the proposal for local centres to be linked to the network of pedestrian and cycle routes, as well as public transport routes, in order to minimise car dependence.

5138 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) [230]**Agent:** Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Ms Claire Morrison) [1199]**Full Text:****Summary:** USS advise that the development of the supermarket or superstore should be linked with the phasing of the housing development in NW Cambridge to ensure that it is providing additional retail to serve the local catchment. This is to ensure that there would be no impact on the City Centre and the Grand Arcade shopping Centre. The IPPG should therefore make it clear that the foodstore provision should be linked to the completion of the housing elements of each developed area.**5139 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) [230]**Agent:** Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Ms Claire Morrison) [1199]**Full Text:****Summary:** USS advise that any decision notice for any future foodstore should include a condition to ensure that development is phased in line with Appendix A (Staging Development - pgh 42) of Circular 11/95. USS suggests the following wording for such a condition:
"The work comprised for the development of the foodstore hereby permitted shall not be commenced before the residential development comprised within X development area is completed"

5164 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Mr Mike Galloway (Orchard Park Community Council) [1197]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** No**Summary:** No**5183 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: ASDA Stores Limited [1207]**Agent:** Osborne Clarke (Mr John Sturt) [1206]**Full Text:** We appreciate that by preparing this Informal Planning Policy Guidance, the Councils are able to respond more quickly than they could by following the process required to adopt a DPD. The IPPG will enable the information to be taken into account, in the short term, as a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications.

We urge the Councils to take steps to incorporate any new retail strategy into their LDFs at the earliest opportunity. This will ensure the strategy is properly tested and that a robust policy basis is established to support future retail development in NW Cambridge.

Summary: We appreciate that by preparing this Informal Planning Policy Guidance, the Councils are able to respond more quickly than they could by following the process required to adopt a DPD. The IPPG will enable the information to be taken into account, in the short term, as a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications.

We urge the Councils to take steps to incorporate any new retail strategy into their LDFs at the earliest opportunity. This will ensure the strategy is properly tested and that a robust policy basis is established to support future retail development in NW Cambridge.

5191 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Lidl UK (Miss Wendy Hurst) [832]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** The level of foodstore provision needs to be suitable to support the urban extensions in addition to offering an alternative to existing larger format retailers in a qualitative sense.**Summary:** The level of foodstore provision needs to be suitable to support the urban extensions in addition to offering an alternative to existing larger format retailers in a qualitative sense.**5197 Comment**

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Anglian Water Services Ltd (Mrs Amie Lill) [1088]**Agent:** N/A**Full Text:** Thank you for this consultation.

However, I do not have any comment to make on this occasion.

Summary: Thank you for this consultation.

However, I do not have any comment to make on this occasion.

5202 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Mrs A Young) **Agent:** N/A
[216]

Full Text:

Summary: The District and City Council have now decided to review the retail provision, with the option of increasing the size of a store or stores, covering Orchard Park, NIAB and the University sites to up to 3,500 square metres. It may be argued by the Parish Councils' that a study was being undertaken before full planning permission for the Histon Road access was granted, despite being omitted from the traffic study for the NIAB development. The decision to grant permission could therefore be argued to have been premature.

5203 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Mrs A Young) **Agent:** N/A
[216]

Full Text:

Summary: If the authority approves a large or superstore for this site, this will attract shoppers and therefore vehicles from outside the development. Especially if, as some consultees have indicated, the site is run by "anyone but Tesco's". The reason for this is less to do with an antipathy to the largest retailer in the country and more to do with the lack of a Sainsbury's, Waitrose or Asda, north of the city.

5218 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214] **Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]

Full Text:

Summary: Whilst the options put forward for consultation are a useful basis for discussion, it is considered that they are slightly misleading. The key issue for consideration in terms of meeting the shopping needs of the residents of North West Cambridge and creating sustainable communities should be on convenience shopping rather than comparison shopping. Yet the options put forward for discussion unduly skew the consideration of the options by providing misleading assumptions as to the amount and proportion of comparison floorspace likely to be delivered under the different store size options.

5219 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners [1214]**Agent:** Bidwells (Mr Neil Waterson) [682]**Full Text:**

Summary: Under Options C and D the likely gross floorspace is exaggerated due to unrealistic assumptions regarding the amount and proportion of comparison goods retail floorspace. Both options assume that 40% of net sales floorspace would provide for comparison goods. This is excessive and unrealistic. A comparison with existing retail stores with a net convenience sales area of between 2,000 and 3,000 sq m shows that the proportion of comparison floorspace ranges between 5% and 30% of the net sales area. This is significant since the assessment of trips associated with store options within the Atkins Retail Transport Study is based on net retail sales floorspace. The transport impact of Option D could therefore be overstated.

