

Appendix A: Summary of Representations to the Options Report and the Councils' Response

Public Participation Report

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1

5155	Support	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Support noted. Both the retail and transport evidence base supported the provision of a local centre with a limited retail offer in Orchard Park	
------	---------	---	--	--

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****Councils' Assessment****Action****3. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT****Question 1:**

5132 - Universities
Superannuation Scheme Ltd
(USS)

Comment 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.

Whilst the primary purpose of the informal planning policy guidance is in relation to foodstores, it also relates to local centres where other types of retail will be found. Therefore the Councils would prefer the objectives to refer to shopping in general rather than restrict it just to food shopping.

The Informal Planning Policy Guidance will include a section on 'Vibrant Local Centres' dealing with possible restrictions on services provided by the medium supermarkets.

5041

Object 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.

The Councils will need to consider planning controls and conditions on retail applications at the time of submission. Whilst noting that the purpose of the local centre is to meet the everyday shopping needs of the local community, any conditions or restrictions on use need to carefully consider the risks of not providing some facilities.

Whilst the Councils acknowledge the benefits of stocking local produce, ultimately they have no powers of control to be able to condition/enforce this on the operator. With regards to local retailers it will be for the site developers and the open market to decide whom the operator of the store will be. The Councils are unable to control the identity of the retailer, other than the Use Class into which this falls. As such it would be difficult to include these as additional objectives, as they would not be within the Councils' control.

Points noted on encouraging local produce and the Councils will work with the developers to explore possibilities for designing space to cater for this in the Local Centres. This will be referred to in the section on 'Vibrant Local Centres' in the IPPG.

The Options Report notes the importance of building local centres that form a centre to the community, and it is envisaged that other smaller units will be developed alongside the foodstore. This may offer opportunities for local producers whom are offering a different more specialised product.

5078
5114 - Cambridgeshire County
Council
5175 - ASDA Stores Limited
5193

Support Support the retail objectives for NW Cambridge and the Councils' intention to facilitate a level of retail development that will meet the needs of the growing NW Cambridge population.

Agreement with the retail objectives set out in the Options Report is noted.

Retail objectives to be taken forward into the Informal Planning Policy Guidance.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5208 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Support	<p>With the following amendments:</p> <p>To create sustainable communities with appropriate provision of shopping and services, to serve the needs of the new and existing population.</p> <p>To establish an appropriate hierarchy of centres having regard to the wider retail hierarchy.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To secure a high degree of sustainable design and construction for the retail units. Seeking to secure BREEAM Excellent or an equivalent.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Many of the changes suggested are supported by the Councils. The suggestion relating to the objective on sustainable design and construction is not supported as it is considered to weaken the objective.</p>	<p>Amend the retail objectives accordingly.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------

