



England
& Lyle

**PROPOSED TESCO FOODSTORE,
MARKET STREET,
HOYLAND**

**REVIEW OF RETAIL
STATEMENT BY DPP
ON BEHALF OF
LITTON PROPERTIES LTD**

May 2011

**England & Lyle Ltd
Chartered Town Planners
Gateway House
55 Coniscliffe Road
Darlington
DL3 7EH**

Tel: 01325 469236

info@england-lyle.co.uk

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Barnsley Smaller Centres Study	3
3. The Proposed Development	3
4. Agreed Matters	4
5. Application of PPS4 Advice	4
6. Policy EC10 Considerations	6
7. Policy EC15 Sequential Approach	8
8. Policy EC16 Retail Impact	9
9. Policy EC17 Evaluation	14
10. Conclusions	15

Appendices

1. Retail Impact Assessment, DPP
2. Retail Impact Assessment, England & Lyle
3. Evaluation Matrix

1. Introduction

1.1 This report has been prepared by England & Lyle for Barnsley MBC to advise on the planning application by Litton Properties Limited in support of the planning application (ref. 2011/0390) for a retail foodstore on the former Market Street School site in Hoyland. The foodstore is intended to be a Tesco store. The proposal site is located approximately 500 metres from Hoyland district centre in an out-of-centre location.

1.2 England & Lyle have been commissioned to carry out an independent Review of the Retail Statement prepared by DPP in support of the planning application. The Review has been undertaken in the light of the Smaller Centres Study prepared for the Council by England & Lyle in November 2010 which assesses shopping provision and shopping patterns in the Hoyland area and elsewhere in Barnsley Borough outside the Barnsley main urban area.

1.3 DPP's planning case in support of the proposed development is essentially that:

- The proposals would result in the redevelopment of a vacant brownfield site.
- Hoyland and Wombwell district centres cater primarily for top-up shopping. Main food shopping patterns in the catchment area are dominated by the out-of-centre Morrisons store at Cortonwood Retail Park and the Tesco store at Wombwell Lane.
- The proposed development is aimed at catering for main food shopping trade, in a location which is closer to Hoyland district centre. It would claw back expenditure which is currently leaking to these out-of-centre shopping destinations.
- No other available, suitable or viable sites have been identified in either Hoyland or Wombwell.
- There is an opportunity for linked trips between the proposed store and Hoyland district centre.
- There would be no significant adverse impact on Hoyland district centre.

1.4 An objection to the planning application has been made by NJL Consulting on behalf of the Co-operative Group. We have taken this objection into account in preparing this Review.

1.5 England & Lyle were consulted by DPP in March 2011 on a draft of the Retail Statement, an approach which is encouraged in PPS4 and the Practice Guidance. A number of matters were agreed with DPP at the draft stage and they are summarised in Section 4 of this Review.

1.6 The Review addresses retail policy aspects of the application only. We have no comments on other matters that may be relevant to the determination of the application.

2. Barnsley Smaller Centres Study

2.1 In November 2010 England & Lyle prepared the Smaller Centres Study (SCS) for Barnsley MBC. The SCS is referred to extensively by DPP in the Retail Statement. The defined catchment area of the proposed foodstore in Market Street includes the centres of Hoyland and Wombwell. The key findings of the SCS as they relate to shopping provision in Hoyland and Wombwell are summarised as follows:

- Wombwell is one of the largest district centres in the Borough with 47 retail units and a total of 112 retail and service units. Hoyland is smaller with 31 retail units and a total of 60 retail and service units.
- Hoyland's vacancy rate is only 5%, well below the national average. Wombwell's vacancy rate of 7% is also below the national average.
- Hoyland's trade in both convenience and comparison goods is drawn almost entirely (98%) from Zone 3, which comprises Hoyland and Wombwell.
- Wombwell's retail trade is drawn mostly from Zone 3, representing 59% of convenience goods turnover and 70% of comparison goods turnover.
- In the Hoyland In-Centre Survey 37% of respondents said they mostly use Morrisons at Cortonwood for their main food shopping. 17% use the Co-op store in Hoyland for main food shopping.
- 62% of respondents said they were doing food shopping in Hoyland.
- 26% of shoppers mostly visiting Hoyland centre for food shopping also make linked trips to visit non-food shops and 25% also do other food shopping.
- There is a limited capacity for additional retail floorspace in Hoyland, based on a constant market share approach. No allowance is made in the capacity analysis for the possibility of a new supermarket in Market Street, Hoyland. A new supermarket would increase the retention level in the Hoyland catchment area.

