



Adroddiad

Ymchwiliad a gynhaliwyd ar 08/11/05 – 11/11/05,
14/11/05 – 18/11/05 & 04/01/06 – 06/01/06
Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 09/01/06

Report

Inquiry held on 08/11/05 – 11/11/05, 14/11/05 –
18/11/05 & 04/01/06 – 06/01/06
Site visits made on 09/01/06

gan/by Clive I Cochrane DipArch RegArch MSc MRTPI

**Arolygydd penodwyd gan Cynulliad
Cenedlaethol Cymru**

**an Inspector appointed by the National
Assembly for Wales**

Dyddiad/Date 15/03/06

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

SECTIONS 77 & 78

Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council

INQUIRY INTO

(1) Planning Application by Wm Morrison Plc & Shoparama Ltd

(2) Appeal by Morbaine Ltd

File Ref: APP/L6940/X/05/514688

Site address: Former Brown-Lenox Site, adjacent to A470, Pontypridd

- On 10/03/05, the application was called in for decision by the Welsh Assembly Government by a direction made under section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- The application is made by Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc and Shoparama Ltd to Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council.
- The application Ref: 03/0625/13 is dated 21/03/03.
- The development proposed is a foodstore and associated car parking.
- The reason given for making the direction was that the proposed development raises planning issues of more than local importance. In particular, it raises issues which may be in conflict with national policy.
- On the information available at the time of making the direction, the following were the matters on which the Assembly particularly wished to be informed for the purpose of their consideration of the application:
 - (i) The visual and environmental implications of the proposed development on the site and surrounding areas.
 - (ii) The relevant national policies as set out in Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) particularly those relating to retail development and Technical Advice Note (TAN) 4 – Retailing and Town Centres;
 - (iii) Policies in the Mid Glamorgan (Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough) Replacement Structure Plan and the Rhondda Cynon Taff (Taff Ely) Local Plan.

Summary of Recommendation: that the application for planning permission for a foodstore development be refused.

File Ref: APP/L6940/A/05/1179257

Site address: Pontypridd Rugby Club, Sardis Road, Pontypridd CF37 1DX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an outline application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Morbaine Ltd against Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council.
- The application Ref: 05/0282/13 is dated 11/02/05.
- The development proposed is a Class A1 foodstore, petrol filling station/car wash, car parking, and associated services and facilities.
- This appeal was linked to the call-in application for decision by the Assembly for the same reasons as set out above.

Summary of Recommendation: that the appeal dismissed and planning permission refused for the proposed foodstore development.

1. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

- 1.1 As similar issues are raised in both the application and the appeal, the same planning matters will be taken into account in considering the Morbaine proposals for the Pontypridd Rugby Ground.
- 1.2 In addition to the matters already identified by the Assembly in calling in the Morrison application, I shall take into account issues of retail need (quantitative and qualitative), the sequential assessment of the retail sites, and the likely retail impact of the proposed developments on the shopping vitality and viability of the Pontypridd town centre. I shall

also deal with the relationship of the proposals to guidance in Planning Policy Wales – March 2002 on sustainable development, with particular reference to transport, i.e: -

- (i) whether each location is appropriate for the proposed development in terms of the level of travel likely to be generated;
- (ii) the scope for, and likelihood of, those visiting the sites making linked trips to Pontypridd town centre by various modes of transport;
- (iii) the accessibility of the proposals by a realistic choice of means of transport within the catchment area the developments seek to serve;
- (iv) whether the proposals would be likely to lead to an increase in overall car use within the catchment area;

The Council also identified the following issues concerning the Morbaine proposals:-

1. loss of sports and recreational facilities arising from the development.
2. loss of trees on the site;
3. potential risk of flooding;
4. adverse impact upon the residential amenity of nearby occupants; and
5. impact on highway conditions.

However, following the submission of the revised site layout, which omits the petrol filling station/car wash, and consultations with the Environment Agency Wales, the Council has withdrawn its objections with regard to the loss of trees and flood risk.

