Review of Planning and Retail Statement for Proposed Retail-led Mixed-Use Development at Land North of Derby Road, Hilton, DE65 5JS

Application Ref: DMPA/2024/0198

Report prepared for South Derbyshire District Council

May 2024

Reeves Retail Planning Consultancy Ltd
Director: Christine Reeves BSc, Dip TP, MRTPI
Registered in Wale - Company Number 8808204
Tel: 0787 3360204
Email: Christine@rrpc.co.uk

1. Introduction

1.1. This report has been prepared by Reeves Retail Planning Consultancy (RRPC) on the instruction of South Derbyshire District Council (SDDC). Its purpose is to provide retail and town centre policy advice to the Council in relation to a recent application by Trenport Investments Ltd (Trenport/ the Applicant) for a retail-led mixed use development of land north of Derby Road, Hilton, DE65 5JS. The application has been submitted in outline and proposes a foodstore, commercial space for Small to Medium Enterprises, a drive-thru coffee shop and community spaces with associated parking, servicing, drainage, landscaping and habitat areas as well as highway works (all matters reserved except for access).

1.2. The application therefore proposes the development of two units for retail/ main town centre uses:

i. A Class E(a) retail store of 1,949 sqm gross floorspace; and

ii. A drive-thru coffee shop of 155 sqm gross.

1.3. This report reviews the Planning and Retail Statement (PRS) prepared by WSP, dated February 2024 which accompanies the planning application and the additional household survey information provided by WSP on 28 March 2024. The latter also included a number of updated tables relating to the retail impact assessment (specifically Tables 8, 9, 13 and 14). These tables were further updated on 29 April 2024 when revised Tables 1-5 were also provided. Our comments refer to this most recent revised information.

1.4. Our report assesses the proposed development against the retail and town centre policies set out in the Local Development Plan and against national planning policy and guidance, namely the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which was most recently revised in December 2023 and the supporting Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (revised September 2020). This is considered further in Section 3 below.

1.5. Our report is structured as follows, following a similar format to the PRS:

- Section 2 considers the proposed development and specifically, the town centre uses proposed;
- Section 3 considers the retail and town centre planning policies relevant to the proposal;
- Section 4 reviews the retail context and the household survey undertaken for the Applicant;
- Section 5 reviews the sequential sites assessment prepared by WSP;
- Section 6 reviews the impact assessment provided by WSP; and
- Section 7 sets out our conclusions on the proposed development and provides our advice to SDDC in terms of retail and town centre policy considerations.

1.6. It should be noted that throughout the report, our advice is limited to the consideration of retail and town centre policy matters and we do not comment on other planning policy considerations.

1.7. It should also be noted that we only provide commentary on those aspects of the application submission which we consider directly relevant to our advice to the Council. Thus, any failure to reference an assumption, comment or conclusion in the PRS should not be interpreted as meaning that we agree with what WSP is saying, rather that it is not significant in informing our overall advice.

2. Proposed Development

2.1. The application proposal is for a mixed use development incorporating retail, town centre, community and employment uses on an 'out of centre' site (PRS, para 2.1.5) located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Hilton (PRS, para 2.1.4).

2.2. The relevant uses from a retail and town centre policy perspective comprise:

- A Class E(a) retail foodstore of 2,031 sqm gross (1,331 sqm net sales area); and
- A 167 sqm gross drive-thru coffee shop.

Foodstore

2.3. There is no named operator for the proposed foodstore, although it is intended to meet weekly shopping needs and offer choice and competition to the out of centre Aldi in the village (PRS, para 3.1.4). It is also intended to primarily provide a convenience offer with only a limited comparison offer (Para 5.1.2).

Drive-thru Coffee Shop

2.4. There is also no named operator for the coffee shop.

2.5. It is suggested this would be Phase 2 of the development (PRS, para 3.1.13).

3. Retail and Town Centre Policy Considerations

3.1. Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the approved development plan for the area unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3.2. The approved development plan for South Derbyshire comprises:

- The Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) (2016);
- The Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) (2017); and
- The Hilton, Marston on Dove & Hoon Neighbourhood Plan (NP) (2021) (PRS, para 4.3.1).