5221 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Dr Simon Wilson [1216]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: With regard to the above consultation we support Option A for the advantageous reasons set out in the report. We do not support the over development of Cambridge in principle and where this has to happen, we would rather local services and amenities were integrated into the existing infrastructure.

Summary: We do not support the over development of Cambridge in principle and where this has to happen, we would rather local services and amenities were integrated into the existing infrastructure.

5224 Comment

6. PROPOSED OPTIONS

Question 9:

Respondent: Ms Vanessa Kelly [1219]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The current 'less sustainable travel patterns' would be helped by new buses serving the Bar Hill and Milton Tesco stores. Having worked on both the Personal Travel Planning projects in Orchard Park and King's Hedges, I know there are many current residents who would support bus services to supermarkets. Will this sort of initiative be part of the planning for NW Cambridge or will the might of Stagecoach and Tesco/Sainsbury prevent it (financially unrewarding)?

Summary: The current 'less sustainable travel patterns' would be helped by new buses serving the Bar Hill and Milton Tesco stores. Having worked on both the Personal Travel Planning projects in Orchard Park and King's Hedges, I know there are many current residents who would support bus services to supermarkets. Will this sort of initiative be part of the planning for NW Cambridge or will the might of Stagecoach and Tesco/Sainsbury prevent it (financially unrewarding)?

5127 Comment

GLOSSARY

GLOSSARY

Respondent: Dr Belinda Brooks-Gordon [1061]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: I would be grateful to have a summary of responses, especially broken down by ward area. I know what my residents say but am interested in what residents of other wards want.

Summary: I would be grateful to have a summary of responses, especially broken down by ward area. I know what my residents say but am interested in what residents of other wards want.

5169 Object

GLOSSARY

GLOSSARY

Respondent: University of Cambridge (Mr Paul Milliner) [47]**Agent:** N/A

Full Text: The definition for net convenience floorspace should exclude checkouts, the area in front of checkouts and lobbies where goods are displayed, so as to be consistent with best practice as set out the Government's PPS4 practice guidance Planning for Town Centres.

The Guidance contains the following definitions for net retail sales area:

"A new set of definitions for retail planning has been prepared by the National Retail Planning Forum (NRPF). The definition for all retail shops and stores other than foodstores was widely supported during initial consultations by the NRPF, and is as follows:

The area within the walls of the shop or store to which the public has access or from which sales are made, including display areas, fitting rooms, checkouts, the area in front of checkouts, serving counters and the area behind used by serving staff, areas occupied by retail concessionaires, customer services areas, and internal lobbies in which goods are displayed; but not including cafes and customer toilets.

For foodstores, an alternative definition of 'net retail sales area' has been put forward by the Competition Commission, and is supported by the majority of major foodstore operators. This is as follows:

The sales area within a building (i.e. all internal areas accessible to the customer), but excluding checkouts, lobbies, concessions, restaurants, customer toilets and walkways behind the checkouts.

The NRPF's definition could be applied to all shops and stores including foodstores, but differs from the way in which the majority of major foodstore operators currently publish details of their store sizes. The Competition Commission's alternative definition is believed to reflect the latter more accurately.

For retail planning purposes, the main consideration is to ensure that comparisons of floorspace and published sales densities are on a like for like basis."

We understand that the net sales figures quoted in the Sub Region Study and Supplementary Retail Study are sourced from IGD, who has confirmed that there is no consistency across the figures as to whether they include or exclude checkouts (etc.). IGD compiles its data from information provided by the retailers themselves, and has no way of ensuring that data complies with a single definition. As noted in the Practice Guidance, however, the majority of major foodstore operators do not accord with the NRPF's definition, or therefore the Councils' proposed definition, in publishing details of their store sizes.

The definition of net floorspace should therefore be amended to 'The sales area within a building (i.e. all internal areas accessible to the customer), but excluding checkouts, lobbies, concessions, restaurants, customer toilets and walkways behind the checkouts.'

Summary: The definition for net convenience floorspace should exclude checkouts, the area in front of checkouts and lobbies where goods are displayed, so as to be consistent with best practice as set out the Government's PPS4 practice guidance Planning for Town Centres.

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).