3. The Proposed Development

3.1 The proposed foodstore has a gross floorspace of 2,594 sq.m. and a net sales area of 1,530 sq.m. The sales area would be split between 1,344 sq.m. for food sales and 186 sq.m. for non-food sales.

3.2 The turnover is estimated as follows.

	Net floorspace sq.m.	Sales density £ per sq.m.	Turnover 2011	Turnover 2016
convenience	1,344	£11,964	£16.08m	£16.27m
comparison	186	£7,316	£1.36m	£1.48m
total	1,530	-	£17.44m	£17.75m

3.3 These figures include an inflow of trade from beyond the catchment area of 5% of the store's turnover, which is excluded from DPP's estimates in Appendix 2, Table 6 of the Retail Statement.

4. Agreed Matters

4.1 The following matters were agreed by England & Lyle in commenting on the draft Retail Statement:

- (1) The catchment area is based on Zone 3 of the Smaller Centres Study (SCS) and comprises Hoyland, Wombwell and surrounding residential areas. The definition of the catchment area is appropriate for a foodstore of the size proposed in Hoyland. It is a larger catchment than that of Hoyland district centre.
- (2) The comparison floorspace of the store is ancillary and the sequential approach should be based on the total floorspace proposed.
- (3) The capacity analysis should relate to the SCS assessment for Hoyland and Wombwell.
- (4) Hoyland is a reasonably vital and viable centre. The SCS shows that it has a slightly better than average level of vitality and viability.
- (5) Hoyland does not function as a main food shopping destination.
- (6) Trade diversion in Hoyland would be predominantly from the Co-op.
- (7) There would be no significant adverse impact on Hoyland.
- (8) There would be a minimal impact on Wombwell and Hoyland Common.
- (9) The greatest impact would be on Morrisons, Cortonwood and Tesco, Wombwell Lane.

4.2 Further comments are made on these matters in the respective sections of this Review.

4.3 In addition we agree with the turnover estimates of the store shown in Section 3 above, with the addition of the inflow element of turnover.

5. Application of PPS4 Advice

5.1 This Section highlights the main requirements set out in PPS4 on planning applications for major retail development that are not in a defined town centre.

5.2 Policy EC10 on Determining Planning Applications for Economic Development states (in summary):

- Local planning authorities should adopt a positive and constructive approach towards planning applications for economic development. Planning applications that secure sustainable economic growth should be treated favourably.
- All planning applications for economic development should be assessed against a number of general impact considerations – these considerations are reviewed in Section 6 of this Review.

5.3 Policy EC14 on Supporting Evidence for Planning Applications for Main Town Centre Uses states (in summary):

- A sequential assessment (under Policy EC15) is required for planning applications for main town centres uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up to date development plan.
- An assessment addressing the impacts in Policy EC16 is required for planning applications for retail and leisure developments over 2,500 square metres gross floorspace not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up to date development plan.

5.4 Therefore, although there is positive support for applications for economic development, there is still a requirement to assess applications against the EC10 considerations and to address the sequential and impact issues in Policies EC15 and EC16 when proposals are made outside existing centres. The sequential assessment is reviewed in Section 7 and the retail impact assessment in Section 8.

5.5 Policy EC17 states that planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up to date development plan should be refused planning permission where:

- (a) the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the requirements the sequential approach (policy EC15); or
- (b) there is clear evidence that the proposal is likely to lead to significant adverse impacts in terms of any one of impacts set out in policies EC10.2 and EC16.1 (the impact assessment), taking account of the likely cumulative effect of recent permissions, developments under construction and completed developments (our underlining)

5.6 Where no significant adverse impacts have been identified under policies EC10.2 and EC16.1, planning applications should be determined by taking account of:

- (a) the positive and negative impacts of the proposal in terms of policies EC10.2 and EC16.1 and any other material considerations; and
- (b) the likely cumulative effect of recent permissions, developments under construction and completed developments (our underlining).

5.7 PPS4 supports economic development where it would contribute to the Government's objective of sustainable economic growth. This objective was reinforced in a Written Statement by the Minister of State for Decentralisation on 23rd March 2011. The Minister said:

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer has today issued a call to action on growth, publishing an ambitious set of proposals to help rebuild Britain's economy. The planning system has a key role to play in this, by ensuring that the sustainable development needed to support economic growth is able to proceed as easily as possible. We will work quickly to reform the planning system to achieve this, but the Government recognises that many of these actions will take some months to deliver, and that there is a pressing need to ensure that the planning system does everything it can to help secure a swift return to

economic growth. This statement therefore sets out the steps the Government expects local planning authorities to take with immediate effect.