- 1.3 The use of conditions and any proposed agreements or undertakings under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 will also be considered.
- 1.4 This report contains a description of both sites and their surroundings, a summary of planning policy, the cases for each party on the main issues, and my conclusions and recommendations. Lists of those attending the inquiry and the documents submitted are appended.
- 1.5 Both the Morrison and Morbaine proposals would provide identical retail floorspace and car parking areas, and they raise the same issues regarding retail need, accessibility and transport and impact upon the town centre. There are specific locational and land use policy issues which differ in each case, but I shall consider the main issues in common in my conclusions on their respective cases. I intend to deal with the evidence from the parties on each of these matters in turn, reaching conclusions on each before turning to my final conclusions and recommendations at the end of the report.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSALS AND SITES

Wm Morrison Proposed Development

- 2.1 The Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc application is in outline form with siting, external appearance, means of access and design details submitted for consideration, and only the landscaping details reserved for subsequent approval. The application proposes a building with a gross floor area of 6,921 sq m, with a net sales area of 3,354 sq m, of which

convenience goods would be 2,851 sq m and comparison goods 503 sq m. The site would provide 425 car parking spaces.

- 2.2 The site lies on the south-east side of Pontypridd town centre, and it is separated from the town centre by the River Taff, Ynysangharad Park and the A470 dual carriageway. The closest point of the site would be some 690m away from the secondary shopping frontage and 810m from the primary shopping area on foot. As proposed, the new store entrance would be 960m from the primary shopping area of Pontypridd on foot.
- 2.3 The site comprises the former Brown Lenox Engineering Building, which covers an area of some 3 hectares immediately adjoining the eastern side of the Broadway intersection of the A4058 with the A470 Merthyr to Cardiff trunk road. To the north-west, the site adjoins the existing service yard of the Brown Lenox Retail Park, which includes a range of bulk retail warehouses (B&Q, Halfords, Tiles R Us and Hypervalue). The northern and eastern boundaries of the site follow the route of a towpath along the former Glamorganshire Canal.
- 2.4 Vehicular access to the site from the north would be through the existing Retail Park from the Bridge Street roundabout. It is also proposed to construct a new access into the site directly from the Broadway roundabout. Various highway works are proposed, including the introduction of traffic light controlled pedestrian crossings for two pedestrian routes from the site towards the town centre via the Bridge Street and Broadway roundabouts, the latter following a new route across Ynysangharad Park. The diversion of some local bus services through the site would be funded by the developers, and bus stops would be provided within the car park on a route through the site from the A470 via the Brown Lenox roundabout and the Retail Park via Bridge Street.

Proposed Morbaine Development

- 2.5 The Morbaine Ltd application was submitted in outline form with all detailed matters reserved for later consideration, but with a site layout plan provided for illustrative purposes only. The Morbaine foodstore would also have a gross floor area of 6,921 sq m. It is estimated that there would be 3,354 sq m net sales floorspace, divided between 2,851 sq m convenience goods and 503 sq m of comparison goods. A revised illustrative layout plan (Drawing No. 5928/34/D) was submitted in September 2005 omitting the petrol filling station, car wash and staff car park, and reducing the shoppers' car parking to 425 spaces.
- 2.6 The appeal site comprises the Pontypridd Rugby Football Club Ground, a former colliery site, which has a south-eastern frontage onto Sardis Road. The eastern boundary of the site follows the public footpath alongside the Rhondda River, whilst the north-western boundary abuts terraced houses in Seaton Place, Lee Street and Pwllgwaun Road. Along the west and south-west boundary there is a steep embankment with mature trees next to the residential area of Maesycloed Road. At its north-western end the site includes an existing childrens' play area.
- 2.7 Apart from the sports field, the existing Rugby Ground contains changing rooms, embankments, covered terracing, a grandstand and dub room and car parking. The southern end of the site has the Celtic Trail Cycle Track crossing the entrance.
- 2.8 The Sardis Road entrance to the site lies some 264m walking distance from the nearest part of the primary shopping frontage of the Pontypridd town centre at Taff Street/High Street. As shown on the illustrative layout, the proposed store entrance doors would be

sited 530m distance from the primary shopping area. There are a number of public buildings and facilities adjoining the appeal site on the south-west side of the town centre, notably the railway station, council offices and town centre car park on Sardis Road.