3.3. We consider that the relevant retail and town centre policies are therefore:

- **LPP1, Policy S7 Retail** which supports the role of Swadlincote Town Centre and notes that the urban extensions to Derby City will be expected to include some retail provision on site. This is to be appropriate to the size of the development and not detrimental to existing retail provision;
- **LPP1, Policy H7: Land at Hilton Depot, Hilton** which allocates the site for residential development and indicates that consideration will be given to retail and other service provision on the site;
- **LPP1, Policy H11: Land north east of Hatton** which allocates the site for residential development and requires consideration be given to additional retail provision on site, to help meet the needs of the site and Hatton;
- **LPP1, Policy H12 Highfields Farm** which includes a new local centre proposal within the allocated housing site;
- **LPP1, Policy H15: Wragley Way (south of Derby)** which includes a new local centre proposal within the allocated housing site;
- **LPP1, Policy H18: Hackwood Farm** which includes a new local centre proposal within the allocated housing site;
- **LPP1, Policy H19 Land West of Mickleover** which includes a new district centre proposal within the allocated housing site; and
- **LPP2, Policy RTL1 Retail Hierarchy (and Map 3)** which sets out the centre hierarchy for the district and requires that applications for retail uses are subject to the sequential test.

  Hilton is identified as a centre in a Key/Local Service Village, as are nearby Etwall, Findern, Hatton and Willington. New Local Centres are also proposed in the new residential developments west of Mickleover and at Wragley Way and Highfields Farm.

  The policy also indicates that development within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 will be permitted in local centres and centres in Key/Local Service Villages where the development is appropriate for the scale and function of the centre and is well related

to existing retail units in the centre. Development in Key/Local Service Villages must also not lead to unsustainable trip generation or undermine the vitality and viability of a neighbouring centre.

Proposal for retail developments of over 1,000 sqm gross outside of a centre will be required to submit a retail impact assessment to measure the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of nearby centres and on committed and planned investment in those centres;

- **NP, Policy H1A Housing delivery** which supports the development of the Mease mixed use development site, provided that it, inter alia, includes the provision of retail units within Use Class E. The supporting text notes that the site is an appropriate location to address the shortfall in retail units identified in the residents' survey, specifically a bakers, butchers, café, restaurant and allows for other similar businesses; and
- **NP, Policy L3 Hilton village shopping centre development** which supports the development of at least six retail units falling within Class E.

3.4. This list is not consistent with the policies listed by WSP (PRS, para 4.3.2) which does not include the allocated development sites where retail uses are proposed. However, some of the sites are considered in Sections 6 and 7 of the PRS.

3.5. Material considerations include the planning policies set out in the NPPF and the accompanying policy guidance (PPG) (PRS, paras 4.2). The retail and town centre policy consideration in the NPPF are set out in the PRS (paras 4.2.5 – 4.2.7).

3.6. Material considerations can also include emerging local plans, although in this case, we agree with WSP that the Local Plan review is at a very early stage and can be given no weight in the determination of the application at the current time (PRS, para 4.4.1).

4. The Retail Context

4.1. Information on current retail provision in Hilton and the surrounding areas is provided in Section 5 of the PRS (paras 5.2.1 – 5.2.2), which also sets out the findings of the household survey commissioned by the Applicant.

4.2. The household survey provides a useful source for understanding current shopping behaviour in the area and we have undertaken our own review of the results. Our key findings are set out below. However, it would be helpful if WSP could confirm the sample size for the survey, as there is a discrepancy between the numbers quoted in the report (PRS, paras 5.3.1 & 7.4.7) and the household survey results that have been provided to RRPC.

4.3. In terms of main food shopping (Q01):

- The existing Aldi in Hilton is the main food shopping destination for a very significant proportion of Hilton residents (Zone 1 - 69.4%), but trade draw from Zones 2 – 5 is considerably more limited, as would be expected given the proximity of other centres and stores. The next most popular destinations for Zone 1 residents are Tesco, Mickleover (7.1%) and Sainsbury's, Kingsway Retail Park, Derby (5.6%);
- Zone 2 covers an extensive area extending north eastwards from the outskirts of Hilton to Mickleover and Littleover and includes the villages of Etwall, Burnaston, Eggington, Finden, Repton and Willington. The main shopping destination for residents of this zone is Tesco, Mickleover (42.4%), with 13.6% going to Aldi in Hilton and 13.3% to Aldi in Littleover.
- Zone 3 covers the area to the south east of Hilton, with the majority of the population living in the northern outskirts of Burton-on-Trent. Respondents use a variety of stores for their main food shopping, including Aldi, Burton-on-Trent (20.9%), Aldi, Hilton (15.7%), Sainsbury's, Burton-on-Trent (10.1%) and Tesco, Burton-on-Trent (9.4%).
- Zone 4 to the south west of Hilton includes Hatton and Tutbury villages. The most popular shopping destination for residents is Tesco, Uttoxeter (30.6%), followed by Waitrose, Uttoxeter (10.5%) and Aldi, Hilton (10.4%).
- Zone 5 covers an extensive rural area to the north west of Hilton. The residents in this zone have very varied shopping patterns, with Sainsbury's, Ashbourne the most used store (26.2%) followed by Aldi, Ashbourne (17.6%).