The Government's top priority in reforming the planning system is to promote sustainable economic growth and jobs. Government's clear expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes', except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy

In determining planning applications, local planning authorities are obliged to have regard to all relevant considerations. They should ensure that they give appropriate weight to the need to support economic recovery, that applications that secure sustainable growth are treated favourably (consistent with policy in PPS4), and that they can give clear reasons for their decisions."

6. Policy EC10 Considerations

6.1 The Retail Statement undertakes an assessment against the five criteria in Policy EC10:

- a) Whether the proposal has been planned over the lifetime of the development to limit carbon dioxide emissions, and minimise vulnerability and provide resilience to, climate change;
- b) The accessibility of the proposal by a choice of means of transport including walking, cycling, public transport and the car, the effect on local traffic levels and congestion after public transport and traffic management measures have been secured;
- c) Whether the proposal secures a high quality and inclusive design which takes the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions;
- d) The impact on economic and physical regeneration in the area including the impact on deprived areas and social inclusion objections; and
- e) The impact on local employment.

6.2 DPP indicate that details of the proposed development including matters relating to store design, sustainability and access are given in the accompanying Design, Access and Sustainability Statement, BREEAM Assessment and Transport Assessment. We make only brief comments on Policy EC10 matters.

Climate Change

6.3 The proposed development incorporates sustainable design and materials, and it is also envisaged that the proposal will significantly reduce CO2 emissions from the reduction in distance travelled. We have no comments in relation to climate change.

Accessibility

6.4 Details on the accessibility of the site are given in the applicant's Transport Assessment. The development will be accessible via bus, on foot, by cycle and via car.

Design

6.5 The Design and Access Statement considers the design vision and demonstrates how it responds to the site's constraints and opportunities.

Regeneration

6.6 DPP emphasise that the proposal would physically regenerate the Market Street site by bringing back in to use a vacant brownfield site and removing an eyesore which has been deteriorating for a number of years. The site has been closed since 2002. We agree there would be physical regeneration benefits.

6.7 Regeneration is also concerned with qualitative need which is a material consideration. The PPS4 Practice Guidance identifies five factors that are relevant to qualitative need:

- Deficiencies or 'gaps' in existing provision
- Consumer choice and competition
- Overtrading, congestion and overcrowding of existing stores
- Location specific needs such as deprived areas and underserved markets, and
- The quality of existing provision.

6.8 The In-Centre survey of Hoyland in the SCS shows that the Co-op supermarket is used by 17% of respondents for main food shopping, compared to 37% who use Morrisons at Cortonwood. For top-up food shopping Hoyland is the centre used by 76% of respondents. The role of Hoyland is predominantly for top-up food shopping and most people go to the larger foodstores for main food shopping. We agree with DPP that the Co-op is not used primarily for main food shopping and that the proposed development would meet a qualitative need for a new foodstore in the Hoyland and Wombwell area.

6.9 The extent of qualitative need for a new foodstore is shown by the results of the In-Centre survey that 20% of respondents in Hoyland said their greatest dislike about Hoyland is the poor range of foodstores (the highest individual response). Asked about the need for new shops and services, 30% said they would like to see another supermarket in Hoyland (again the highest individual response).

Employment

6.10 The Retail Statement indicates the proposed foodstore will provide approximately 140 full and part time jobs. Recent national research on employment densities shows that supermarkets create an average of 1 job per 17 sq. metres net sales area. On this basis, with a sales floorspace of 1,530 sq.m. the store could be expected to create 90 jobs (full-time equivalents). The

total of 140 jobs estimated by the applicants includes a large number of part-time posts. However, the creation of part-time employment can have benefits in terms of social inclusion. We accept that the scheme would have positive local employment benefits.

6.11 DPP have identified a number of positive impact benefits brought about by the development proposal and we agree that the proposal complies with Policy EC10 of PPS4.

7. Policy EC15 Sequential Approach

7.1 A sequential assessment (under Policy EC15) is required for planning applications for main town centres uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up to date development plan. The PPS4 Practice Guidance indicates that the catchment area of the proposed development is the relevant area of search for sequential sites.