4. EVIDENCE BASE

4.15

5196 - University of Cambridge	Comment	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Councils acknowledged in the Options Report at paragraph 4.15 that the 75:25 split which was used in the Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) did appear to give a high proportion of comparison goods when compared with similar sized stores in and around Cambridge. For stores of around 2,000 sqm net floorspace the evidence suggests that around 90 - 95% of the floorspace would be convenience food goods.</p> <p>A 90 - 95% food split in floorspace would allow a 2,000 sqm net supermarket to sell a wider range of food products for a main weekly shop. This would also not draw significant trade for comparison goods from higher order centres such as the City Centre.</p> <p>This higher proportion of convenience (90 to 95%) to comparison (5 to 10%) is more realistic for supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net and will be taken forward into the IPPG.</p>	<p>The Informal Planning Policy Guidance will include a section on 'proportion of convenience and comparison floorspace in the foodstores' which will set out that the majority of the floorspace in the supermarkets should be for the sale of convenience goods (90-95%).</p>
--------------------------------	---------	---	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.20</i>				
5146 - University of Cambridge	Comment	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.	<p>Comments noted on the size of store required to provide a range of goods for residents to undertake a main food shop.</p> <p>The pipeline figures were calculations made in the GVA Cambridge Sub Regional Study (2008) produced by GVA Grimley. However, no figure was used for convenience floorspace in this study for the University site. In addition since this study was produced, around 2,000 extra homes are now planned for the North West of the City. The Supplementary Retail Study from NLP was commissioned to consider the uplift in dwelling numbers from the 2008 study and to update the retail floorspace requirements.</p> <p>The pipeline figure of 2,500 sq m gross or 1,625 sqm was an estimate developed by officers and the consultants carrying out the study. It was considered to be a reasonable assumption for the University site based on the size of the retail proposals in the NIAB planning application.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>4.24</i>				
5223	Comment	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)?	The strategy for North West Cambridge is to serve the new and existing communities by providing additional floorspace for food shopping in the North West, which would help to reduce the current unsustainable travel patterns to stores such as Milton and Bar Hill. There are no plans to look at bus services to existing stores. However, the new food stores to be provided in North West Cambridge will be located in local centres which will be served by bus services.	
<hr/>				
<i>4.25</i>				
5147 - University of Cambridge	Comment	Occupiers at the University site are likely to have low car usage as well as low car ownership.	Agree that the University students and key workers are less likely to own cars than residents living in market and other types of affordable housing.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.32 5227	Comment	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?	Outline planning consent for NIAB is subject to the signing of the legal agreement. The access junctions referred to have been designed to a preliminary level of detail only and detailed design as part of reserved matters planning applications will be required prior to construction on site. The capacity of the access junctions will be re-evaluated following any decision to provide additional retail floorspace on this site. It is considered unlikely that substantial re-design of junctions will be required should it be decided to provide additional retail floorspace on the NIAB site. Measures to encourage sustainable modes of transport will be retained in any new designs.	
4.35 5204 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Comment	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	Detailed consideration of the detailed effects on Histon Road is outside the scope of the retail transport study, although it did consider impacts of the options on key junctions including in Histon Road and the two medium store options performed better than those for a single larger store. Any application for a new foodstore would be required to provide a transport assessment which would look at this in more detail.	
4.36 5205 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Comment	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.	The comments made are outside the scope of the retail transport study report, although it did consider impacts of the options on key junctions including in Histon Road and concluded that the scale of impact of additional retail floorspace was 'minor' compared with the planned level of development in this part of Cambridge. It also concluded that the two medium store options performed better than those for a single larger store. However, any application for a new foodstore would be required to provide a transport assessment which would look at the effects on Histon Road in more detail.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.40</i>				
5206 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Comment	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.	<p>The retail transport study looks at the overall effects of additional retail in North West Cambridge (compared to the baseline position) for the primary catchment, secondary catchment and Cambridge Urban Area. It considers all traffic movements associated with the additional retail provision. The Councils disagree with the statement that it does not fully consider movements in the northern edge of the city.</p> <p>Consideration of the detailed effect on Histon Road is outside the scope of the retail transport study, although it did consider impacts of the options on key junctions including in Histon Road and concluded that the scale of impact of additional retail floorspace was 'minor' compared with the planned level of development in this part of Cambridge. It also concluded that the two medium store options performed better than those for a single larger store. However, any application for a new foodstore would be required to provide a transport assessment which would look at this in more detail.</p>	
<hr/>				
<i>4.47</i>				
5185 - William Morrisons Supermarkets	Comment	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.	Good design, sustainable design and construction, adequate access and parking, along with a viable local centre is critical to the success of the local centres. Agree that detailed work on the design of the local centre, supermarket and access needs to be considered in detailed application discussions at an early stage and with all relevant parties to help develop an integrated design solution. A recent document by CABE, 'Supermarket-led development: asset or liability?' (November 2010) provides examples of best practice design and how to ensure that supermarket schemes are both commercially viable and enhance the place in which they are built.	The 'design quality' section of the IPPG will set out key principles for developing the local centres. This includes the need for early design meetings with all relevant parties in order to develop an integrated design solution.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4.56 5184 - William Morrisons Supermarkets	Comment	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.	Good design, sustainable design and construction, adequate access and parking, along with a viable local centre is critical to the success of the local centres. Agree that detailed work on the design of the local centre, supermarket and access needs to be considered in detailed application discussions at an early stage and with all relevant parties to help develop an integrated design solution. A recent document by CABE, 'Supermarket-led development: asset or liability?' (November 2010) provides examples of best practice design and how to ensure that supermarket schemes are both commercially viable and enhance the place in which they are built.	The 'design quality' section of the IPPG will set out key principles for developing the local centres. This includes the need for early design meetings with all relevant parties in order to develop an integrated design solution.
4.63 5225	Comment	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/	Whilst the Councils are supportive of local and sustainably sourced food they are unable to dictate the store operator. However, reference will be made in the Informal Planning Policy Guidance that the Councils would like to work with developers to explore the possibility of designing space within the local centres for temporary markets which could sell local food produce. In addition farm shops or shops selling organic produce may also find opportunities to occupy one of the units within the local centre if there is a market for this type of produce.	Reference to the possibility of temporary markets and that the Councils welcome local and sustainably sourced food outlets will be referred to in the section on 'vibrant local centres' in the IPPG.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
6. PROPOSED OPTIONS				
<i>Question 2</i>				
5119 - Madingley Parish Council	Comment	Would prefer to see a series of small shops on the NIAB/NW Cambridge site rather than a superstore	A series of smaller shops as set out in Option A is unlikely to fully meet local food shopping needs, and unsustainable travel patterns to existing superstores by car would continue. The Councils prefer Option B which includes medium sized supermarkets on the University site and NIAB site and a small supermarket at Orchard Park. This will enable residents to carry out a main food shop, but will be easier to integrate into the local centres than a superstore. Even if Option A is chosen the Council would not be able to insist on small independent shops as the planning system does not consider retailer identity.	Option A will not be taken forwards.
5144 - Foxton Parish Council	Comment	This proposal does not fully meet the local needs identified for this development.	Agree, in wider sustainability terms there is a need to provide existing and new residents within North West Cambridge with adequate facilities to prevent the continuation of unsustainable travel patterns to out of centre superstores. Option A does not fully meet the local needs for the developments.	Option A will not be taken forwards.
5156	Object	The options report clearly shows there is a need for additional retail provision to serve North West Cambridge area as a whole.	Agree, the Options Report demonstrates the need for additional food retail floorspace in North West Cambridge to serve both the existing population and new population in the new developments.	Option A will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5115 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	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.	<p>Agree that the food shopping needs of the local community must be met on these sites in order that they are sustainable communities. Option A would perpetuate the current position in North West Cambridge of people needing to travel elsewhere by car to access main foodstores for weekly shopping.</p> <p>The work undertaken in the Supplementary Retail Study and Transport Study provides evidence to show that Option A does not meet the quantitative or qualitative need for food shopping in North West Cambridge and that a larger foodstore store is required to increase sustainability and reduce car travel and trip numbers.</p> <p>Agree this option does not meet the identified qualitative need and would mean that many residents in the new communities would make unsustainable car journeys to stores outside of the study area.</p>	Option A will not be taken forwards.
5199 - Waitrose Limited 5209 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Object	<p>This option would perpetuate the current position in north west Cambridge of residents needing to travel by car to larger supermarkets for weekly shopping and would therefore not meet the identified qualitative retail need for a bulk food shopping facility to serve this quadrant of the City.</p> <p>Unsustainable car journeys would need to be made to stores outside of the study area with this option.</p>	<p>Agree this option does not meet the identified qualitative need and would mean that many residents in the new communities would make unsustainable car journeys to stores outside of the study area.</p>	Option A will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5149 - University of Cambridge 5176 - ASDA Stores Limited	Object	<p>This option would not deliver the size and quality of foodstore necessary to enable residents to undertake a main food shop locally, thus exasperating problems of expenditure leakage to stores in Cambridge and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Deficiency in retail provision in north west Cambridge, no main food store at present so a high proportion of residents travel outside of the area to shop at stores such as Tesco Milton and Bar Hill which have a wide product range.</p> <p>The proposed floorspace would not meet the needs identified qualitative need for the development and residents would need to shop elsewhere and would not meet the requirements of the local catchment area.</p> <p>Need for additional retail provision to serve the north west area as a whole.</p> <p>Unsustainable car journeys would need to be made to stores outside of the study area with this option.</p> <p>Students and employees based at the University site without access to cars would have no access to adequate retail provision. Do not agree that this option would lead to more localised traffic problems. The Retail Transport Study (paragraph 5.3) concludes that non-car share modes achieved from options for new stores - especially at the University site - are better than for option A, because a large proportion of trips to the new stores would originate from the local area. This would help to mitigate the impact of traffic increases.</p>	<p>Agree, because the evidence in the SRS shows that there is a quantitative and qualitative need for additional floorspace above that which would be provided by the already planned pipeline convenience store floorspace. Option A would not provide shops capable of accommodating a main weekly shop and would perpetuate the need for many residents to make unsustainable car journeys to stores outside the study area.</p>	<p>Option A will not be taken forwards.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5058 5063 5079	Object	<p>Small stores are considered to be inconvenient and people need a place to be able to purchase food and basic necessities.</p> <p>This option does not provide to keep people on the sites, they would then have to go elsewhere for shopping.</p>	<p>Agree that the food shopping needs of the local community must be met on these sites in order that they are sustainable communities. Option A would perpetuate the current position in North West Cambridge of people needing to travel elsewhere by car to access main foodstores for weekly shopping.</p> <p>The work undertaken in the Supplementary Retail Study and Transport Study provides evidence to show that Option A does not meet the quantitative or qualitative need for food shopping in North West Cambridge and that a larger foodstore store is required to increase sustainability and reduce car travel and trip numbers.</p>	Option A will not be taken forwards.
