

Jones, Becky

Subject: RE: Application 14/5997/FUL - Aldi, London Road

From: Dan Templeton
Sent: 09 February 2015 14:04
To: Jones, Becky; Alan Williams
Cc: Bishton, Roger
Subject: RE: Application 14/5997/FUL - Aldi, London Road

Dear Becky,

Further to our conversation earlier, please find attached a response to the highways comments made on behalf of Asda. I have copied these to Roger as requested. Quite why Asda have waited nearly eight months following the submission of the application to raise these comments is unclear, but their letter is presumably designed to try to influence the Council's decision making at the Committee meeting on Wednesday.

With regard to the format points raised by Asda, an ALDI store is manifestly different in terms of size, format and function from the Asda proposal. Whilst it is clear that discount retailers have made great gains in the convenience shopping market, this has not been done by materially altering their philosophy and stores continue to provide a limited line store format.

In any event, it is incorrect for RPS to imply that the proposal has not been subject to rigorous assessment against the relevant policy tests set by the NPPF. As you are well aware, the proposal has been the subject of detailed scrutiny by the Council's appointed consultant; and exactly the same level of scrutiny as that given to the other proposals (Asda and Sainsbury's). Following this scrutiny, Officer's (and the Council's consultant's) advice is that there is no retail policy objection to the ALDI proposals.

It is helpful that RPS do, however, agree with your consultant's conclusions that the MCCP is not sequentially preferable for the ALDI store.

I trust that's helpful. Please do not hesitate to call if you have any queries in advance of Wednesday's meeting.

Many thanks and regards,

Dan Templeton
Director

Turley

10 Queen Square
Bristol BS1 4NT
T 0117 989 7000
M 07795 815 482

turley.co.uk



Think of the environment, please do not print unnecessarily
This e-mail is intended for the above named only, is strictly confidential and may also be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient please do not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on it or any attachments. Instead, please notify the sender and then immediately and permanently delete it. Turley is a trading name of Turley Associates Ltd, registered in England and Wales Registered No 2235387 Registered Office 1 New York Street, Manchester, M1 4HD.

Location: A30 London Road, Salisbury
Planning application no. 14/05997/FUL
Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of Class A1 food store with associated access, parking and landscaping
Response to Asda Highway comments

TRANSPORT COMMENTS	Entran Response
<p>The planning application includes an additional 48 car parking spaces at the Park and Ride (P&R). However the TA does not consider the additional traffic implications of this extension to the P&R car park</p>	<p>The additional spaces being provided at the P&R site are not required on capacity grounds, far from it. They are being provided as part of the package of works being undertaken by Aldi to ensure that the area under the proposed deck is available should it ever be needed.</p>
<p>Servicing of the store is likely to occur during the trading hours as there are suggested planning restrictions on out of hours servicing. The swept path analysis of the service vehicle confirms that manoeuvres are required within the car park. This is not unusual, however in this instance the disabled parking spaces are located close to the site access and the HGV is shown to over sail the hatched area to the rear of the spaces. The alighting of vehicle occupants, or loading and unloading of goods, could therefore potentially delay the HGV resulting in the vehicle blocking the site access. This has the potential to impact detrimentally on the operation of the access and London Road</p>	<p>Not agreed, the potential for the suggested negative interaction is extremely negligible furthermore servicing is once or twice a day with the first delivery generally undertaken either before or as the store opens</p>
<p>The layout is such that servicing requires the HGV to conflict with customer traffic at the site access. All of the access 'bell mouth' is required to accommodate the swept path and this could result in conflicts between vehicles or delays to vehicles entering and exiting the site. The HGV left turn out of the site also over sails the right turn ghost island and this could result in delays to vehicles or impacts between vehicles on London Road.</p>	<p>Agreed, but this is not a safety issue, it happens once or twice a day at all stores of this nature. The left turn does over sail the right turn lane similar to what happens at other junctions along the London Road.</p>
<p>The ability to achieve a 4.5m x 120m visibility splay, consistent with a 40mph speed limit, has not been demonstrated.</p>	<p>Consistent with MfS2, visibility splays of 2.4m by 120m were agreed with WC as being appropriate in this location. Visibility splays in excess of the required standard are being provided</p>
<p>Traffic speeds were collected for the TA but these are not referred to. The eighty-fifth percentile wet weather journey speed should be used to confirm the actual visibility requirement given that the access is located on a principal A class road. Failure to provide adequate visibility splays commensurate with vehicles speeds has significant road safety implications.</p>	<p>85th percentile speeds of 40mph were recorded in both direction commensurate with provided visibility splays</p>
<p>The operation of the site access arm is suggested to be 0.71 [RFC], the preferred maximum RFC is 0.85. This is a potential issue given that the TA only considers the PM peak hour period. Typically a food store will have a higher trip generation rate in the Saturday midday peak period. A comparison</p>	<p>This is not an issue. The main road traffic flows during the PM peak (1950) are greater than 30% higher than the Saturday midday peak (1450). The turning movements in to and out of the</p>