7.2 Sites within and on the edge of Hoyland and Wombwell centres have been identified and assessed in the Retail Statement. In Hoyland four sites have been assessed. England & Lyle agree that these are the only alternative sites in Hoyland. In Wombwell no sites were identified that could be considered available or suitable. We agree with DPP on this point. Any edge-of-centre potential in Wombwell has been taken up by the new medical centre and residential redevelopment on High Street / Mayflower Way.

7.3 DPP's assessment of sites in Hoyland is summarised in the following table. The sites are shown on the map in Appendix 5 of the Retail Statement.

1. Land at West Street	Redevelopment for a foodstore is not viable given the limited size of the site. The site is not currently available given the number of differing ownerships, and the inclusion of much of the site in the adjacent Hoyland Centre scheme. Therefore the site is not available or viable for a foodstore of the size proposed.
2. Land at Milton Road / Southgate / High Street	Not available as it is midway through construction for redevelopment for the Hoyland Centre
3. The Market Site and Adjacent Car Park, Mallin Croft	Redevelopment of this site for a foodstore is not appropriate given its current contribution to the vitality and viability of the town centre. Further, there are no suitable sites for relocation of the market. Also, the site is significantly smaller than the application site. Therefore, the market site is not available or viable for accommodating the proposed foodstore.

4. Land at King Street / Bethel Street	This site has been redeveloped for residential use and so is not available for retail development. It is also too small to accommodate the proposed development.
--	--

7.4 The Sequential Assessment concludes that there are no available, suitable or viable alternative sites within or on the edge of Hoyland and Wombwell district centres which should be given preference in retail terms. The proposed site is the most sequentially preferable in Hoyland, despite its out-of-centre location. We agree that the proposal satisfies the requirements of PPS4 Policy EC15.

8. Policy EC16 Retail Impact

8.1 Policy EC16 on Impact Assessments states that planning applications for main town centres uses that are not in a centre and not in accordance with an up-to- date development plan should be assessed against the following impacts on centres:

- (a) the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal;
- (b) the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and the range and quality of the comparison and convenience retail offer;
- (c) the impact of the proposal on allocated sites outside town centres being developed in accordance with the development plan;
- (d) in the context of a retail or leisure proposal, the impact of the proposal on in-centre trade/turnover and on trade in the wider area, taking account of current and future consumer expenditure capacity in the catchment area up to five years from the time the application is made;
- (e) if located in or on the edge of a town centre, whether the proposal is of an appropriate scale (in terms of gross floorspace) in relation to the size of the centre and its role in the hierarchy of centres; and
- (f) any locally important impacts on centres under policy EC3.1.e.

8.2 In our experience it is necessary to first assess the impact of the proposal on in-centre trade/turnover and on trade in the wider area before any assessment can be made of impact on investment or vitality and viability. We have no comments on the EC16 factors of impact on allocated sites outside centres or on any locally important impacts because these factors are not applicable at present in Barnsley.

Impact on Trade/Turnover

Capacity

8.3 PPS4 no longer includes a requirement to demonstrate quantitative need for additional retail floorspace. However, it refers to capacity as a factor to include in assessing the impact of proposed retail developments. The relevance of capacity is that evidence of quantitative need helps to reduce the significance of any possible trading impact; on the other hand, a lack of evidence of quantitative need can be regarded as a negative sign that a level of trading impact may be significant.

8.4 The capacity analysis in the Smaller Centres Study is based on a market share approach. It assumes that there will be no increase in Hoyland's market share of convenience goods trade within its catchment area because no new floorspace has been approved that could increase market share by clawing back leakage of spending. However, we accept that a new supermarket would increase the market share (retention level) in the Hoyland catchment area.

8.5 DPP have made an assessment of capacity in convenience and comparison goods in 2016 in Appendix 2 of the Retail Statement. The population and expenditure data are taken directly from the Smaller Centres Study. DPP have made their own estimates of existing benchmark turnover in stores and centres in the catchment area. In convenience goods the retention level (pre-development) in 2016 is calculated to be 50%. DPP consider that the retention level could increase to 75% assuming that 95% of the convenience turnover of the store is drawn from within the catchment. In comparison goods the retention level (pre-development) in 2016 is calculated to be just 9%. DPP consider that the retention level could increase to 10% assuming that 95% of the comparison turnover of the store is drawn from within the catchment.