5097	Support	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) has shown that there is both a quantitative and qualitative need for main foodstore provision in North West Cambridge. At present only 16% of all convenience expenditure is retained within the primary catchment area and 5% from the secondary catchment area. This shows that there is a considerable leakage of trade to out of centre main stores. In particular the Tesco stores at Bar Hill and Milton are the main draws, with travel likely to be by car.</p> <p>It is important that the new communities have adequate shopping and other facilities within the local centres to reduce the need to travel elsewhere and also to enable the potential use of more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport.</p>	Option A will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5113	Support	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.	<p>The Councils acknowledge the support for small local shops and independent traders. However, in wider sustainability terms there is a need to provide existing and new residents within North West Cambridge with adequate main food shopping facilities to prevent the continuation of unsustainable travel patterns to out of centre superstores.</p> <p>It is important that the new communities have adequate shopping and other facilities within the local centres to reduce the need to travel elsewhere and also to enable the potential use of more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport.</p>	Option A will not be taken forwards.
5108	Support	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.	<p>The Councils acknowledge the support for small local shops and independent traders. However, in wider sustainability terms there is a need to provide existing and new residents within North West Cambridge with adequate facilities to prevent the continuation of unsustainable travel patterns to out of centre superstores.</p> <p>The Council is unable to dictate the store operator or influence rental levels which will be set on the free market. An element of brand loyalty or store preference will always exist, however, providing stores in two local centres should allow choice of two operators. To provide no supermarket would mean that all residents would have to travel for this facility and main food shopping, therefore this is not a sustainable option.</p>	Option A will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5042 5051 5052 5059 5069 5070 5220	Support	<p>Consideration that option A will provide enough shops due to the proximity of other supermarkets such as Milton and Bar Hill.</p> <p>Support for local retailers, supermarket provision will undermine demand for local shops. Smaller supermarkets will draw less trade away from existing independent traders. They will attract less traffic from outside the area.</p> <p>Support for independent food stores as they support local workers and produce. Social benefits from a more personalised service and can aid community development and reverse the supermarket culture. They will have a smaller environmental impact and be more sustainable.</p>	<p>The Councils acknowledge the support for small local shops and independent traders. However, in wider sustainability terms there is a need to provide existing and new residents within North West Cambridge with adequate facilities to prevent the continuation of unsustainable travel patterns to out of centre superstores.</p> <p>The Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) has shown that there is both a quantitative and qualitative need for main foodstore provision in North West Cambridge. At present only 16% of all convenience expenditure is retained within the primary catchment area and 5% from the secondary catchment area. This shows that there is a considerable leakage of trade to out of centre main stores. In particular the Tesco stores at Bar Hill and Milton are the main draws, with travel likely to be by car. It is important that the new communities have adequate shopping and other facilities within the local centres to reduce the need to travel elsewhere and also to enable the potential use of more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. The SRS provides evidence that there is a need for an additional 3,791 sq m net convenience floorspace in addition to the proposed pipeline convenience (assuming the sales density for a large foodstore floorspace, it would be double this if it was for a smaller format foodstore which has a lower sales density). A qualitative need has also been identified as this part of Cambridge is poorly served by main foodstores. Existing shops in this area are mainly catering for top-up shopping, leading to the high outflow of shoppers for main food shopping.</p> <p>The Councils are also mindful of the deliverability of the local centres in the early stages of the development. Experience from Cambourne and Orchard Park show that it is extremely difficult to deliver small shops in the early stages of development and then the population does not have any other choice but to travel elsewhere and unsustainable travel patterns are established.</p> <p>Local shops often rely on passing trade. The local centres are proposed in the centre of the new developments and so there will be relatively little</p>	Option A will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>passing trade in the early stages of the development. The development of a main foodstore will prove more of a draw and will help to establish a local centre early in the development to give life to the new community. This will also allow for other retail units to be developed which benefit from the linked trips.</p>	
		<p>The size of stores being proposed in the other options are still relatively modest in size compared to existing stores in Cambridge. They are intended to meet the qualitative and quantitative demand in North West Cambridge and not to draw a significant number of car borne trips from outside the area. Other areas of the City already have good access to existing food stores. The Councils preferred option is Option B, which is two medium sized supermarkets, one at the University site and one at NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p>	
		<p>It is important that the new communities have adequate shopping and other facilities within the local centres to reduce the need to travel elsewhere and also to enable the potential use of more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. In addition to the foodstores the Councils are seeking to develop vibrant local centres with smaller shops and community facilities which will be at the heart of the developments and will help to provide a hub for the community.</p>	
		<p>The SRS looks at the potential impact of new main foodstores on existing centres. A main foodstore is most likely to impact on other similar foodstore facilities as people change their main food shopping destinations. The SRS also looks at local centres in the area. The centres most likely to be affected are Histon Road Local Centre and Histon and Impington Rural Centre. Health checks of these centres show that they are vital and viable centres. Within Histon Road Local Centre the greatest impact is likely to be on the Aldi, Iceland and Co-op stores. These are currently performing well and as such the SRS states that there would not be an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the local centre.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5086	Support	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Support for Option A is noted. The size of stores being proposed in the other options are intended to meet the qualitative and quantitative demand in North West Cambridge and not to draw a significant number of car borne trips from outside the area. Other areas of the City already have good access to existing food stores. The Councils' preferred option is Option B, which is two medium sized supermarkets, one at the University site and one at NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p> <p>It is important that the new communities have adequate shopping and other facilities within the local centres to reduce the need to travel elsewhere and also to enable the potential use of more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. In addition to the foodstores the Councils are seeking to develop vibrant local centres with smaller shops and community facilities which will be at the heart of the developments and will help to provide a hub for the community.</p>	Option A will not be taken forwards.
<hr/>				
3 5159 - Lidl UK	Support	<p>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.</p>	<p>Agree that the level of food provision needs to meet the everyday needs of the new populations in the urban extensions. Option B would provide two medium sized supermarkets that would be large enough to carry out main food shopping. The Informal Planning Policy Guidance will state that the supermarkets should be predominantly for the sale of convenience goods (90 to 95% of the floor area). The type of operator can not be dictated by the Council.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
7 5170 - Lidl UK	Support	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.	Support for the medium sized supermarkets having a high proportion of convenience goods floorspace compared to comparison goods is noted. The Informal Planning Policy Guidance will state that the supermarkets should be predominantly for the sale of convenience goods (90 to 95% of the floor area). This is on the basis that the sale of comparison goods should be from the City Centre, and also so that there will be a larger amount of floorspace devoted to food ranges which will enable local residents to carry out main food shopping. The operator can not be dictated by the Councils.	IPPG to include a section on 'proportion of convenience/comparison floorspace in the foodstores'.
10 5171 - Lidl UK	Support	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.	The Councils can not dictate which operators will come forward to run the stores as this is outside the control of the planning system and is determined by the market. Whilst the argument that a "Limited Assortment Discounter" (LAD) format store may mean less customer and delivery movements to the store, this fails to address movements and expenditure leakage to outside the site as the range of goods may be different to a conventional food store. This representation is made with no detailed analysis to prove this point.	
2 5173 - Lidl UK	Comment	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.	No evidence is presented to support this statement. The Councils can not dictate the operator of the stores. Any planning application for a supermarket should be accompanied by a transport assessment which will look at traffic movements.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4 5174 - Lidl UK	Comment	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.	<p>Whilst it is agreed that a "Limited Assortment Discounter" (LAD) format retailer provides a different offer to conventional foodstores, no evidence is provided to support this representation. The Councils can not dictate the operator of the stores and will assess each application on its merits.</p> <p>The IPPG will take forward Option B, however the Councils decided that it was not necessary to hold back one of the medium supermarkets as these are essential in the early phases of the developments at NIAB and the University sites to create vibrant communities and as enabling development to deliver other essential infrastructure. It is likely that the local centre, including the small supermarket, at Orchard Park will be provided before the other developments are at a stage where a medium supermarket would be ready to be delivered, which reduces the concern around phasing of the two medium supermarkets.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5152 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>OBJECTION TO PHASING PROPOSAL</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The Councils agree that phasing of the two medium supermarkets set out in Option B, by holding one of these back, creates some difficulties in achieving the Councils' objectives for creating vibrant communities in the early phases of the new developments and should not be taken forward into the Informal Planning Policy Guidance. Also, with the preferred option, the issue focuses on whether it would be possible to deliver a local food shop in the Orchard Park local centre if it has not been provided before the two supermarkets on the other sites. Orchard Park is well advanced and there is significant local desire to see the local centre provided as soon as possible. It is therefore likely that the local centre, including the local foodshop, at Orchard Park will be provided before the other developments are at a stage where a supermarket would be ready to be delivered, which reduces the concern around phasing of the two supermarkets.</p> <p>Therefore, the IPPG will state that the medium supermarkets at the University site and the NIAB site should be delivered in the early phases of both developments. Early delivery of the foodstores will have the benefit of anchoring the local centre and creating linked trips to other shops and community facilities. Early delivery will also give new residents somewhere to shop from when they move in, thus helping to prevent unsustainable shopping patterns from establishing. Through the early phasing of the foodstores and local centres in each development, the Councils will expect developers to deliver supporting infrastructure and community facilities early in the creation of the new communities. It will also make clear that the Councils would like to see the local centre at Orchard Park delivered as soon as possible, to provide residents with essential day to day shopping facilities within easy walking and cycling distance.</p>	<p>Propose not to take forwards the phasing proposal for Option B by holding back one of the two medium supermarkets. Instead, the IPPG will include a section on 'phasing' which requires early delivery of the local centres at all three developments and the medium supermarkets at the University and NIAB sites.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5 5153 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>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.</p> <p>If, however, the Councils are minded to pursue the phasing recommendation, the first foodstore should be delivered at the University's site.</p>	<p>The Councils agree that phasing of the two medium supermarkets set out in Option B, by holding one of these back, creates some difficulties in achieving the Councils' objectives for creating vibrant communities in the early phases of the new developments and should not be taken forward into the Informal Planning Policy Guidance. Also, with the preferred option, the issue focuses on whether it would be possible to deliver a local food shop in the Orchard Park local centre if it has not been provided before the two supermarkets on the other sites. Orchard Park is well advanced and there is significant local desire to see the local centre provided as soon as possible. It is therefore likely that the local centre, including the local foodshop, at Orchard Park will be provided before the other developments are at a stage where a supermarket would be ready to be delivered, which reduces the concern around phasing of the two supermarkets.</p> <p>Therefore, the IPPG will state that the medium supermarkets at the University site and the NIAB site should be delivered in the early phases of both developments. Early delivery of the foodstores will have the benefit of anchoring the local centre and creating linked trips to other shops and community facilities. Early delivery will also give new residents somewhere to shop from when they move in, thus helping to prevent unsustainable shopping patterns from establishing. Through the early phasing of the foodstores and local centres in each development, the Councils will expect developers to deliver supporting infrastructure and community facilities early in the creation of the new communities. It will also make clear that the Councils would like to see the local centre at Orchard Park delivered as soon as possible, to provide residents with essential day to day shopping facilities within easy walking and cycling distance.</p>	<p>Propose not to take forwards the phasing proposal for Option B by holding back one of the two medium supermarkets. Instead, the IPPG will include a section on 'phasing' which requires early delivery of the local centres at all three developments and the medium supermarkets at the University and NIAB sites.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 3:</i>				
5053	Comment	This would be my second preferred option, if Option A is not possible, keeping size smaller and localised.	Comment noted. Option B will provide two medium sized supermarkets, one on the NIAB site and one on the University Site, and a small supermarket at Orchard Park. It is proposed that Option B is taken forward into the Informal Planning Policy Guidance.	Take forwards Option B