4.4. This suggests that any foodstores in Hilton will have a relatively limited trade draw from areas outside of the village itself for main food shopping.

4.5. In terms of other shops used for main food shopping (Q08):

- Aldi, Hilton is a popular alternative location for main food shopping (10.3%), especially those in Zones 1 and 4;
- Tesco, Mickleover is used by 20.3% of respondents as an alternative main food destination and is particularly popular with residents in Zones 2 (39.8%) and 1 (20.1%);

- Otherwise, a range of stores are used, although only half of respondents indicate they use more than one store for their main food shopping.

4.6. In terms of top-up shopping (Q10 and Q12):

- Aldi, Hilton is used by 10.1% of all respondents for top-up shopping, primarily due to its popularity in Zones 1 and 2 (32.1% and 11.6% respectively). This makes it the third most popular store in the study area after Tesco Mickleover (14.9%) and Tesco Express, Hilton (13.8%). The latter is particularly important in Zone 1 where it is mentioned by 52.5% of respondents;
- Aldi, Hilton is also popular as an 'other top-up' shopping destination, mentioned by 11.1% of respondents. This is supported by respondents in Zone 3 as well as Zone 1 (although sample sizes for this question are low and need to be treated with a degree of caution);
- Sainsbury's and Tesco in Mickleover are the other two main other top-up locations due to usage by Zone 2 respondents;
- Of the shops serving the villages in the area other than Hilton (PRS, para 5.2.2), the Co-op at Hatton appears to be well used by Zone 4 residents. The Nisa Local in Hatton, Etwall Stores and One Stop in Etwall are also mentioned by respondents.

4.7. The survey also includes questions on the use of the Aldi store in Hilton by all respondents (Q13 – Q17). The responses suggest that:

- Around 90% of respondents in Zone 1 have used it at some point;
- Between a third and a half of respondents in Zones 2, 3 and 4 have visited the Aldi; and
- Only around a fifth to a quarter of respondents in Zone 5 have ever visited the Aldi in Hilton.

4.8. These responses confirm our view that the Aldi is a popular store for Hilton residents and those in the immediately surrounding area, but that the catchment area for the store is relatively restricted by the location of other stores and centres.

4.9. The survey also asked questions regarding respondents views of the Aldi store and this confirms that there is an issue with insufficient parking (Q17), with 23.7% of those using the store indicating this is a problem. However, very few respondents identified other issues often experienced when a store is overtrading, such as lack of stock, the store being too busy/crowded or too small. As a result, we do not consider that the household survey responses provide evidence of significant overtrading (PRS, para 5.2.3).

4.10. We also see no evidence of significant leakage from Hilton (PRS, para 5.2.4) with nearly 70% of Zone 1 residents indicating they use the Aldi for their main food shop. Responses in the other zones are considerably lower, but we would not expect residents of these zones to look to Hilton as their main food shopping destination (PRS, para 5.2.4).

5. The Sequential Assessment

5.1. The purpose of the sequential test is to support the 'town centre first' approach to development, with the preferred location for new retail and other town centre uses being the defined centres in an area. Any such development outside a centre, is expected to demonstrate that suitable but more central sites are not available, and this applies to both edge of centre and out of centre sites, with policy being clear that the accessibility of both edge and out of centre sites to/from the centre needs to be considered.

5.2. In this case, the sequential assessment is set out in Section 6 of the PRS and there is much in the assessment that we agree with. However, we cannot agree that the foodstore and drive-thru are 'interdependent and interconnected' (PRS, para 6.3.1), based on the information presented in the PRS. It is not a normal development requirement to have the two uses on the same site and, in this case the masterplan shows the two units physically separated.