8.6 We believe it is realistic for the convenience goods retention level or market share in the defined catchment area to increase from 50% to 75% if a new foodstore of the size proposed is developed. We agree with DPP that there is scope for the area to accommodate the additional floorspace proposed. However, it is still necessary to assess whether there could be any significant adverse impacts on centres in the catchment area.

Trading Impact

8.7 In Appendix 2, Table 8 of the Retail Statement, DPP have undertaken a retail impact assessment of the proposed development for both convenience and comparison goods. The table is difficult to read and we have reproduced it in a better format in Appendix 1 of this Review. Unusually, the turnovers of existing stores used in the impact analysis are benchmark (company average) turnovers. However, since the catchment area includes small centres for which accurate survey-based turnovers are not available, it is reasonable to use benchmark

turnovers in this instance. We have made an adjustment to DPP's estimated turnover of the proposed store to include the element of 5% of the store's turnover which is assumed to be inflow from beyond the catchment area.

8.8 In our Appendix 1, the DPP analysis shows a predicted trade diversion of 11.7% from the Co-op supermarket in Hoyland in convenience and comparison goods combined. The overall trade diversion from Hoyland is 7.9% and the overall trade diversion from Wombwell is 1.2%. The largest trade diversion of 15.1% is predicted to be from Morrisons at Cortonwood.

8.9 DPP's view is that the impact on Hoyland will be "negligible". The trading impact of 11.7% on the Co-op supermarket would not be "unduly harmful". Other local traders would remain largely unaffected. Hoyland would continue to function as a predominantly top-up and specialist convenience shopping destination. DPP also consider that the proposed foodstore will have a minimal impact on turnover in Wombwell. The relatively high level of impact on the Morrisons superstore at Cortonwood, which is currently the principal main food shopping destination in the catchment area, would not be significant in view of the strength of that store. In any event, a store in this out-of-centre shopping location is not afforded any policy protection. DPP predict a 10% trade diversion from the Tesco superstore at Wombwell Lane. This is also an out-of-centre store. DPP state that this would not be a significant impact and that Tesco would not be proposing to develop the Market Street store if it resulted in a significant adverse impact on their existing store at Wombwell Lane.

8.10 We have carried out an independent review of DPP's impact assessment in Appendix 2 to be able to advise the Council on the robustness of the assessment. We have used DPP's estimates of benchmark turnover of existing stores and we accept DPP's estimate of the turnover of the proposed foodstore. We have made a close examination of DPP's assumptions about trade draw to the proposed store from existing stores and centres. In convenience goods we consider that a small trade draw of 1% of turnover should be allowed for from other shops in Hoyland, from Tesco Express in Hoyland, from Tesco Express in Wombwell, from other shops in Wombwell, and from Hoyland Common. No allowance is made by DPP for trade draw from these stores and centres. We consider that the trade draw from Morrisons, Cortonwood should be slightly higher (36% rather than 34%) and that clawback would be 50% of turnover rather than 57%. In comparison goods we accept most of the estimated trade draws but we have increased the trade draw from Morrisons, Cortonwood from 28% to 33% and we have reduced the trade draw from clawback from 56% to 50% (both to provide greater consistency with the convenience goods assessment).

8.11 In Appendix 2 we predict a trade diversion of 12.2% from the Co-op supermarket in Hoyland in convenience and comparison goods combined. The overall trade diversion from Hoyland is 10.0%, a higher figure than that estimated by DPP because we predict a trade diversion of 6.0% from other shops in Hoyland. The overall trade diversion predicted from Wombwell is also higher at

4.9%. The largest trade diversion of 16.2% is predicted to be from Morrisons at Cortonwood.

8.12 We are aware that concerns have been expressed about the potential impact of the proposed development on the Co-op supermarket in Hoyland. The Co-op is the largest supermarket in Hoyland but it is a relatively small store – with only 570 sq.m. net sales area. There is clear evidence that the Co-op store is used predominantly for top-up food shopping and that most people go to the larger out-of-centre foodstores for main food shopping. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that a new Tesco store would draw its trade mostly from the larger supermarkets with which it will compete on a like-for-like basis. Even allowing some degree of trade diversion in top-up food shopping, we would not expect the overall trade draw from the Co-op to be more than 4% and the trade diversion from the store to be more than 12%. The Co-op would maintain its existing role for top-up food shopping and we do not believe there is any risk of closure of the store.