5172 - Lidl UK	Object	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 curtailling excess competition with other centres and expansion. It must be very much a local provision.	<p>The Council has no control over the identity of the retailers and cannot refuse planning applications on grounds of retailer identity. Each application will be considered on its merits.</p> <p>It is proposed that the Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG) will specify that the majority of the floorspace of the medium sized supermarkets (in the order of 90 to 95%) will be for the sale of convenience goods (food and everyday essential items). In addition at the planning application stage the Councils will give further consideration as to whether conditions should be attached to the foodstores to limit the range of services they provide such as a pharmacy or cafe if this is considered the most effective means of securing the delivery of a range of local shops in the local centre. This will be set out under a section on 'vibrant local centres' in the IPPG.</p>	Take forwards Option B into the IPPG, with sections on 'proportion of convenience / comparison floorspace in foodstores' to ensure a high proportion of the floorspace (90 to 95%) is for the sale of convenience goods and a section on 'vibrant local centres' dealing with possible restrictions on services provided by the medium supermarkets.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5057 5064 5210 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Object	<p>Not large enough for a full weekly/family shop which would still need to be done elsewhere, these supermarkets are too small and therefore inconvenient</p> <p>This option means that a considerable quantitative and qualitative need for a main food store in NW Cambridge will remain. This option would not meet the need and therefore perpetuate the current unsustainable travel patterns outside the area.</p>	<p>The Supplementary Retail Study which was produced as part of the evidence base states that two stores of this size (2,000 sq m net) will meet much but not all of the main food shopping needs in North West Cambridge. They will not be able to fully compete with the existing superstores in the City. However, the stores would be closer in size to that contemplated in local centres and would be easier to design in to the centres and there would be a more balanced provision of foodstores in the three local centres. As the stores will be in the local centres at the centre of the developments, they will be very well connected to the walking, cycling and public transport networks and this will make it easier for people to use these modes of transport to carry out their food shopping trips.</p> <p>It is proposed to take forward Option B into the Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG). The IPPG will specify that the majority of the floorspace of the medium sized supermarkets (in the order of 90 to 95%) will be for the sale of convenience goods (food and everyday essential items). This would allow a 2,000 sqm net supermarket to sell a wider range of food products for a main weekly shop. This would also not draw significant trade for comparison goods (non-food items bought on a less frequent basis such as books, toys, clothing, electrical items) from higher order centres such as the City Centre. By comparison a superstore would have on average 30% of the sales area devoted to comparison goods.</p> <p>The exact amount of floorspace will be determined at the time a planning application is submitted given that different operators trade at different sales floorspace densities.</p>	<p>Take forwards Option B. The IPPG will contain a section on 'proportion of convenience / comparison floorspace in foodstores' to ensure a high proportion of the floorspace (90 to 95%) is for the sale of convenience goods.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5043	Object	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.	<p>The Councils acknowledge the support for small local shops and independent traders. However, in wider sustainability terms there is a need to provide existing and new residents within North West Cambridge with adequate facilities to prevent the continuation of unsustainable travel patterns to out of centre superstores.</p> <p>The supermarket will act as an anchor and encourage trade into the local centre in the early years of the development, drawing in expenditure from the existing communities that currently goes outside of the City to stores such as Milton and Bar Hill. This will enable the local centre and community facilities to be established early on in the development to aid the creation of the local community.</p> <p>Whilst it is agreed that the medium sized supermarkets of Option B will have a dominance on the food provision for the local centre, the aim is to secure a range of smaller shops alongside the supermarket in the local centre. The Councils will give further consideration at the planning applications stage as to whether conditions should be used to limit the services they provide, such as a pharmacy or cafe if this is considered to be the most effective means of securing a range of local shops in the local centre. However, the Councils will also be mindful of the risk of key facilities not being provided in the local centre if such a condition is applied. More specialised shops such as farm shops or shops selling organic produce may also find opportunities to occupy one of the smaller units within the local centre if there is a market for this type of produce.</p>	Take forwards Option B. The IPPG will include a section on how to achieve 'vibrant local centres'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5157 5167 - Lidl UK 5177 - ASDA Stores Limited	Support	<p>Need for provision of a local centre at Orchard Park. The provision of medium foodstores at both NIAB and the University site will meet the shopping needs of those developments as well as together meeting the unmet retail provision for North West Cambridge area as a whole</p> <p>Whilst stores of this scale are unlikely to meet all of the main food shopping needs of each urban expansion area they would provide residents with a viable local shopping destination and reduce the current loss of expenditure from NW Cambridge, primarily to competing out of centre destinations. This would encourage more localised shopping trips, allowing the use of sustainable modes. This option represents a positive response to the qualitative and quantitative need identified for increased foodstore provision in the area</p> <p>Justified approach as compared to a centre anchored by a major food retailer who will draw trade from throughout the City. It helps promote the idea of smaller more centralised LAD retailers, who provide a smaller yet essential offering which is underrepresented in the City</p>	<p>Agree that Option B would provide a good balance of food provision in North West Cambridge by providing medium supermarkets at the University and NIAB sites, and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p> <p>The Supplementary Retail Study which was produced as part of the evidence base states that two stores of this size (2,000 sq m net) will meet much but not all of the main food shopping needs in North West Cambridge. They will not be able to fully compete with the existing superstores in the City. However, the stores would be closer in size to that contemplated in local centres and would be easier to design in to the centres and there would be a more balanced provision of foodstores in the three local centres. As the stores will be in the local centres at the centre of the developments, they will be very well connected to the walking, cycling and public transport networks and this will make it easier for people to use these modes of transport to carry out their food shopping trips.</p> <p>It is proposed to take forward Option B into the Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG). The IPPG will specify that the majority of the floorspace of the medium sized supermarkets (in the order of 90 to 95%) will be for the sale of convenience goods (food and everyday essential items). This would allow a 2,000 sqm net supermarket to sell a wider range of food products for a main weekly shop. This would also not draw significant trade for comparison goods (non-food items bought on a less frequent basis such as books, toys, clothing, electrical items) from higher order centres such as the City Centre. By comparison a superstore would have on average 30% of the sales area devoted to comparison goods.</p>	Take forwards Option B. The IPPG will contain a section on 'proportion of convenience / comparison floorspace in foodstores' to ensure a high proportion of the floorspace (90 to 95%) is for the sale of convenience goods.
5121 5141 - Foxton Parish Council 5229	Support	<p>This option would lead to having less vehicular traffic into and out of the sites, when compared to the other options</p> <p>Option B is considered to be more self sufficient as a local centre development, and should have less impact on the local highway network</p>	The Transport Study has demonstrated that Option B comes out slightly better than the other options in terms of reducing trips by car and would have the least impact on the highways network.	Take forwards Option B.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5150 - University of Cambridge	Support	<p>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.</p> <p>Option B is supported in relation to a number of reasons relating to design, transport and access, and the balanced distribution of development</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Agree; stores of the size proposed in Option B can be designed into the creation of successful local centres. This option provides an anchor store that will cater for the food needs of the community, but will enable development of other shops in the local centre.</p> <p>A store of around 2,000 sqm net is in design terms slightly easier to wrap and cap into the local centre than a significantly larger store. Another advantage is that a store of this size would require less car parking spaces than the superstores in options C and D.</p> <p>Considering the consultation responses and re-visiting data on supermarkets of this size in the City it is considered that for stores of around 2,000 sqm net floorspace 90 - 95% of the floorspace should be for convenience food goods and this will be taken forward into the IPPG.</p> <p>The Councils agree that phasing of the two medium supermarkets set out in Option B, by holding one of these back, should not be taken forward into the Informal Planning Policy Guidance. Instead, the IPPG will state that the medium supermarkets at the University site and the NIAB site should be delivered in the early phases of both developments. Early delivery of the foodstores will have the benefit of anchoring the local centre and creating linked trips to other shops and community facilities. Early delivery will also give new residents somewhere to shop from when they move in, thus helping to prevent unsustainable shopping patterns from establishing. Through the early phasing of the foodstores and local centres in each development, the Councils will expect developers to deliver supporting infrastructure and community facilities early in the creation of the new communities.</p> <p>The County Council accept the statements in relation to transport and access expressed at items 6 to 10 of the detailed representation as being reasonable.</p>	<p>Take forwards Option B. The IPPG will contain a section on 'proportion of convenience / comparison floorspace in foodstores' to ensure a high proportion of the floorspace (90 to 95%) is for the sale of convenience goods.</p> <p>Propose not to take forwards the phasing proposal for Option B by holding back one of the two medium supermarkets. Instead, the IPPG will include a section on 'phasing' which requires early delivery of the local centres and medium supermarkets at the University and NIAB sites.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5081 5104 - Stratfield Close & Tavistock Road Residents Association 5116 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5234	Support	<p>Support for option B as the most sensible form of provision, providing easy access for non-car modes and choice of retail stores. Also this option would be easier to incorporate into the design of the local centres than a superstore (Option C and D)</p> <p>This size of supermarket would be adequate to address the needs of the community and would attract a range of smaller shops offering a greater range of products. The option would provide for the retail needs in the NW quadrant, including the future developments on the University and NIAB land.</p> <p>It will provide a good choice of where to shop and will not be too dominant on the local area and therefore less likely to prevent local businesses from starting up. This should stop people travelling out of the local area and provides the best balance in economic, social and environmental sustainability terms. Would promote a balanced distribution of stores in the three centres, with no one centre dominant</p>	<p>Agree; stores of the size proposed in Option B can be designed into the creation of successful local centres. This option provides an anchor store that will cater for the food needs of the community, but will enable development of other shops in the local centre. This option will provide more of a balance across the sites, with no one site being dominant.</p> <p>A store of around 2,000 sqm net is in design terms slightly easier to wrap and cap into the local centre than a significantly larger store. Another advantage is that a store of this size would require less car parking spaces than the superstores in options C and D.</p> <p>As the stores will be in the local centres at the centre of the developments, they will be very well connected to the walking, cycling and public transport networks and this will make it easier for people to use these modes of transport to carry out their food shopping trips.</p>	Take forwards Option B.
5128	Support	<p>This option best meets the requirements of the area. Attracting a range of smaller shops would add interest.</p>	<p>Agree; this option provides two medium sized supermarkets on the NIAB and University sites which will allow residents to carry out a main food shop. However, they will not be so dominant in the local centre to prevent the development of other shops and services such as banking, estate agents, hairdressing and a cafe etc.</p>	Take forwards Option B.
5140 - Cambs. County Council Liberal Democrat Group	Support	<p>This option was discussed by the group on Friday and unanimously agreed to be the preferred option</p>	Support for Option B noted	Take forwards Option B.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5120 5133 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) 5233	Support	<p>Option B would prevent one large operator having a monopoly on the area and would be most convenient for people living in the new developments</p> <p>Support for this option as the superstores are likely to provide more comparison shopping that will compete directly with the City Centre and will not meet the overall policy objective of North West Cambridge to provide facilities to meet the needs of the new and existing population</p> <p>Support for option B as the most viable and sustainable option, more emphasis should be given to access by non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>This option is the most sensible and far better than the superstores suggested in Options C and D.</p>	<p>Option B does allow for the floorspace to be spread more evenly amongst the sites in north-west Cambridge. The objective of the study is to look at the food goods needs of the residents of the new communities, and the Councils agree that in the main comparison shopping should be directed to the City centre.</p> <p>Agree that Orchard Park does not need more than the planned provision due to the nearby Tesco Milton and Histon Road shops. The Transport Study has demonstrated that Option B comes out slightly better than the other options in terms of reducing trips by car and would have the least impact on the highways network.</p>	Take forwards Option B
5098	Support	While not as strong an option as A, this is also a reasonable option.	Comment noted, that Option B is also acceptable.	Take forwards Option B, as preferable to Option A.

