



## **EASTERN BCP PLANNING COMMITTEE – 23 JANUARY 2025**

### **ADDENDUM SHEET**

**6a**

**Westover Retail Park, Castle Lane West, Bournemouth**

**7-2023-1927-BT**

#### **Addendum Report**

Additional condition to restrict the type of goods sold and prevent other more general retail sales. This is based on the retail assessment both by the applicant and Litchfields which was carried out for the applicant's specific type of retail operation.

There shall be no more than 1,210 square metres net retail floor area provided within the food store, of which no more than 20% shall be used for the sale of comparison goods and at least 80% shall be used for the sale of convenience goods, and at no time shall more than 4,000 individual lines of goods be sold from the retail unit hereby permitted.

Reason: To protect the vitality and viability of defined centres and in accordance with the application submission.

Paragraph 2 update as follows

Existing floorspace is 2,025 sq m gross floorspace not 2123 sq m.

Proposed cycle parking is for 28 customer bicycles and 5 racks for staff. Not 10 as previously noted.

Materials as follows. The walls are almost all brick (with no piers) with limited amounts of render on the side elevation at the end and at the edge of the poster panels, timber cladding. Rather than mainly render.

Paragraph 17 re trees – 14 existing trees rather than 16 are to be retained and 35 rather than 33 new trees are to be planted.

Paragraph 41 (and para 81) re sequential approach. Rather than say whether there are better sites it is more accurate to say "suitable sites that are reasonably available for the proposed development".

Paragraph 46 The examination into the BCP Local Plan has been taking place this week. Whilst the plan was at an early stage when the application first was submitted it is now gaining more weight as the Local Plan moves through the plan making stages. However, the NPPF advice still references to 'an up to date plan', which must mean one that has been formally adopted. At this stage it would not be reasonable to place significant weight on the policies in the emerging Local Plan ahead of those policies and allocations having been properly considered by the Inspector. At this time the emerging Local Plan is still some time from being adopted and there remains unresolved objections to some of the policies relevant to this application. Consequently, any weight to be given to the policies in the emerging Local Plan at this time should remain limited. As such the policies of the adopted Local Plans should prevail and as set out in your Officers report the planning balance has concluded that the benefits outweigh any harm associated with the scheme.

Paragraph 55 reference should be paragraph 135 (b) of the NPPF not paragraph 153.

Condition 1 – updated list of plans

Proposed site plan ref. 7715-00-2003-C9.

Proposed levels strategy ref. 7715-00-2004-C5

MoE stair - setting out and details ref. 7715-00-2009-C3 2.

Pedestrian ramp - setting out and details ref. 7715-00-2010-C43.

Proposed street scene (1 of 2) ref. 7715-00-2011-C7.

Proposed street scene (2 of 2) ref. 7715-00-2012-C10.

Proposed boundary treatments ref. 7715-00-2013-C6.

Section Drawing. 7715-00-2014-C2.

Proposed Surfacing Plan Site Block Plan 7715-00-2015-C3

Proposed roof plan. 7715-00-2102-P2.

Proposed elevations ref. 7715-00-2103-C4

Update on representations.

Further objection letter on behalf of Tesco. The following grounds are cited and the case officer comments are set out below each point.

*– The weight that should be given to the emerging Local Plan;*

The point is made that the emerging local plan should have more significance especially in relation to the requirement for a retail impact assessment and the site allocation for a mixed commercial/residential scheme. Since the application was submitted the Local Plan has progressed forward and is closer to becoming adopted, although the weight to be given to the policies in the emerging Local Plan is still limited. It is accepted that the comments in the report that the new policies should be altered from having very limited weight to limited weight. As set out in the report whilst limited weight has been attached it is still concluded that there are insufficient grounds to refuse the application on the

grounds of the proposed new policies due to the fact they carry limited weight and there remain unresolved objections to policies relevant to this application.