- 2.9 There is an existing pedestrian route between the site entrance and the town centre, already used by town centre visitors, and there are footpath and cycleway links on the edge of the site.

3. PLANNING POLICY

- 3.1 The relevant government guidance comprises Planning Policy Wales – March 2002; Technical Advice Note 4 – Retailing and Town Centres, November 1996; TAN 12 – Design; TAN 16 – Sport and Recreation and TAN 18 – Transport. During the adjournment of the inquiry, Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 02/2005 - Planning for Retailing and Town Centres (November 2005) was published and this is taken into account by the parties.

- 3.2 The following policies of the Mid Glamorgan (Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough) Replacement Structure Plan, adopted January 1999 (Core Document 8) are relevant to the proposed developments: -

R1 Retailing: Pontypridd is to be maintained and enhanced as a Sub-Regional Centre;

R4 New superstores selling mainly convenience goods are not permitted where:

- (1) The vitality and viability of nearby town centres is likely to be undermined, taking into account the cumulative effects of other approved retail development;
- (2) The development plan allocates an appropriate site within or adjacent to the town centre capable of accommodating the proposal;
- (3) Access to the primary road network is considered inadequate and there are unacceptable adverse effects on traffic flows;
- (4) Accessibility to public transport is considered inadequate;
- (5) The proposal leads to unacceptable conflict with the conservation of the environment or the maintenance of local amenity;
- (6) The proposal is likely to lead to unacceptable impacts on overall shopping travel patterns, particularly where this involves major increases in private car travel;
- (7) The proposal does not comply with the requirements of R6 where the use of industrial land is involved.

R6 The use of industrial sites for any new retail floorspace (including . . . superstores) will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there is a sufficient quantity and variety of land available for manufacturing and service industry within that relevant travel to work area, and retail land is scarce.

- 3.3 The following Structure Plan policies are more relevant to the Morbaine proposals: -

EV13 Protection of native broadleaf trees is encouraged;

L4 New development which results in the discontinuance of an existing leisure facility, including public rights of way, will only be permitted where (1) an alternative facility can be provided with at least an equivalent level of provision,

or (2) it can be demonstrated that its continued use as a leisure facility is not required.

3.4 The relevant policies contained in the Rhondda Cynon Taff (Taff Ely Local Plan - Adopted June 2003) (Core Document 9) are summarised as follows: -

Employment Sites

E4 Improvements, redevelopments, extensions, conversions and infill development within Classes B1 and B2 will be permitted on existing industrial land, including Brown Lenox site;

E6 Within business land allocations in Policy E4, retail uses (inter alia) which support the main business activities will be permitted only as minor ancillary elements;

Retail development

S1 The Gas Road and Taff Vale Precinct site within Pontypridd town centre to be redeveloped, which must include about 8,000 sq m class A1 retail floorspace in unit shops;

S11 New large stores (about 1,000 sq m or more) outside the central shopping areas will be permitted, provided that: -

- (1) The proposals are supported by clear and unambiguous evidence that the vitality and viability of nearby town centres would not be undermined, taking account of other relevant retail proposals;
- (2) No suitable site for the proposals is available in, or any closer to, the defined central areas;
- (3) The site is easily accessible to a choice of means of transport;
- (4) The proposal would be unlikely to result in overall increased use of cars compared with alternative locations;
- (5) The proposals are consistent with policies to protect the countryside; and
- (6) The development would not reduce the range and quality of industrial land available.