Question 4:

5154 - University of Cambridge	Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Comments noted. Option B will be taken forward into the IPPG which is two medium sized stores of 2,000 sq m net, one at the University site and one at NIAB site, and a small supermarket at Orchard Park. This would appear to be in line with the University's aspirations.	Option C will not be taken forwards.
--------------------------------	---------	---	---	--------------------------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5105 - Stratfield Close & Tavistock Road Residents Association 5129	Object	<p>Would attract more traffic and lead to congestion. This would not solve the problem of car movements between the two sites as people would need to transport a weekly shop by car. It is unsustainable</p> <p>Will impact adversely on noise and air quality and has not considered the non-car modes of transport in sufficient detail</p>	<p>The Retail Transport Study carried out by Atkins indicates that there is not a significant difference in the level of traffic associated with Option C, compared to the baseline position ie Option A. Therefore the statement, "would attract more traffic and lead to congestion", cannot be substantiated.</p> <p>A superstore at the University site and the pipeline provision at the other sites would be likely to lead to trips between the NIAB site and Orchard Park sites to the University site, although these trips would not be as far as people are currently travelling to Bar Hill, Milton and elsewhere in Cambridge. However, the Councils' preferred option, Option B, includes a medium sized supermarket at both the University site and NIAB site, which would maximise the trips that could be carried out by walking, cycling (particularly if trailer schemes are set up by the foodstore operators) and public transport and would also reduce the need to travel between the sites.</p> <p>The County Council do not agree that Option C, "will impact adversely on noise and air quality and has not considered the non-car modes of transport in sufficient detail". Compared to the baseline position, Option C will have an insignificant impact on noise and air quality levels.</p> <p>However, on balance the Councils' preference is for Option B, a medium sized supermarket at the NIAB and University sites and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p>	Option C will not be taken forwards.
5158	Object	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.	Agree, the Councils would be concerned that a superstore on one of the sites would make it difficult to establish or maintain viable local centres at the other two sites. It may be difficult to find operators for the pipeline stores if they would be in direct competition with a superstore. This could also put at risk the viability of the other small shops and community facilities in the local centres, which would not benefit from linked trips.	Option C will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5096 5230	Object	<p>The associated car parking would take up too much land, thus threatening community facilities and leading to increase housing densities on site. There is no need to sell non-food items</p> <p>Shopping patterns will depend on which supermarkets are provided, as many have strong preferences for particular retailers</p> <p>There is no need/demand for a large superstore. Another store like Bar Hill would be a disaster and unnecessary</p>	<p>Agree that a superstore would require more car parking spaces in the local centre than options A and B. Whilst the land take for this would need to be part of the detailed design and solutions such as deck and undercroft parking could be introduced to help mitigate against any land take impacts, the larger store would be more difficult to design into the local centre.</p> <p>The Councils are not able to control the identity of the retailer, but agree that shopping patterns are influenced by brand loyalty.</p> <p>The store proposed in Option C and D of 3,500sqm net is considerably smaller than Bar Hill, which is 9,392 sqm net. However, the Councils agree that a store of this size would not be the best option in North West Cambridge and prefer Option B.</p>	Option C will not be taken forwards
5065	Object	<p>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.</p>	<p>The larger store on the University site would serve the qualitative need and address the large employment and provision and low car ownership on the site, however the Transport study does reveal that out of options C and D, NIAB would be the more sustainable option for the foodstore and reduce vehicle distances to a greater level than Options C and B. However, the Councils preferred option is Option B, two medium sized supermarkets, one on the University site and one on NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p> <p>Comment noted on hiring bike trailers, however, the availability of these to encourage travel by sustainable modes should be promoted.</p>	Option C will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5044 5056 5099 5122 5123 5134 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) 5143 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	<p>Would be over-developed and out of scale, better provision can be delivered through a selection of local retailers and market space.</p> <p>A superstore on one site would not be convenient for residents of the other sites and is unsustainable</p> <p>It would dominate retail provision within the site and impact on planned sites at Orchard Park & NIAB.</p> <p>It would conflict with the need for self-sufficient flourishing local centres and adversely affect small businesses which would be unable to compete on price</p> <p>Superstores are more likely to include comparison shopping which will compete directly with city centre provision and will therefore not meet the policy objectives for NW Cambridge. It will not meet the overall objectives set out in the adopted and emerging policy for NW Cambridge</p>	<p>The Councils agree that a superstore on one of the sites could dominate retail provision within North West Cambridge. The dominance of one of the centres would be of concern to the Councils as it may make it difficult to establish or maintain viable Local Centres at the other two sites. It may be difficult to find operators for the pipeline stores if they would be in direct competition with a superstore. This could also put at risk the viability of other small shops and community facilities in the local centres, which would not benefit from linked trips.</p> <p>The Councils' objectives for foodstore provision in NW Cambridge set out in the Options Report are to provide a retail offer for main food shopping, and not comparison goods which should be located in the City Centre. On average 30% of the sales area within a superstore is for the sale of comparison goods. Therefore the Councils prefer an option where the majority of floorspace is convenience with only very limited comparison floorspace, as in the two supermarket option in Option B.</p>	Option C will not be taken forwards.
5082	Object	I support option B.	Support for Option B noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5211 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Object	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.	<p>The evidence in the Supplementary Retail Study shows that a superstore of this size would provide the 'best fit' in terms of meeting the qualitative and quantitative need for convenience retail floorspace. However, it is not the only option and Option B is also an alternative way of providing the floorspace. With a superstore, the dominance of one of the centres would be of concern to the Councils as it may make it difficult to establish or maintain viable local centres at the other two sites. It may be difficult to find operators for the pipeline stores if they would be in direct competition with a superstore. This could also put at risk the viability of other small shops and community facilities in the local centres, which would not benefit from linked trips.</p> <p>The Councils also have concerns with regards to integrating a superstore into a local centre and that the retail offer should be mainly for convenience goods and not the comparison ranges that are usually sold in superstores. These types of goods should be sold from the City Centre.</p> <p>A larger store on the University site would serve the large employment provision and low car ownership on the site, however the Transport study does reveal that out of options C and D, NIAB would be the more sustainable option for the foodstore and reduce vehicle distances to a greater level than Options C and B, but that the 2 medium store options performed better than those for a single larger store. The Councils' preferred option is Option B, two medium sized supermarkets, one on the University site and one on NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p>	Options C will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5117 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	This 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.	<p>Agree that the larger store would be more difficult to design into the local centre particularly as it would include a large amount of car parking, although, the Councils' joint urban design team indicated in the Options Report that a bespoke solution may be possible to achieve successful integration.</p> <p>Agree that a superstore could put at risk the viability of other smaller shops, in both the local centre in which it is located and also the other two local centres in North West Cambridge.</p>	Option C will not be taken forwards.
5222	Support	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The Supplementary Retail Study revealed that the retail options for NIAB including the pipeline will not have detrimental impact on the existing centre on Histon Road, which is currently performing well.</p> <p>The Councils agree that high quality design and sustainability levels will need to be met, whichever option is chosen. Guidance on this will be provided in the Informal Planning Policy Guidance.</p> <p>The Council is unable to control the identity of the operators of the food stores.</p> <p>The Councils prefer Option B which includes medium sized supermarkets on the University site and NIAB site and a small supermarket at Orchard Park. This will enable residents to carry out a main food shop, but will be easier to integrate into the local centres than a superstore.</p>	Option C will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5179 - ASDA Stores Limited 5187 - William Morrisons Supermarkets	Support	<p>A superstore would compete effectively with other main foodstores in the City. The superstore would meet main food shopping needs and would reduce the propensity to travel outside the North West Cambridge Area (Reducing Traffic). Leakage of expenditure from the core catchment area would significantly reduce</p> <p>Both superstore options would provide an appropriate and sustainable level of retail development to meet the needs of the growing population</p> <p>Scale would be suitable to be commercially viable, could compete with existing provision and would provide additional consumer choice. Much will rest with ensuring that a scheme can be delivered to meet modern retailer requirements, including a suitable level of car parking, this should be balanced against Local Planning Authority and wider local centre provision</p>	<p>The evidence in the Supplementary Retail Study shows that a superstore of this size would provide the 'best fit' in terms of meeting the qualitative and quantitative need for convenience retail floorspace. However, it is not the only option and Option B is also an alternative way of providing the floorspace. With a superstore, the dominance of one of the centres would be of concern to the Councils as it may make it difficult to establish or maintain viable local centres at the other two sites. It may be difficult to find operators for the pipeline stores if they would be in direct competition with a superstore. This could also put at risk the viability of other small shops and community facilities in the local centres, which would not benefit from linked trips.</p> <p>The Councils also have concerns with regards to integrating a superstore into a local centre and that the retail offer should be mainly for convenience goods and not the comparison ranges that are usually sold in superstores. These types of goods should be sold from the City Centre.</p> <p>The superstore would be more difficulty to design into the local centre particularly as it would include a large amount of car parking.</p> <p>Whilst the store would compete with other stores in the City in terms of retail offer, it would still be substantially smaller than the larger superstore at Bar Hill (9,392 sqm net).</p> <p>The Councils' preferred option is Option B, two medium sized supermarkets, one on the University site and one on NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p>	Option C will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 5:</i>				