*– Failure to undertake retail impact assessment and risk of significant adverse impact;*

It is considered that the Council has had regard to the retail impact of the development with advice from Litchfields as set out in the report and has concluded that when balancing the issues the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

*– Irreversible loss of important allocated housing land;*

It is accepted that the Council has a shortage of allocated housing land and some consideration should be given to this matter. As set out in the report the applicant is not able to provide residential as part of the current proposal. However, given the current situation with housing some weight should be given to whether the Council should insist on a housing provision on the site. The potential for residential on this site is largely speculative. Also as part of the assessment of the application the Council has to weigh the other benefits of the scheme and it is still considered that the application provides sufficient benefits to outweigh the possible future residential benefits, especially given the limited weight to be given to the policies in the emerging Local Plan. The benefits of the scheme as set out are considered to have greater weight. In particular, the proposal will provide a local facility that will be more sustainable and provide transport improvements to the local bus service and provide a better crossing for pedestrians.

*– The scale of the development is inappropriate for the size of the site;*

Whilst the urban design officer and arboricultural officer initially had strong reservations about the scheme amendments have been carried out by the applicant to provide more trees on site and to improve the design. It is considered that the overall design and landscaping together with public art is on balance acceptable.

*– Cumulative effects with the proposed Aldi store;*

It is considered that the application can be considered in isolation from the Aldi store given the limited impact and as indicated by Litchfields who are advising the Council.

*– Misleading conclusions regarding trip generation;*

It is accepted that there is a difference in trip generation between food and non-food retailing. However, the highway officer has concluded that:

- “• Vehicular trip generation associated with the proposed store will predominantly result in vehicle routing changes rather than a pro-rata uplift in traffic utilising local highways.
- TA shows there will be a net increase in vehicular trips of less than 3% on the immediate road network surrounding the site. For context anything under 5% is not considered a significant impact upon the operation of the highway network. Consequently, pursuant to paragraph 116 of the NPPF, the expected increase in trip generation to/from the development site does not represent a severe cumulative impact on the road network or the safety of its users and could not be refused on this basis.
- Based on the data findings of Junction Modelling software, the Castle Lane West/Wimborne Road traffic junction will result in an average queue increase of 2-3 passenger car units (PCUs) across peak hours on the busiest arms of the traffic junction. Queues at all other arms of the junction are expected to result in a maximum increase of one PCU or less across peak hours.
- Accounting for the expected net increase of all non-transferred trips arising from the proposed development, the new store is expected to result in an average increase of one vehicular movement entering the highway network (from the site) every 1-2 minutes across peak hours.

*Extended queue times are considered to be minimal and along the A3060 will have no direct material impact on the operational safety of the traffic junction and will have a negligible impact on the wider highway network.*

*In planning terms, it is not for this proposal to mitigate existing traffic congestion problems, it need only mitigate its own impact. Solutions to providing significant enhancements to traffic flows through the Castle Lane West/Wimborne Road traffic junction would not be proportionate to the traffic impact of the proposal.*

*Additionally, this proposal is providing a significant financial contribution towards RTI equipment and a pedestrian crossing. In turn, improved sustainable travel infrastructure encourages a shift towards sustainable travel modes thereby reducing reliance on car trips.”*

*and*

- Lack of condition to restrict the permission to ‘limited assortment discount retailing’

The recommendation has been amended to include a condition relating to this matter.

One additional letter of support from a local resident on the following grounds

*I support the redevelopment of Westover Retail Park by Lidl. There is no low price supermarket within a mile and a half of Westover Retail Park. The site is well served by local buses which could help reduce CO2 emissions*

*We, our household, believe that there wouldn't be a significant increase in traffic caused by the redevelopment as it seems that there a significant number of vehicles that use the car park at the site but do not shop there.*

*We welcome the redevelopment and very much hope that it goes ahead.*

One additional letter of objection from a local resident on the following grounds

*"We already have countless supermarkets within a few miles radius including one of their own but 2/3 miles away at Parley.*

*There is constant gridlock wherever you drive around the conurbation and the junction is a major junction that would inevitably become even busier than it is because of the increased traffic .*

*Any jobs created will be low skilled low wage jobs"*