5.3. This was discussed with WSP at the pre-app stage and therefore we are pleased that they have also considered sites for the separate uses (PRS, para 6.3.2). The criteria for considering a site to be suitable (PRS, paras 6.3.4 – 6.3.6) are considered reasonable.

5.4. We are also in general agreement with the area of search and centres included in the assessment provided (PRS, paras 6.3.12 – 6.3.14) and the sources used to identify potential sites (PRS, para 6.3.17). Our comments on the sites subsequently identified are set out below.

5.5. However, as a general point we do not agree that a site should be dismissed as unsuitable simply because it has been allocated for or has planning permission for a different form of development (PRS, paras 6.3.20 & 6.3.30 for example). The same argument could be applied to the application site, in that it is not allocated for the form of development proposed. It is also not unusual for the details of a permitted scheme to change before development is completed as market demand changes (see PRS, paras 6.3.39 – 6.3.41). Were a site suitable in all other respects therefore, we consider it would warrant further investigation as a potentially sequentially preferable site.

5.6. Our comments on the individual sites are as follows:

- **Hilton Garage, The Mease, Hilton** – We agree that the site is currently in commercial use and are not aware of any plans for the closure of the garage. We therefore agree that the site is not available.
- **Hilton Depot** – we understand that the majority of the Hilton Depot site has now been developed and we are not aware of any remaining undeveloped parts of the site suitable for retail development.
- **2- 8 Station Road, Mickleover** – we agree that this site is unsuitable;
- **Hackwood Farm, Mickleover** – we agree that this site is unsuitably located to meet convenience shopping needs in Hilton;
- **Land West of Mickleover / Newhouse Farm** – we disagree that the proposed local centre site would not be suitable for a development similar to the application

proposal, based on the information provided by WSP. The approval is in outline and, as indicated above, changes to the composition of the centre may be possible. However, we do agree with WSP that the location is unsuitable to meet convenience shopping needs in Hilton;

- **Highfields Farm / Tutbury Avenue** – we agree that the site is not available;
- **Ryneld Road / Heatherton Neighbourhood Centre** – we agree that this site is not suitable for, or available for the proposed development;
- **4 Twyford Road, Willington** – we agree that the site would be too small for the proposed development; and
- **Land at Brookhouse Hotel, Rolleston on Dove** – we agree that this site is not available.

5.7. We therefore agree with WSP that there are no sequentially suitable sites available to accommodate the proposed development, either as a single development or with the two town centre uses considered separately.

6. Impact Assessment

6.1. Details of WSP's impact assessment are provided in Section 7 of the PRS, and we agree that the methodology adopted is acceptable. However, before reviewing the trade draw we would note that:

- The additional population assumed as a result of housing development being completed between 2023 and 2028 (PRS, para 7.4.8) cannot be justified without further consideration of whether this is over and above what had previously been forecast based on past trends ie. is the new housing required to meet anticipated population growth, or does the housing represent additional development in the area to that expected based on past trends. Without further information on this we consider that the population increase in Zone 1 may be overstated. However, the difference would not be expected to be major and would not affect the final impact assessment to any noticeable effect; and
- There appears to be an error in Table 11, where the convenience turnover 2023 is stated as £12.48m. We consider the figure should be £12.07m. However, as the PRS figure is higher we have continued to use that for the purposes of this review.

Trade Draw and Convenience Impacts

6.2. The assumed trade draw is the key assumption that will inform the levels of impact forecast and it is therefore important that the approach adopted is realistic and robust. In this case, we consider that the approach adopted (PRS, paras 7.4.16 – 7.4.19) is appropriate, but our review of the amended trade draw table (Table 13) has identified a number of instances where we do not agree completely with the forecast trade draw. The key differences are that we consider:

- The trade draw from Tesco, Mickleover is overstated across all the zones, unless the proposed store were to be occupied by Tesco. The Mickleover store is considerably larger than the proposed store (around 4,800 sqm gross, 3,000 sqm net based on VOA data) and as such will continue to have the greater draw;
- The trade draw from stores outside the study area is overstated;
- The trade draw from Co-op at Main Street, Stretton is overstated, as residents on the fringe of Burton-on-Trent are the most likely to be using this store and they are unlikely to transfer to a new store in Hilton; and
- The trade draw from Aldi, Hilton is likely to be higher than suggested, given the current draw of the store is likely to reflect the lack of local competition in Hilton.