5166 - University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The University objects to Option D for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 thge 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. 	<p>A superstore on the University site would serve the qualitative need and address the large employment and low car ownership on the site, although the Retail Transport Study concludes that out of options C and D, NIAB would be the more sustainable option for the foodstore and reduce vehicle distances to a greater level than Options C and B. However, the Councils' preferred option is Option B, two medium sized supermarkets, one on the University site and one on NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park. This option would provide a better balance of retail provision across the three sites, and would enable main food shopping to take place at both the University and NIAB sites.</p> <p>The Councils would be concerned about Options C and D in relation to the deliverability of the other local centres, the successful integration of a superstore into the design of a local centre and the proportion of non-food goods provided in a superstore.</p>	Option D will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5045 5083 5095 5100 5124 5130 5142 - Foxton Parish Council 5160 5161	Object	<p>Do not support big name supermarkets; local retailers and market space could offer better provision. Any big name supermarket would make it impossible for local retailers will not be able to compete on price</p> <p>There is no need/demand for a large superstore. Another store like Bar Hill would be a disaster and unnecessary</p> <p>The proposal is in conflict with the need for a self-sufficient flourishing local centre and would affect the ability to attract smaller retailers. As NIAB1 and NIAB extra will be located off Histon Road a larger foodstore on either of these may affect the viability of the local centre at Orchard Park.</p> <p>Provision of a superstore would undermine the potential to create an attractive local centre at the NIAB site.</p> <p>Orchard Park is close to Milton Tesco and therefore does not need more foodstore provision.</p>	<p>The Councils agree that a superstore on one of the sites could dominate retail provision within North West Cambridge. The dominance of one of the centres would be of concern to the Councils as it may make it difficult to establish or maintain viable Local Centres at the other two sites. It may be difficult to find operators for the pipeline stores if they would be in direct competition with a superstore. This could also put at risk the viability of other small shops and community facilities in the local centres, which would not benefit from linked trips.</p> <p>The store of 3,500 sqm net proposed in Option C and D is considerably smaller than Bar Hill, which is 9,392 sqm net. However, the store would be one of the largest in the Cambridge area.</p> <p>With regards to the impact on the local centre at Orchard Park this is likely to be minimal given the size of the store provided for is likely to mainly cater for top up shopping. Residents at Orchard Park will be able to access the medium supermarkets at NIAB and the University site in addition to the Tesco store at Milton.</p>	Option D will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5135 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) 5231	Object	<p>This would represent overdevelopment and be out of scale, the associated car parking would take up to much land thus threatening community facilities or leading to higher housing densities. There is no need for a store selling non-food items.</p> <p>A superstore is more likely to include comparison shopping floorspace which will compete directly with the City Centre and does not meet policy objectives</p>	<p>Agree that a superstore would require more car parking spaces in the local centre than options A and B. However, the land take for this would need to be part of the detailed design. Solutions such as deck and undercroft parking could be introduced to mitigate against any land take impacts. The larger store would be more difficult to design into the local centre, however, the Councils' joint urban design team indicated in the Options Report that a bespoke solution could be used to achieve successful integration.</p> <p>The Councils' objectives for foodstore provision in NW Cambridge set out in the Options Report are to provide a retail offer for main food shopping, and not comparison goods which should be located in the City Centre. On average 30% of the sales area within a superstore is for the sale of comparison goods. Therefore the Councils prefer an option where the majority of floorspace is convenience with only very limited comparison floorspace, as in the two supermarket option in Option B.</p>	Option D will not be taken forwards.
5118 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>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.</p>	<p>Agree that the larger store would be more difficult to design into the local centre, particularly as it would include a large amount of car parking, although the Councils' joint urban design team indicated in the Options Report that a bespoke solution may be possible to achieve successful integration.</p> <p>Agree that a superstore could make it more difficult to attract other smaller shops in the local centres.</p>	Option D will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5106 - Stratfield Close & Tavistock Road Residents Association 5200 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	<p>A superstore will attract shoppers and therefore vehicles from outside the development. The traffic study concentrates on carbon reduction from the shortening of trips, rather than considering the increase in movement from the northern edge of the city. Would affect traffic flows on Histon Road and on Histon and Impington</p> <p>This size of store on either site would not solve the unsustainable problems of car movements between the two sites as people would be unable to carry shopping manually</p>	<p>The Retail Transport Study showed that compared to the baseline position, there will be no appreciable increase in the number of vehicles attracted to retail facilities from outside the development.</p> <p>It looks at the overall effects of additional retail in North West Cambridge (compared to the baseline position) for the primary catchment, secondary catchment and Cambridge Urban Area. It considers all traffic movements associated with the additional retail provision. The County Council disagrees with the statement that it does not fully consider movements in the northern edge of the city.</p> <p>Consideration of the detailed effects on Histon Road are outside the scope of the transport study although it did look at impacts on key junctions and it concluded that Option B comes out slightly better than the other options in terms of reducing trips by car and would have the least impact on the highways network.</p> <p>The County disagrees that any of the options would have "a large effect on the communities of Histon and Impington".</p> <p>As the foodstores will be in the local centres they will have good access to walking, cycling and public transport networks which will make it as easy as possible for people to access these modes of transport. In addition the Councils will require that the operators set up bike trailer schemes similar to that at the Waitrose store in Trumpington which allows customers to transport a larger amount of shopping home and is an alternative to the car.</p>	Option D will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5178 - ASDA Stores Limited 5212 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Support	<p>A superstore would compete effectively with other main foodstores in the City. The superstore would meet main food shopping needs and would reduce the propensity to travel outside the North West Cambridge Area (reducing traffic and the need for car travel). Leakage of expenditure from the core catchment area would significantly reduce.</p> <p>Both superstore options would be commercially viable and provide an appropriate and sustainable level of retail development to meet the needs on the growing population</p> <p>The NIAB site is the most appropriate location for this option as it is the most centrally located and accessible to the new and existing population within the catchment</p>	<p>The evidence in the Supplementary Retail Study shows that a superstore of this size would provide the 'best fit' in terms of meeting the qualitative and quantitative need for convenience retail floorspace. However, it is not the only option and Option B is also an alternative way of providing the floorspace. With a superstore, the dominance of one of the centres would be of concern to the Councils as it may make it difficult to establish or maintain viable local centres at the other two sites. It may be difficult to find operators for the pipeline stores if they would be in direct competition with a superstore. This could also put at risk the viability of other small shops and community facilities in the local centres, which would not benefit from linked trips.</p> <p>The Councils also have concerns with regards to integrating a superstore into a local centre and that the retail offer should be mainly for convenience goods and not the comparison ranges that are usually sold in superstores. These types of goods should be sold from the City Centre.</p> <p>A larger store on the University site would serve the large employment provision and low car ownership on the site, however the Transport study does reveal that out of options C and D, NIAB would be the more sustainable option for the foodstore and reduce vehicle distances to a greater level than Options C and B, but that the 2 medium store options performed better than those for a single larger store. The Councils' preferred option is Option B, two medium sized supermarkets, one on the University site and one on NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p>	Option D will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5198 - Waitrose Limited	Support	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).	<p>The suggested size of store at NIAB 2,323 sq m net sales is nearer in size to Option B (2,000 sq m net) than the 3,500 sq m net floorspace in Option D. Any planning application will be considered on its own merits. However it is recognised that different foodstore operators have different sales densities and therefore turnover per sq m of floorspace alters depending on retailer identity.</p> <p>Also with regards to a store of 2,323 sqm net this would fall more comfortably into the definition of a supermarket (Self-service stores selling mainly food, with a trading floorspace less than 2,500 square metres, often with car parking) than a superstore.</p>	Option D will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5055 5060 5062 5094 5186 - William Morrisons Supermarkets	Support	<p>Car parking requirements should be balanced against design objectives of the Local Planning Authority and wider local centre provision.</p> <p>There is a need for a large supermarket in this area as the local shops are small and limited in their offer. A superstore would help the elderly & car-less to purchase good value shopping and less traffic would travel to destinations further a field such as Milton and the Beehive Centre</p> <p>This option would be most central to the different development and convenient to existing residents. Smaller outlets would not remove the need to travel to other larger supermarkets for a good selection of products</p> <p>There is a need for this in the Arbury/Kings Hedges area, so put it on the NIAB site and towards the Northern edge and ensure enough car parking</p>	<p>A superstore would require more car parking spaces in the local centre than options A and B. Whilst the land take for this would need to be part of the detailed design and solutions such as deck and undercroft parking could be introduced to help mitigate against any land take impacts, the larger store would be more difficult to design into the local centre.</p> <p>The evidence in the Supplementary Retail Study shows that a superstore of this size would provide the 'best fit' in terms of meeting the qualitative and quantitative need for convenience retail floorspace. However, it is not the only option and Option B is also an alternative way of providing the floorspace. With a superstore, the dominance of one of the centres would be of concern to the Councils as it may make it difficult to establish or maintain viable local centres at the other two sites. It may be difficult to find operators for the pipeline stores if they would be in direct competition with a superstore. This could also put at risk the viability of other small shops and community facilities in the local centres, which would not benefit from linked trips.</p> <p>The Councils also have concerns with regards to integrating a superstore into a local centre and that the retail offer should be mainly for convenience goods and not the comparison ranges that are usually sold in superstores. These types of goods should be sold from the City Centre.</p> <p>A larger store on the University site would serve the large employment provision and low car ownership on the site, however the Transport study does reveal that out of options C and D, NIAB would be the more sustainable option for the foodstore and reduce vehicle distances to a greater level than Options C and B, but that the 2 medium store options performed better than those for a single larger store. The Councils' preferred option is Option B, two medium sized supermarkets, one on the University site and one on NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p>	Option D will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 6:</i>				
5213 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners 5214 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Comment	<p>Due consideration should be given to how the foodstore provision within North West Cambridge fits with the wider provision within Cambridge and its immediate hinterland</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) did look at the existing foodstore provision in Cambridge and the surrounding villages as part of a qualitative assessment. This involved identifying any 'gaps' in provision, consumer choice and competition, overtrading / overcrowding of existing stores and the quality of existing provision. This followed the PPS4 Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Specialist retail consultants carried out both the 2006 Retail Study and the Supplementary Retail Study (SRS). The SRS mainly looked at main foodstore provision as an existing gap was identified from carrying out the qualitative assessment. It also identified that the committed and pipeline developments at the three sites did not include stores of a scale to the meet the main foods shopping needs of existing and future residents of the primary catchment area. As a result a quantitative analysis was carried out to assess the need for additional main foodshopping floorspace and where this should be located, which had regard to the current distribution and location of foodstores.</p>	