8.13 The objection by NJL Consulting on behalf of The Co-operative Group emphasises the impacts on the vitality and viability of Hoyland district centre and trade in the centre. Dealing with trading impact, NJL draw particular attention to linked trips between the Co-op supermarket and other shops in the district centre. There is evidence of linked trips in Hoyland, which benefits both food and non-food shops. We predict some trading impact on existing shops but the figures would suggest that there will not be a significant adverse impact. There will continue to be linked trips between the Co-op and other shops in the centre because the centre will maintain its current role for top-up shopping. The vast majority of trade diverted to the proposed Tesco store will be main food shopping that is clawed back into Hoyland from the large out-of-centre foodstores.

Impact on Planned Investment

8.14 The Retail Statement considers that the proposal represents a significant private investment in Hoyland by a private developer and by Tesco. The report also points out that two significant public and private town centre redevelopment schemes are currently taking place in Hoyland. Both of these town centre development schemes appear to be progressing. In any event, they are not competing schemes. Therefore we agree with DPP that this planning application does not pose any threat to the ongoing development of those sites.

Impact on Town Centre Vitality and Viability

8.15 Impact has to be judged in terms of any possible adverse impact on the vitality and viability of centres as a whole, not just on retail facilities that may compete directly with a new development. The relevant centres in terms of vitality and viability are Hoyland and Wombwell.

Hoyland

8.16 The Smaller Centres Study concludes that Hoyland performs reasonably well on most vitality and viability indicators. The centre would benefit from additional investment, and the benefits of the ongoing redevelopment of the civic area is yet to be completed. This could result in improvements to the town centre in the short term. DPP's Retail Statement agrees that Hoyland performs fairly well on the PPS4 indicators, and in particular has a low vacancy rate well below the national average, with good pedestrian footfall. In our view the level of trading impact predicted in Hoyland is unlikely to result in any significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Hoyland town centre.

8.17 DPP place some emphasis on the possibility of linked trips between the proposed store and Hoyland district centre, either on foot or by car. It is claimed that there is a genuine possibility of linked trips as a result of the flat and direct route along Market Street which is not compromised by any pedestrian barriers. Linked trips would help to mitigate any potential impact on shops in the district centre. We are doubtful that many shoppers would be prepared to make linked trips on foot over a distance of 500 metres between the store and the centre. However, there is potential for shoppers to visit Tesco for main food shopping and then make a combined trip to the district centre for top-up purchases, which is not practical at present if shoppers are going to Morrisons at Cortonwood and Tesco at Wombwell Lane for their main food shopping.

8.18 The objection by NJL Consulting on behalf of The Co-operative Group touches on the impact on the vitality and viability of Hoyland district centre. There is a concern that the proposed development will result in a decline in footfall in the district centre and reduction in linked trips. The extent of any impact on vitality and viability must take account of the health of the centre, which is reasonably good, and the nature of the trade diversion. Even though we predict a higher trade diversion from Hoyland than in DPP's assessment (10% overall), we agree that most of the trade diversion would be from the Co-op supermarket. It has been established that the role of the Co-op store is predominantly for top-up food shopping. The impact on the Co-op would be concentrated on its more limited main food shopping trade. The store will continue to meet top-up shopping needs in Hoyland and there will continue to be spin-off benefits to other shops and services in the district centre.

Wombwell

8.19 The Smaller Centres Study concludes that Wombwell also performs reasonably well on most vitality and viability indicators. The centre caters primarily for a localised top-up food shopping. However it also benefits from a number of notable comparison goods operators as well as a strong and regular market. The centre could benefit from additional investment in convenience goods shopping. We have predicted a higher level of trading impact from Wombwell than that assessed by DPP – overall 4.9% rather than 1.2%, mostly

because of a larger trade diversion from Tesco Express. However, we agree with DPP that there would not be a significant adverse impact on Wombwell and there is no risk of harm to its vitality and viability.

Scale of Development

8.20 PPS4 requires an assessment of whether a proposal in or on the edge of a town centre is of an appropriate scale (in terms of gross floorspace) in relation to the size of the centre and its role in the hierarchy of centres. The Market Street site is out-of-centre. Nevertheless, the Retail Statement considers that the proposed development is appropriate in terms of scale. Whilst it would be a large foodstore in the context of existing facilities in Hoyland, it would not be the largest foodstore in the catchment area which would remain the out-of-centre Morrisons store at Cortonwood. We agree that the proposed store will be of a scale capable of serving the main food shopping needs of Hoyland and its immediately surrounding residential catchment, aimed at stemming the high levels of existing expenditure leakage and reducing the need to travel to stand alone foodstores further afield.