<p>of the developer provided PM peak trip rate (7.290 two-way) and the Saturday midday peak period trip rate (1.962 two-way) confirms that the Saturday is some 60% higher than the PM peak. The operation of the site access arm is suggested to be 0.71 [RFC], the preferred maximum RFC is 0.85. This is a potential issue given that the TA only considers the PM peak hour period. Typically a food store will have a higher trip generation rate in the Saturday midday peak period. A comparison of the developer provided PM peak trip rate (7.290 two-way) and the Saturday midday peak period trip rate (1.962 two-way) confirms that the Saturday is some 60% higher than the PM peak.</p>	<p>site will therefore be significantly easier with the junction operating at a lower RFC.</p>
<p>The distribution and assignment of store traffic is overly simplistic and is not supported by the Retail Impact Assessment (RIA). The consultant relies upon 80% of traffic visiting the store coming from the south. There is, however, a large local residential development to the north of the site at Bishopsdown, access to the store from here is likely to be via London Road. Whilst the reassignment of traffic will assist the right turn into the site, the right turn outbound will increase the pressure on the sensitive site access operation.</p>	<p>The distribution was based on a high level population catchment area and agreed in advance with WC</p>



Park House, Greyfriars Road, Cardiff CF10 3AF

T +44 (0)29 2066 8662 F +44 (0)29 2066 8622 E rpssw@rpsgroup.com W rpsgroup.com

Our Ref: JPW0361
Your Ref: 14/05997/FUL

E-mail: ross.bowen@rpsgroup.com
Direct Dial: 02920 2055 0681
Date: 09/02/2015

Mrs Becky Jones
Senior Planning Officer
Development Services
Wiltshire Council
The Council House
Bourne Hill
Salisbury
SP1 3UZ

By Post and Email: becky.jones@wiltshire.gov.uk

Dear Mrs Jones,

Proposed Aldi Store, Former Autechnique Site, London Road, Salisbury
Application Reference: 14/05997/FUL

I act on behalf of Asda Stores Ltd, who you will be aware have an application for a foodstore on London Road currently before the Council (14/04756/FUL).

I am aware that the application for the proposed Aldi store is being reported to the Strategic Planning Committee on 11th February with a recommendation for approval. I have reviewed the Report for the application, and must raise some concerns with the rationale for this recommendation. My concerns relate to three key issues, detailed below.

The Aldi Format

The report (and the GVA advice which informs it) frequently refers to Aldi as being a distinct format of retail use, which is at least part of the basis to justify treating the proposal differently to the other retail proposals before the Council. This manifests itself in particular in how the Council have applied the sequential test – an issue which I will return to.

Whilst it would have been reasonable to argue that a 'Deep Discounter' such as Aldi had distinguishing characteristics from 'mainstream' retailers in years gone by, the past few years and last 12 months in particular, have confirmed that such a distinction no longer applies. Aldi are a key competitor of the 'Big 4' retailers, with significant growth in market share at the expense of those retailers. This transformation of the retail sector has been well publicised over recent years, with Aldi now taking a 4.8% market share, up by 20% in a year, and profits up by 65% in the past year. Customer numbers are reported to have increased by one million.

The 'discounter' model has become increasingly sophisticated with many of the types of products and services previously not provided increasingly becoming part of their offer. This rapid growth in market share and profits has been delivered in the context of many stores being restricted in terms of products and services which can be provided, as is being recommended by condition for this application. Such restrictions do not limit the trade draw from other food stores. Aldi are now a firm competitor of the 'Big 4' and it is inappropriate to not fully scrutinise a proposal against the NPPF tests on the basis of an outdated perception of there being a distinct format for the particular use.

IMS0005v1



FS 32940



ISO 14001
EMS 70824

RPS Planning & Development Ltd. Registered in England No. 02947164
20 Western Avenue, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX14 4SH
A member of the RPS Group Plc

In this respect an analogy can be drawn with the 'warehouse club' model of retailing. Although this claims to follow a different format to conventional retailers, in policy terms it is to be treated as A1 retail and assessed accordingly.

The Sequential Approach

The key concern with the application is with how the proposal has been considered in relation to the sequential test, and in particular the M CCP (Maltings and Central Car Park) site, when compared to the Asda and JS proposals.

There is a clear need for policy to be applied consistently across all the three planning applications. If the M CCP site is considered to be unsuitable for Aldi it cannot be considered suitable for the larger Asda or Sainsbury stores.