5188 - William Morrisons Supermarkets	Comment	<p>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.</p>	<p>Good design, sustainable design and construction, adequate access and parking, along with a viable local centre are critical to the success of the local centres. Agree that detailed work on the design of the local centre, supermarket and access needs to be considered in detailed application discussions at an early stage and with all relevant parties to help develop an integrated design solution. A recent document by CABE, 'Supermarket-led development: asset or liability?' (November 2010) provides examples of best practice design and how to ensure that supermarket schemes are both commercially viable and enhance the place in which they are built.</p>	<p>The 'design quality' section of the IPPG will set out key principles for developing the local centres. This includes the need for early design meetings with all relevant parties in order to develop an integrated design solution.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5084 5136 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) 5137 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS)	Comment	A restriction on comparison floorspace should be considered (suggestion that no more than 25 or 30% of the net floorspace should be used for comparison). Support for independent provision (i.e. not as part of a supermarket) of a pharmacy, dry cleaners and cafes	<p>The Councils acknowledged in the Options Report at paragraph 4.15 that the 75:25 split which was used in the Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) did appear to give a high proportion of comparison goods when compared with similar sized stores in and around Cambridge. For stores of around 2,000 sqm net floorspace the evidence suggests that around 90 - 95% of the floorspace would be convenience food goods.</p> <p>A 90 - 95% food split in floorspace would allow a 2,000 sqm net supermarket to sell a wider range of food products for a main weekly shop. This would also not draw significant trade for comparison goods from higher order centres such as the City Centre.</p> <p>This higher proportion of convenience (90 to 95%) to comparison (5 to 10%) is more realistic for supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net and will be taken forward into the IPPG.</p> <p>At the planning application stage the Councils will give further consideration as to whether conditions should be attached to the foodstores, particularly the two medium supermarkets, to limit the services they provide, such as a pharmacy or cafe, if this is considered the most effective means of securing delivery of a range of local shops in the local centre. However, the Councils will also be mindful of the risk of key facilities not being provided in the local centre if such a condition is applied.</p>	A section of the IPPG on 'proportion of convenience and comparison floorspace in the foodstores' will set out that the majority of the floorspace in the supermarkets should be for the sale of convenience goods (90-95%). A section of the IPPG on 'vibrant local centres' will refer to the possible restriction of other services being provided at the medium sized supermarkets.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5046 5066 5101 5109	Comment	<p>Support for local producers and retailers should be considered as they are more likely to have less of an impact on the environment as they will source products locally and use less packaging</p> <p>West Cambridge desperately needs shops. Ideally a butcher, baker and grocers - however I suspect a supermarket, please not Tescos, would have to do. A pub should be considered on the site</p> <p>A supermarket (other than Tesco) will add to the local choices</p> <p>Important to support local stores - option that focuses on this should be considered</p> <p>The argument that people won't go far to a supermarket is flawed as cost and quality of goods and brand of supermarket will come into their decisions. Many people have strong preferences for particular companies</p>	<p>The Councils acknowledge the support for small local shops and independent traders. However, in wider sustainability terms there is a need to provide existing and new residents within North West Cambridge with adequate facilities to limit the continuation of unsustainable travel patterns to out of centre superstores.</p> <p>The Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) has shown that there is both a quantitative and qualitative need for main foodstore provision in North West Cambridge. At present only 16% of all convenience expenditure is retained within the primary catchment area and 5% from the secondary catchment area. This shows that there is a considerable leakage of trade to out of centre main stores. In particular the Tesco stores at Bar Hill and Milton are the main draws, with travel likely to be by car. It is important that the new communities have adequate shopping and other facilities within the local centres to reduce the need to travel elsewhere and also to enable the potential use of more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>The Councils prefer Option B which includes medium sized supermarkets on the University site and NIAB site and a small supermarket at Orchard Park. This will enable residents to carry out a main food shop, but will be easier to integrate into the local centres than a superstore. Even if Option A is chosen the Council would not be able to insist on small independent shops as the planning system does not consider retailer identity.</p> <p>The supermarket will act as an anchor and encourage trade into the local centre in the early years of the development, drawing in expenditure from the existing communities that currently goes outside of the City to stores such as Milton and Bar Hill. This will enable the local centre and community facilities to be established early on in the development to aid the creation of the local community.</p> <p>Whilst it is agreed that the medium sized supermarkets of Option B will have a dominance on the food provision for the local centre, the aim is to secure a range of smaller shops alongside the</p>	<p>The IPPG will include a section on how to achieve 'vibrant local centres'.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5201 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Comment	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.	<p>supermarket in the local centre. The Councils will give further consideration at the planning applications stage as to whether conditions should be used to limit the services they provide, such as a pharmacy or cafe if this is considered to be the most effective means of securing a range of local shops in the local centre. However, the Councils will also be mindful of the risk of key facilities not being provided in the local centre if such a condition is applied. More specialised shops such as farm shops or shops selling organic produce may also find opportunities to occupy one of the smaller units within the local centre if there is a market for this type of produce.</p> <p>Consideration of the effect on Histon Road is outside the scope of the transport study</p> <p>The County Council consider that neither of these options would have "a large effect on the communities of Histon and Impington".</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5125 5228	Comment	<p>Non-car modes of transport should be considered more.</p> <p>Mitigating measures will be needed to address additional traffic, how can these be achieved on the junctions with NIAB without impacting more sustainable modes of transport.</p>	<p>The Retail and Transport Studies both took account of non-car modes and the accessibility of 2 medium supermarkets to a greater number of people by sustainable modes was an influencing factor in the Councils' preference for Option B.</p> <p>Outline Planning Consent for NIAB is still subject to the signing of a legal agreement.</p> <p>The access junctions referred to have been designed to a preliminary level of detail only: detailed design will be required prior to construction on site.</p> <p>The capacity of the access junctions will be re-evaluated, following any decision to provide additional retail floorspace on this site. It is considered unlikely that substantial re-design of junctions will be required should it be decided to provide additional retail floorspace on the NIAB site.</p> <p>Measures to encourage sustainable modes of transport will be retained as part of access junctions design process</p>	
5180 - ASDA Stores Limited	Comment	No further issues, save for those raised above.	Comment Noted	
5192	Comment	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.	Comment noted. None of the options consider increased retail provision for Orchard Park. No change is proposed to the existing policy that a small supermarket is located in the local centre here.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5189 - Lidl UK	Comment	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.	<p>Whilst it is agreed that a "Limited Assortment Discounter" (LAD) format retailer provides a different offer to conventional foodstores, no evidence is provided to support this representation. The Councils can not dictate the operator of the stores and will assess each application on its merits.</p> <p>The IPPG will take forward Option B, however the Councils decided that it was not necessary to hold back one of the medium supermarkets as these are essential in the early phases of the developments at NIAB and the University sites to create vibrant communities and as enabling development to deliver other essential infrastructure. It is likely that the local centre, including the small supermarket, at Orchard Park will be provided before the other developments are at a stage where a medium supermarket would be ready to be delivered, which reduces the concern around phasing of the two medium supermarkets.</p>	
5232	Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>2. Shopping patterns will depend on which particular supermarkets are provided. Many people have strong preferences for particular companies.</p>	<p>The level of community facilities and open space provided at the development sites is dependent on the population projections for the development sites and these will not be reduced. The development sites were planned to have a local centre with a range of shopping uses including a supermarket. The Councils' preferred option is Option B, two medium sized supermarkets, one on the University site and one on NIAB and a small supermarket at Orchard Park. The size of the medium supermarkets is not considerably greater than was previously being considered under the pipeline developments and with appropriate design it is unlikely that there will need to be any significant changes to the masterplanning.</p> <p>It is not possible for the Council to dictate the identity of foodstore operators. It is acknowledged that people do have preferences in terms of shopping operator and some will continue to shop outside of the area. However, to have no supermarket would force more people to travel for main food shopping. Option B gives the opportunity for two supermarkets, most likely operated by different retailers to trade from the sites and would therefore provide the most choice in terms of operators.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5145 - University of Cambridge	Object	A 75% convenience/25% comparison split is not appropriate for stores of 2,000m ² 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 2,500m ² 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 2400m ² net floorspace, and some larger stores, comprise almost entirely convenience space.	<p>The Councils acknowledged in the Options Report at paragraph 4.15 that the 75:25 split which was used in the Supplementary Retail Study (SRS) did appear to give a high proportion of comparison goods when compared with similar sized stores in and around Cambridge. For stores of around 2,000 sqm net floorspace the evidence suggests that around 90 - 95% of the floorspace would be convenience food goods.</p> <p>A 90 - 95% food split in floorspace would allow a 2,000 sqm net supermarket to sell a wider range of food products for a main weekly shop. This would also not draw significant trade for comparison goods from higher order centres such as the City Centre.</p> <p>This higher proportion of convenience (90 to 95%) to comparison (5 to 10%) is more realistic for supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net and will be taken forward into the IPPG.</p>	A section of the IPPG on 'proportion of convenience and comparison floorspace in the foodstores' will set out that the majority of the floorspace in the supermarkets should be for the sale of convenience goods (90-95%).
5049	Support	<p>The West Cambridge site desperately needs shops. Ideally a bucher, baker and a grocers - however I suspect a supermarket, please not Tescos, would have to do.</p> <p>Also, a pub or two is needed too. It is probably the only reason the Cavendish Laboratory hasn't had a nobel price since it moved to the new site.</p>	The Council can not dictate the operator of the retail stores. The development at West Cambridge lies outside of the primary study area.	
5168	Support	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.	Comments noted on the local centre and retail provision at Orchard Park. No options were put forward for a larger retail offer at Orchard Park than the commitment in the planning permission and the preferred option envisages that the planned local centre with small supermarket will be provided.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 7:</i>				
5162 5181 - ASDA Stores Limited	Comment	No further options put forward.	Noted.	
5102 5110 5226	Comment	<p>A local food hub, or other selection of food sources that offer access to good, fresh, affordable, local food.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Perhaps the Peoples Supermarket could be persuaded to open on one of the sites.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Supplementary Retail Study was to focus on the main food needs of the community. The retail objectives and Vibrant Local Centres section of the Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG) will seek to encourage a mix of uses in the local centres and encourage working with developers to create outdoor temporary market space for local produce.</p> <p>The Councils are unable to control rent levels on private development sites. The market will determine the rental value of these units. The Councils can not control retailer identity.</p>	
5215 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>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)</p> <p>NC = Net Convenience NSF = Net Sales Floorspace GF = Gross Floorspace</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>This alternative option sets out the same gross floor areas for the University and Orchard Park sites, but with slightly less net convenience floorspace. The main difference between this Option and Option D is that there is less comparison floorspace at the superstore on the NIAB site, resulting in a lower gross floorspace. The convenience floorspace is the same as Option D.</p> <p>Whilst this alternative Option may be preferable to Option D in that the Councils would not want a significant amount of comparison goods in a superstore in the local centre as this type of shopping should be located within the City Centre, on balance the Councils prefer Option B, two medium sized supermarkets of 2,000 sq m net, one on the University site and one on the NIAB site and the pipeline provision on Orchard Park. This would provide a better balance of provision across the sites and would be easier to design in to the local centres. The two medium sized supermarkets would be easily accessible by people on both the NIAB and University sites as they would be in the local centre at the heart of the developments, and this would enable the possibility of access by sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport.</p>	This alternative option will not be taken forwards.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5207 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Comment	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.	Consideration of the detailed effect on Histon Road is outside the scope of the retail transport study, although it did consider impacts of the options on key junctions including in Histon Road and concluded that the scale of impact of additional retail floorspace was 'minor' compared with the planned level of development in this part of Cambridge. It also concluded that the two medium store options performed better than those for a single larger store. However, any application for a new foodstore would be required to provide a transport assessment which would look at this in more detail.	