8.21 Having considered the factors of trading impact, impact on planned investment, impact on town centre vitality and viability, and scale of development, there is no indication that the proposal would have any significant adverse impacts in relation to any of the tests in PPS4 Policy EC16 and we would advise that the proposed development satisfies the requirements of Policy EC16.

9. Policy EC17 Evaluation

9.1 PPS4 Policy EC17 states that planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up to date development plan should be refused planning permission where:

- (a) the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the requirements the sequential approach (policy EC15); or
- (b) there is clear evidence that the proposal is likely to lead to significant adverse impacts in terms of any one of impacts set out in policies EC10.2 and EC16.1 (the impact assessment).

9.2 Where no significant adverse impacts have been identified under policies EC10.2 and EC16.1, planning applications should be determined by taking account of the positive and negative impacts of the proposal in terms of policies EC10.2 and EC16.1 and any other material considerations.

9.3 The PPS4 Practice Guidance suggests that an impact evaluation matrix could be used to assess the potential impacts of a retail proposal. To assist the Council in assessing the current application we have used the information in this Review to prepare an evaluation matrix for the current application, which is enclosed as Appendix 3.

9.4 Our assessment shows that:

- The proposals comply with the sequential approach in Policy EC15.
- The proposals satisfy the general impact considerations in Policy EC10 and there would not be any significant adverse impacts in relation to any of these factors.
- There would not be any significant adverse impacts in respect of any of the key town centre impact considerations in Policy EC16. There would also not be any minor adverse impacts on these factors except for a small trading impact on Hoyland district centre. However, this would not be at a level that would result in any significant harm to the vitality and viability of the district centre.
- Any minor adverse effects on Hoyland district centre would be offset by the positive benefits of the proposal in terms of regeneration of a disused site, employment, reduction in shopping trips to more distant out-of-centre superstores and improved consumer choice and competition.

10. Conclusions

10.1 The Retail Statement concludes that

- The proposed foodstore would meet a qualitative need for main food shopping in the Hoyland area.
- There are no other available, suitable or viable sites in Hoyland or Wombwell.
- There would be no significant adverse impact on Hoyland district centre.
- The proposal complies with Policies EC10 and EC16 and will bring a number of wider benefits to Hoyland and surrounding areas.
- The proposal fully accords with the requirements of PPS4.

10.2 Our independent Review of the Retail Statement concludes that:

- (1) The proposed development is for a retail foodstore on the former Market Street School site in Hoyland. The proposed foodstore has a gross floorspace of 2,594 sq.m. and a net sales area of 1,530 sq.m, and it is intended to be a Tesco store.
- (2) The proposal complies with general impact considerations in Policy EC10 of PPS4.
- (3) The proposal satisfies the requirements of PPS4 Policy EC15 regarding the sequential approach.
- (4) The proposed development is predicted to have a 12% trading impact on the Co-op supermarket in Hoyland and overall trade diversions of 10% in Hoyland and 5% in Wombwell. The largest trade diversion of 16% is predicted to be from Morrisons at Cortonwood, which is not a material planning consideration. The levels of trading impact on centres do not represent a significant adverse impact.
- (5) There will continue to be linked trips between the Co-op and other shops in Hoyland centre because the centre will maintain its current role for top-

up shopping. The vast majority of trade diverted to the proposed Tesco store will be main food shopping that is clawed back into Hoyland from the large out-of-centre foodstores.

(6) There are unlikely to be any significant adverse impacts on the vitality and viability of Hoyland and Wombwell district centres.

(7) The proposed development satisfies the requirements of Policy EC16 in terms of key town centre impacts.

(8) In relation to Policy EC17, there would not be any minor adverse impacts except for a small trading impact on Hoyland district centre. However, this would not be at a level that would result in any significant harm to the vitality and viability of the district centre.

(9) Any minor adverse effects on Hoyland district centre would be offset by the positive benefits of the proposal in terms of regeneration of a disused site, employment, reduction in shopping trips to more distant out-of-centre superstores and improved consumer choice and competition.