As matters stand we believe that the Council would be acting unreasonably – in the Wednesbury sense of that word – if it approves the Aldi store on the basis that the M CCP site is 'unsuitable', despite the view that it is apparently 'suitable' for a larger store. Instead members should be advised that given the regeneration strategy that has been adopted for the M CCP, the site is not considered to be suitable, nor available, for any of the three foodstore applications.

Transport Considerations

Your highway officers have stated they have no objection to the proposed development (although the same cannot be said of the City and Parish Councils). However we are unclear as to how they have reached this recommendation. Asda's transport team, who have a detailed knowledge of the operational and impact issues associated with foodstore developments, have highlighted the following issues in relation to Aldi's Transport Assessment (TA) and proposed access arrangements:

- The planning application includes an additional 48 car parking spaces at the Park and Ride (P&R). However the TA does not consider the additional traffic implications of this extension to the P&R car park.
- Servicing of the store is likely to occur during the trading hours as there are suggested planning restrictions on out of hours servicing. The swept path analysis of the service vehicle confirms that manoeuvres are required within the car park. This is not unusual, however in this instance the disabled parking spaces are located close to the site access and the HGV is shown to over sail the hatched area to the rear of the spaces. The alighting of vehicle occupants, or loading and unloading of goods, could therefore potentially delay the HGV resulting in the vehicle blocking the site access. This has the potential to impact detrimentally on the operation of the access and London Road.
- The layout is such that servicing requires the HGV to conflict with customer traffic at the site access. All of the access 'bell mouth' is required to accommodate the swept path and this could result in conflicts between vehicles or delays to vehicles entering and exiting the site. The HGV left turn out of the site also over sails the right turn ghost island and this could result in delays to vehicles or impacts between vehicles on London Road.
- The ability to achieve a 4.5m x 120m visibility splay, consistent with a 40mph speed limit, has not been demonstrated.
- Traffic speeds were collected for the TA but these are not referred to. The eighty-fifth percentile wet weather journey speed should be used to confirm the actual visibility requirement given that the access is located on a principal A class road. Failure to provide adequate visibility splays commensurate with vehicles speeds has significant road safety implications.



- The operation of the site access arm is suggested to be 0.71 [RFC], the preferred maximum RFC is 0.85. This is a potential issue given that the TA only considers the PM peak hour period. Typically a food store will have a higher trip generation rate in the Saturday midday peak period. A comparison of the developer provided PM peak trip rate (7.290 two-way) and the Saturday midday peak period trip rate (11.962 two-way) confirms that the Saturday is some 60% higher than the PM peak.
- The distribution and assignment of store traffic is overly simplistic and is not supported by the Retail Impact Assessment (RIA). The consultant relies upon 80% of traffic visiting the store coming from the south. There is, however, a large local residential development to the north of the site at Bishopsdown, access to the store from here is likely to be via London Road. Whilst the reassignment of traffic will assist the right turn into the site, the right turn outbound will increase the pressure on the sensitive site access operation.

I hope that you will have due regard to all of the above comments, and would suggest that these issues should be given due consideration and dealt with before the application is considered by Members at Committee.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ross Bowen'.

Ross Bowen
Director

cc J Scholey – Asda Stores Ltd
R Hughes – Wiltshire Council – Wiltshire Council

Development Services
North Monkton Park
Chippenham
Wiltshire
SN15 1ER

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application No: 14/05997/FUL

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of Class A1 foodstore (1,585 sq.m. gross) with associated access, decked car parking and landscaping, and additional Park and Ride parking.

Site Address: Former Autechnique Site, London Road, Salisbury, SP1 3HN

On Behalf of: ALDI Stores Ltd

Having read the officer's briefing and noted the advice to approve the above application I wish to raise the issue of access to the site.

Salisbury City Council Planning & Transportation Committee were broadly in favour of the Aldi application, although we rejected it because of the inherent flaws in providing a direct access off the A30 London Road. WC Highways have argued away the concerns over the A30 to the satisfaction of the technical manuals which provide their guidance. However, the reality is far different. When the site was a garage there were regular accidents involving cars turning out of the site; going further back in time to the 70s and 80s, when Reliance Marine (boat building) and a Texaco garage were on the site, there was far less traffic than now but there were also regular accidents (including 7 car shunt as witnessed by a resident who used to work at the site 20+ years ago). The dangers were recognised at the time and workers would go out on the road to hold up traffic to let large vehicles out safely in both directions. Last summer I witnessed a simple 3 car shunt at the top of the hill (by the proposed Aldi access) on a Friday afternoon. The resulting traffic jam accelerated back up the A30 towards Hampshire in double quick time!