5048	Support	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.	The retail objectives and 'Vibrant Local Centres' section of the Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG) will seek to encourage a mix of uses in the local centres. The Councils will work with developers to explore the possibility of designing outdoor spaces within the local centres to allow for temporary uses such as markets.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 8:</i>				
5216 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Comment	<p>The existing and future shopping patterns would change the most under Option D and to a lesser extent Option C.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>The medium sized supermarkets in Option B would allow people to carry out a main food shop. Whilst stores of this size would not be able to directly compete with existing superstores, the Supplementary Retail Study showed that this would be a suitable alternative way of providing the additional floorspace needed in North West Cambridge. The Informal Planning Policy Guidance will limit the amount of non-food goods to be sold from the medium sized supermarkets in order that as much of the floorspace is given over to the sale of food.</p> <p>The Councils have a number of concerns about a superstore at one of the sites in terms of designing it into one of the local centres and making it difficult to establish and maintain viable local centres at the other two sites.</p>	<p>On balance the Councils' preferred option is Option B.</p>
5050	Comment	<p>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.</p>	<p>The planning system does not distinguish between retail operators and therefore the Councils do not have any control over operator identity. This will be determined by the market.</p>	
5054	Comment	<p>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).</p>	<p>Comments noted on current shopping patterns and how these may change with the completion of the NIAB local centre. It is encouraging that a local resident envisages making trips to the supermarket and local centre at NIAB by sustainable modes of transport such as by foot or bike.</p> <p>The Councils propose to take forward Option B which is a medium sized supermarket at both the NIAB and University sites and a small supermarket at Orchard Park.</p>	
5163 5182 - ASDA Stores Limited	Comment	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5047 5061 5067 5085	Comment	Consultees provided details of their main food shopping destinations.	Current shopping patterns noted. The most common destinations include Tesco at Bar Hill, Asda at the Beehive Centre, Waitrose in Trumpington and City Centre stores, with Aldi and local shops such as Daily Bread and Co-op also mentioned.	
5111	Comment	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.	The Council has no control over operator identity. Whilst acknowledging some people will always shop according to brand loyalty, shopping trends are also influenced by store proximity and relative accessibility, pricing, car parking, store size and format which influences range of goods. Shopping behaviour was discussed in the Options Report. Option B provides two medium sized supermarkets, and it is likely that these will be operated by different retailers.	
5217 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Comment	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.	One of the retail objectives for the Informal Planning Policy Guidance is to ensure that opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport are maximised. The suggestion that Option D would help alleviate traffic congestion on the A14 is not supported by the Retail Transport Study. No evidence has been provided to support this statement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 9:</i>				
5218 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners 5219 - Barratt Strategic and the North West Cambridge Consortium of Land Owners	Comment	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. 40% of net sales floorspace providing comparison goods is excessive and unrealistic, between 5% and 30% is more realistic. This has an effect on transport impacts, it is felt the transport impacts of option D are overstated.	The floorspace split between comparison and convenience was based on data used in the Supplementary Retail Study (SRS). The Councils agree and understand that floorspace breakdown differs from operator to operator. The Councils have accepted in response to other representations that the level of comparison floorspace suggested in the SRS appears to be high in Option B (25% of 2,000 sqm net) when compared to similar sized stores in the Cambridge area. In the Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG), the Councils will require a more appropriate 90 to 95% of the floorspace for convenience goods. For Options C and D the SRS used 70% convenience to 30% comparison breakdown. This is realistic when compared to other existing stores in the City. The County Council disagrees with the statements with regards to the transport impacts and advises that the conclusions of the Transport Study remain valid for all options.	
5224	Comment	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)?	The strategy for North West Cambridge is to serve the new and existing communities by providing additional floorspace for food shopping in the North West, which would help to reduce the current unsustainable travel patterns to stores such as Milton and Bar Hill. There are no plans to look at bus services to existing stores. However, the new food stores to be provided in North West Cambridge will be located in local centres which will be served by bus services.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5183 - ASDA Stores Limited	Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Comments noted. The Councils intend to incorporate the policy approach in the Informal Planning Policy Guidance into their Local Development Frameworks at the earliest opportunity to support future retail development in North West Cambridge.	
5112 5221	Comment	<p>The evidence is biased towards supermarkets and discourages people from choosing option A. Does not explain how Option A would reduce carbon.</p> <p>Do not support the over development of Cambridge, where this must happen local services and amenities should be integrated into existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Councils acknowledge the support for small local shops and independent traders. However, the evidence in the SRS shows that there is a quantitative and qualitative need for additional floorspace above that which would be provided by the already planned pipeline convenience store floorspace. Option A would not provide shops capable of accommodating a main weekly shop and would perpetuate the need for many residents to make unsustainable car journeys to stores outside the study area.</p> <p>The Transport Study took Option A as its baseline for considering impacts of the options on carbon emissions, as this is the current policy position. It therefore would not give any additional carbon benefits.</p> <p>It is important that the new communities have adequate shopping and other facilities within the local centres to reduce the need to travel elsewhere and also to enable the potential use of more sustainable forms of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>The Councils prefer Option B which includes medium sized supermarkets on the University site and NIAB site and a small supermarket at Orchard Park. This will enable residents to carry out a main food shop, but will be easier to integrate into the local centres than a superstore.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5107 - Stratfield Close & Tavistock Road Residents Association 5126 5138 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) 5191 - Lidl UK	Comment	<p>There might be a danger that the planned local centres for these sites would disappear from the agenda.</p> <p>Supermarket provision should be at the Madingley Road end of the site; the west of the city is badly served compared with the north.</p> <p>Any supermarket provision should be linked with the phasing of the residential development. It should therefore be made clear that foodstore provision should be linked to the completion of housing elements of each developed area.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The development of the local centres is key to the development of the urban extensions and the foodstores will be integrated within these.</p> <p>The late delivery of the local centre at Orchard Park has been a concern for residents of the new community, this situation should not be repeated at NIAB and the University Site. The supermarket, local centre and community facilities will be phased early into the NIAB and University developments in order to deliver much needed facilities for residents in the early years of development. The local centres will form a hub for the new communities.</p> <p>The retail provision for each sites will be within the local centre as positioned within the development masterplans for the sites.</p>	The Informal Planning Policy Guidance will contain sections on 'Vibrant Local Centres', 'Design' and 'Phasing'.
5164	Comment	No	Noted	
5068	Comment	<p>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!</p> <p>Impact of delivery and distribution lorries to new retail units on residents should also be considered.</p>	<p>Sustainable development planning seeks to make access to locations such as local centres and supermarkets accessible by non-car modes. In this way it will make it possible and easier for people to use alternative modes of transport. One of the objectives of the Informal Planning Policy Guidance is 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. However, it is acknowledged that cars will still be used to access the supermarkets and car parking facilities will be available.</p> <p>The impact of delivery lorries is an important issue and the IPPG will make clear that servicing locations should cause minimal disruption to local residents. This will also be considered carefully by the Councils in working with developers on the masterplanning of the local centres and when assessing planning applications.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5139 - Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS)	Comment	<p>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:</p> <p>"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"</p>	<p>The Councils consider it important for the medium supermarkets at the University site and the NIAB site to be delivered in the early phases of both developments. Early delivery of the foodstores will have the benefit of anchoring the local centre and creating linked trips to other shops and community facilities. Early delivery will also give new residents somewhere to shop from when they move in, thus helping to prevent unsustainable shopping patterns from establishing. Through the early phasing of the foodstores and local centres in each development, the Councils will expect developers to deliver supporting infrastructure and community facilities early in the creation of the new communities. The Councils would also like to see the local centre at Orchard Park delivered as soon as possible, to provide residents with essential day to day shopping facilities within easy walking and cycling distance. A section on phasing will be included in the Informal Planning Policy Guidance (IPPG).</p> <p>Planning conditions will be considered at the time of the detailed and outline applications for the sites.</p>	<p>The IPPG will include a section on 'phasing' which requires early delivery of the local centres and medium supermarkets at the University and NIAB sites.</p>
5131 - Natural England	Comment	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Informal Planning Policy Guidance will include sections on sustainable design and construction and encouraging sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>With regards to the SSSI, the medium supermarket on the University site would be located within the local centre and will have no adverse impact.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
5202 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 5203 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Comment	As this study was not complete prior to granting of permission for NIAB, it could be argued this permission was premature. A new foodstore will attract shoppers and vehicles from outside the development, particularly if it is 'anyone but Tesco'.	The planning permission for NIAB main site is still subject to the completion of the Section 106 agreement. Consideration of the detailed effect on Histon Road is outside the scope of the retail transport study, although it did consider impacts of the options on key junctions including in Histon Road and the two medium store options performed better than those for a single larger store. It is acknowledged that the supermarkets would attract shoppers especially from the primary catchment area, this would have some beneficial impacts and reduce travel distances to further away and out of centre stores such as Bar Hill and Milton. The Council can not control the identity of the operator.	
5197 - Anglian Water Services Ltd	Comment	Thank you for this consultation. However, I do not have any comment to make on this occasion.	Noted	

GLOSSARY

GLOSSARY

5127	Comment	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.	The Committee Report for Environment Scrutiny Committee on 15th March provides a schedule of all of the representations made and the Councils' responses. Many of the representations have come from developers and local organisations. The Councils are unable to give out individual respondents addresses.	
5169 - University of Cambridge	Object	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.	Comment noted. Agree that checkouts, lobbies etc do not count as net floorspace in line with the PPS 4 practice guidance.	Amend the glossary definition for 'net floorspace' in the Informal Planning Policy Guidance.