APPENDIX 1: RETAIL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, CONVENIENCE AND COMPARISON GOODS

Assessment by DPP for 2016 (2008 prices) (based on benchmark turnovers)

	convenience turnover	comparison turnover	total turnover	convenience trade draw	convenience trade diversion	comparison trade draw	comparison trade diversion	total trade diversion	total percentage impact
	£m	£m	£m		£m		£m	£m	
<u>Hoyland</u>									
Co-op, High Street	5.03	0.29	5.32	4%	0.62	0%	0.00	0.62	11.7%
Other shops	1.51	1.44	2.95	0%	0.02	1%	0.01	0.03	1.0%
Centre total	6.54	1.73	8.27	4%	0.64	1%	0.01	0.65	7.9%
Tesco Express, Hoyland	1.51	-	1.51	0%	0.02	-	-	0.02	1.3%
<u>Wombwell</u>									
Tesco Express	2.04	-	2.04	0%	0.01	-	-	0.01	0.5%
Other shops	2.38	3.79	6.17	0%	0.02	5%	0.07	0.09	1.5%
Centre total	4.42	3.79	8.21	0%	0.03	5%	0.07	0.10	1.2%
Hoyland Common	2.41	0.38	2.79	0%	0.02	-	-	0.02	0.7%
Morrisons, Cortonwood	35.55	3.70	39.25	34%	5.49	28%	0.42	5.91	15.1%
Cortonwood Retail Park	-	17.50	17.50	-	-	5%	0.08	0.08	0.5%
Clawback	-	-	-	57%	9.28	56%	0.83	10.11	-
Inflow of Trade	-	-	-	5%	0.81	5%	0.07	0.88	-
Catchment area total	50.43	27.10	77.53	100%	16.27	100%	1.48	17.75	-

APPENDIX 2: RETAIL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, CONVENIENCE AND COMPARISON GOODS

Assessment by England & Lyle for 2016 (2008 prices) (using DPP estimates of benchmark turnovers)

	convenience turnover £m	comparison turnover £m	total turnover £m	convenience trade draw	convenience trade diversion £m	comparison trade draw	comparison trade diversion £m	total trade diversion £m	total percentage impact
<u>Hoyland</u>									
Co-op, High Street	5.03	0.29	5.32	4%	0.65	-	-	0.65	12.2%
Other shops	1.51	1.44	2.95	1%	0.16	1%	0.01	0.18	6.0%
Centre total	6.54	1.73	8.27	5%	0.81	1%	0.01	0.83	10.0%
Tesco Express, Hoyland	1.51	-	1.51	1%	0.16	-	-	0.16	10.8%
<u>Wombwell</u>									
Tesco Express	2.04	-	2.04	1%	0.16	-	-	0.16	8.0%
Other shops	2.38	3.79	6.17	1%	0.16	5%	0.07	0.24	3.8%
Centre total	4.42	3.79	8.21	2%	0.33	5%	0.07	0.40	4.9%
Hoyland Common	2.41	0.38	2.79	1%	0.16	1%	0.01	0.16	5.8%
Morrisons, Cortonwood	35.55	3.70	39.25	36%	5.86	33%	0.49	6.35	16.2%
Cortonwood Retail Park	-	17.50	17.50	-	-	5%	0.07	0.07	0.4%
Clawback	-	-	-	50%	8.14	50%	0.74	8.88	-
Inflow of Trade	-	-	-	5%	0.81	5%	0.07	0.89	-
Catchment area total	50.43	27.10	77.53	100%	16.27	100%	1.48	17.75	-

APPENDIX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX

POLICY TEST	Compliance	Any significant adverse impacts	Adverse impacts	Acceptable	Comments
EC10 General Impact Considerations					
Climate Change	Yes	-	-	-	See Design & Access Statement
Accessibility	Yes	-	-	-	See Transport Assessment
Design	Yes	-	-	-	See Design & Access Statement
Regeneration	Yes	-	-	-	Physical regeneration benefits on a disused brownfield site
Employment	Yes	-	-	-	Job creation benefits: potential for 140 new jobs
EC15 Sequential Assessment					
Compliance with Sequential Approach	Yes	-	-	-	No sequentially preferable sites are available, suitable and viable
EC16 Key Town Centre Impacts					
Impact on Trade/Turnover of Centres	-	No	Yes	Yes	No significant trade diversion from Hoyland or Wombwell centres
Effects on Planned Investment	-	No	No	Yes	No harm to any planned investment
Effects on Vitality and Viability of Centres	-	No	No	Yes	No harm to vitality & viability of Hoyland or Wombwell centres
Allocated Sites outside Town Centres	-	No	No	Yes	No allocated sites in catchment area
Scale	-	No	No	Yes	Scale is appropriate
Locally Important Impacts	-	No	No	Yes	Not applicable