This stretch of A30 lies within my ward (Bishopdown & St Marks) and I raised our concerns with the WC Senior Highways engineer when I spoke to him last summer. He informed me that WC officers had already pre-determined in initial discussions with Aldi that they would not allow access via the logical and safe route from the adjacent Parkwood roundabout. SCC also sent a formal letter to WC in July 2014 (copy attached), followed up with a repeat of the same letter later in the year as the previous letter had been 'mislaidd', highlighting 8 major concerns with this stretch of the A30. The issues, which included the Aldi access, must be considered together otherwise we will have another main arterial road suffering regular blockages. Regrettably, despite our endeavours to have the issues properly considered, the City Council has not received any acknowledgement that WC has considered our concerns. I request that the Strategic Planning Committee refuse this application on the grounds of unsuitable access until such time as WC officers are able to make a proper consideration of the problems that we have with this short but vital stretch of road.

Colin Froude
Salisbury City Councillor
St Marks & Bishopdown

Jones, Becky

From: David Morgan
Sent: 09 February 2015 16:07
To: Jones, Becky
Subject: Fwd: Late correspondence for Aldi 14.05997.FUL

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Morgan
Date: 9 February 2015 17:05:28 CET
To: "developmentmanagementsouth@wiltshire.gov.uk"
<developmentmanagementsouth@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Late correspondence for Aldi 14.05997.FUL

Unfortunately I am unable to be with you personally because I am currently in France and cannot attend the meeting. I am, therefore, writing you this letter in support of the Aldi development of the formally Autotecnic Site in Salisbury.

As an inhabitant of Salisbury since 1991 I have observed numerous changes to the city both positive and negative. Over the past twenty-five years, Salisbury District Council had developed out of city shopping facilities on the south side of the city, particularly along the Southampton Road and towards the north with projects on the old cattle market which now accommodates Waitrose. Both the east and west of the city have remained poorly served with limited small shopping facilities despite the huge housing developments.

The housing development to the east has a very small Spar shop on Bishopdown Farm and a Marks & Spencer's convenience store attached to the BP garage. They offer the expanding community and local businesses limited facilities but nothing like the discounted stores of some of the larger retailers or smaller supermarkets of efficient foreign competitors such as Lidl, Netto and Aldi.

The City Council has been supporting a successful green transport policy which encourages limiting vehicle access into the city centre. Park and Rides and higher parking tariffs have successfully reduced the number of people regularly entering the city centre and encouraged them to support the out of town stores.

Ironically, this has meant that most inhabitants to east of the city still have to travel south to stores like Tesco and Lidl's or go across the north of the city to Waitrose. In my discussions with local inhabitants, Sainsburys, in the city centre, appears to be a victim of the Council's successful transport policy.

The formally Autotecnic site has remained derelict for a number of years and the proposal to develop the site by Aldi Stores seems opportune. It will give the inhabitants of a vastly expanded community, on the east of the city, a much needed shopping facility, offering independent financial help to the city to improve the environment with the redevelopment of brown site land, the development of general facilities to the east of the city and also supporting passing trade using the Park Ride. Aldi will bring additional competition to the trading life of the area and also substantially help in reducing the carbon footprint of those currently having to drive across the city for their weekly grocery provisions.

I was initially delighted with the Council's positive reaction to the development of the site. I fully understand the City Council's concern about the issues of access onto the London Road. I can fully appreciate their worries, especially with the current issues of the BP Garage and the original planning permission for this site. I hope these issues will soon be resolved as they are pertinent to the Council's current argument but, sadly and ironically, have remained unresolved for some years.

The proposed Aldi Store has arranged for a slip road onto their site which should ensure free flow traffic into the city. The issue of traffic turning right could easily be avoided if cars and delivery vehicles, visiting Aldi that required a right turn into or out of the site, were obliged to turn left and use the roundabouts at either end of London Road to change direction. This traffic paradigm is used on the Southampton Road. It would ensure all traffic to and from Aldi turned left and minimise accidents and traffic congestion.

The City Council's current objection to the potential additional competition to inner city trade, such as their Maltings development, is contrary to their past policies and is denying the people of the city, particularly the communities in the east of Salisbury, access to an externally financed improvement project to local facilities.

The question of landscaping and limiting overnight parking should be issues that could be easily resolved through discussion with the developers.

Increased traffic noise has been a continually growing issue throughout the country and cannot be realistically raised as a issue, especially as the London Road is a main trunk road and is rarely empty of traffic. Moreover, the site originally had a petrol station as well as the Saab garage and vehicles were moving over the site throughout the day and late evening.

Perhaps, with the acceptance of this project, the Strategic Planning Committee can further demonstrate support for the local economy and community of Salisbury and South Wiltshire.

Your faithfully,

David Morgan

09/02/2015

Sent from my iPad