6.3. We also consider that the forecast trade draw from village shops outside of Zone 1 is overstated. This is important because the impacts forecast by WSP in Tables 13 and 14 are, in our opinion relatively high for centres reliant on their convenience offer, particularly given the lack of expenditure growth expected in the coming years and the higher business costs being faced by retailers.

6.4. Conversely, we consider that there is likely to be some impact on the village shop in Hilton (PRS, para 7.4.22), but agree it is likely to be negligible.

6.5. As a result, whilst we agree with WSP that the greatest impact will be on the out of centre Aldi in Hilton (Table 13 and PRS, para 7.4.20) we believe the trade draw from this store will be higher.

6.6. The impact on the out of centre Tesco Express in Hilton would seem to be appropriate at around 15%. The impacts on other stores and centres will generally be lower than WSP suggests.

6.7. On this basis we agree with WSP that the convenience impacts on existing town centre foodstores will be limited.

Cumulative Impacts

6.8. In terms of the expected impacts from the 266 sqm of comparison floorspace at the proposed foodstore, we consider that the offer will primarily be used by shoppers undertaking a food shop and as such comparison sales will be ancillary. The main trade draw will therefore be from the same foodstores as the convenience draw, where a comparison offer is provided. We therefore agree that the trade draw suggested by WSP (PRS, para 7.4.27) is appropriate.

6.9. We also agree that this would not be expected to noticeably affect impacts on defined town centres.

6.10. In terms of the proposed drive-thru we disagree that the size of the unit is relevant to the need to assess impact (PRS, para 7.4.31) given it is being proposed as part of a larger development including other main town centre uses, namely the foodstore. It is total amount of floorspace proposed, not the size of the individual elements that triggers the need to undertake an impact assessment.

6.11. We also disagree with WSP that drive-thrus only compete with other drive-thru facilities (PRS, para 7.4.32). The proposed facility will offer the same products as a dine-in café or coffee shop and therefore has the potential to draw trade from existing outlets. In the case of Hilton, this would include the TLC Bakery on Main Street and the Hilton Brook public house, as it would provide an alternative option for food and beverage purchases.

6.12. The impact on the former would be a planning concern given it is located within the village centre. However, we consider any loss of trade at the bakery would be limited, given the different and specialist offer provided in the existing outlet.

6.13. Any impact on the public house would not be a planning consideration as it is an out of centre facility.

6.14. Given trade draw from other outlets can be expected to be dispersed we do not consider that this element of the application proposal will have a significant adverse impact on any centre when considered in isolation.

6.15. We also consider that any food and beverage trade draw from centres that will also be impacted by the proposed foodstore, such as Mickleover District Centre will also be very limited and will not noticeably increase the forecast retail impacts.

Impact Policy Considerations

6.16. Having determined the quantitative extent of expected trade draw from the existing stores and centres in the study area, the next stage is to consider what this means in planning policy terms.

Impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres

6.17. In terms of the impact of the proposal on in-centre investment, we agree with WSP that the main concern would be the effect of the development on the planned local centres within the catchment area (PRS, paras 7.3.1 – 7.3.9). We also agree with WSP that in most cases the scale of development proposed for these new centres is limited to that required to serve the new local communities and they would not be affected by additional convenience retail development in Hilton.

6.18. We therefore agree that the proposed development would not affect local centre investment proposals at Highfields Farm (Policy H12), Hackwood Farm (Policy H18) or Land West of Mickleover (Policy H19).

6.19. Although not referred to by WSP, we would also not expect any impact on investment decision in relation to local plan allocation at Wragley Way (Policy H15).

6.20. Within Hilton, there are two potential retail sites that need to be considered, namely Hilton Depot (Policy H7) and the Neighbourhood Plan site at Hilton Garage, The Mease.

6.21. It terms of the latter, we consider that the form of development proposed has the potential to adversely impact on the retail element of the redevelopment proposals. The increase in out of centre convenience retail development proposed (with or without the Aldi proposal) would decrease the likelihood of attracting a convenience store operator to The Mease. However, the Neighbourhood Plan policies do not specifically require the inclusion of such a use.

6.22. This, combined with the uncertainty as to when and if the site will come forward for redevelopment means we do not consider the potential for impact on this neighbourhood plan proposal to be a reason for the refusal of the current application.

6.23. In terms of the Hilton Depot site (Policy H7), WSP does not provide any comment on the likely impact on this proposal although it is referred to (PRS, para 7.3.2). Given that the foodstore proposal is intended to absorb some of the retail expenditure generated by the new housing development in Hilton (PRS, para 7.2.1) it is not sufficient to rely on the additional expenditure generated by new residents, as is suggested for the more distant housing sites (PRS, paras 7.3.5 – 7.3.7).

6.24. However, as noted above, we understand that the majority of the Hilton Depot site has now been developed and we are not aware of any remaining undeveloped parts of the site suitable for retail development. Therefore, the application proposal will not adversely impact on this policy allocation.

6.25. The final site which we consider needs to be assessed, but which WSP do not refer to, is the housing allocation on land north east of Hatton (Policy H11). The development plan requires

consideration be given to additional retail provision on the site, to help meet the needs of the new residential development and Hatton.

6.26. The housing allocation site is relatively close to Hilton and we consider that further retail development in Hilton would increase the likelihood of trade being drawn from Hatton. This in turn could affect the potential interest from convenience operators were a retail scheme to be included within the Hatton residential development. However, we understand that the development that has come forward on the site (Application Ref: 9/2015/1108) does not include any retail development.

Impact of the proposal on centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and range and quality of the comparison and convenience retail offer

6.27. The effect of the proposed development on existing town centre vitality and viability will be a function of both the scale of the trade diversion expected and the current health of a centre.

6.28. In this case, we agree with WSP that the main trade draw to the proposed foodstore will be from the existing Aldi in Hilton. This is an out of centre store and therefore any impact on it is not a planning consideration, although in this case it would not be expected to affect the future trading of the store, given the evidence that it is significantly overtrading.

6.29. The neighbouring Tesco Express is also expected to see some loss of trade but not to the extent that it would be expected to affect the trading future of the store. However, again this store is not within a defined town centre and as such any impact is not a planning consideration.

6.30. After the Aldi, we would expect the main trade draw to be from the Tesco store in Mickleover District Centre. This would include both convenience and comparison spend. There is also the potential for some trade loss to the proposed drive-thru. However, trade from Hilton is likely to represent a small part of the centre's overall catchment and any impact would be expected to be limited.

6.31. The WSP forecast is for a 4.9% impact on the Tesco (Table 14), which we consider is likely a maximum for the reasons given above. The overall impact on the centre will be less than this and, given the current health of the centre (PR, para 5.3.21 – 5.3.26), we do not consider it would be significantly adverse.

6.32. The impact on the vitality and viability of Hilton village centre and the neighbouring villages is more difficult to quantify and we would be concerned if the trade diversion were to reach the levels forecast (WSP, Table 14), given the limited growth in convenience expenditure, the increasing costs being faced by retailers and the importance of convenience provision in these locations. However, we consider that the convenience impacts have been overstated in the WSP assessment and that in practice increasing foodstore provision in Hilton where there is already an Aldi store that is known to be significantly overtrading, would be unlikely to affect local convenience provision in either Hilton centre or the surrounding villages.

7. Conclusions

7.1. We have reviewed the Planning and Retail Statement that accompanies the application by Trenport Investments Ltd for a retail-led mixed use development on land north of Derby Road, Hilton, DE65 5JS. The application has been submitted in outline and proposes a foodstore, commercial space for Small to Medium Enterprises, a drive-thru coffee shop and community spaces with associated parking, servicing, drainage, landscaping and habitat areas as well as highway works (all matters reserved except for access).

7.2. Our review has assessed the proposed development against the retail and town centre policies set out in national and local planning policy and we conclude that the proposal is in accordance with policy. Compliance with the sequential test has been demonstrated and the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on any defined town centres in the catchment area.

7.3. Should the Council be minded to approve the planning application however, we would suggest that planning conditions should be imposed to ensure that the main town centre uses proposed as part of the development are developed and retained in accordance with the form of development assessed. This should include a condition which restricts the net sales area of the foodstore to no more than 1,331 sqm (with the net sales defined as all areas to which the public have access). The use of the unit should also be restricted to ensure that no more than 1,065 sqm of retail floorspace is devoted to convenience sales and no more than 266 sqm to comparison sales.