S13 Ancillary retail uses only are allowed on allocated employment sites;

EN14 Prevention of loss of trees and landscaping;

EN26 General criteria for the design of new development;

EN27 Design to be in keeping with surroundings;

EN60 Requirement for art in the environment;

EN61 Requirement for environmental improvements;

EN64 Development of contaminated sites;

R7 Proposals involving the loss of part or all of any sports grounds, play grounds, etc, will not be permitted except as part of a scheme which :

- (1) enhances provision of the same facility in the same neighbourhood; and

(2) includes acceptable proposals for the future use of the existing site.

P4 New development to provide adequate off-street parking.

- 3.5 The Taff Ely Local Plan identifies a regeneration strategy for Pontypridd town centre based on relief road construction, pedestrianisation, car parking provision, environmental improvements and retail development. Some elements of this strategy are now in place (i.e. the Relief Road and pedestrianisation of Market Street and Church Street), whilst others, such as the Catherine Street car park and the retail redevelopment of the Gas Road/Taff Vale Precinct scheme (the Angharad Walk Scheme) have planning permissions and are moving towards implementation.
- 3.6 In order to develop a further package of regeneration measures, the Council commissioned RPS to prepare a Regeneration Strategy for the town centre. The Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy Final Report, July 2005 (Core Document 11) is the result of a wide-ranging public consultation exercise. The Angharad Walk and Rugby Club sites are included in a series of Key Projects. The Angharad Walk development is intended to improve the retail offer of the town centre, raise the profile of the town and induce private sector investment in adjoining areas. Its contribution to the regeneration strategy is described as the creation of a new gateway at the north end of Taff Street, the integration of Ynysangharad Park into the town centre and better use of the Taff river corridor.
- 3.7 The Regeneration Strategy highlights the Pontypridd Rugby Club site as a development opportunity, without identifying an alternative site for the relocation of the Rugby Club itself. The strategy proposes a mixed leisure and residential development as the most appropriate use for the Rugby Club site.

4. RETAIL NEED

The case for additional retail floorspace outside Pontypridd town centre was made by each of the main parties, and it was supported by the local planning authority, Rhondda Cynon Taff CBC. As their cases are broadly similar, with some disagreement on the sequential test and sustainability issues. I shall deal with them in turn under this issue, before turning to the case against both proposals, presented by the Scarborough Development Group and Sainsbury's.

Case for Wm Morrison Plc/Shoparama Ltd

The material points are: -

- 4.1. Morrisons was founded in 1899 and is now the fourth largest supermarket operator in the UK. The company trades from approximately 360 stores throughout the UK, with an annual turnover in excess of £12 billion, and employs over 145,000 people. It is predominantly a food retailer with a strong emphasis on fresh foods delivered via a "Market Street" concept. 85% of the sales area is to be used for the sale of convenience goods.
- 4.2. Morrisons have had a requirement for a foodstore in Pontypridd since the mid-1990s. As the main centre for the Rhondda Valley, the town is considered to be under-represented by large major supermarkets. The store would create 350 full and part-time jobs in a wide range of skills and trades for which training would be provided. The only other large store in the catchment area is the Tesco Store at Upper Boat, which is situated 2 miles south of Pontypridd on the A470, and does not provide any links to the town centre. Other stores

within the catchment area are either small or medium size, which do not provide the facilities required for a weekly bulk shopping trip.

- 4.3. The Brown Lenox site is considered to be the only site capable of accommodating a new store in addition to the Angharad Walk Scheme to compete with existing stores so as to retain expenditure in Pontypridd and prevent leakage.

Retail Need: Quantitative

- 4.4. Planning Policy Wales – March 2002 advises that need is one of the factors to be taken into account in determining applications for retail development. Paragraph 10.2.10 of PPW defines need as “quantitative to address a provable unmet demand” and “qualitative, such as where it can be shown that new provisions will contribute to meeting policies set out in UDPs and in this guidance”. The guidance on retailing and town centre policy was further clarified by the Welsh Assembly Government advice in December 2003, which gives precedence to establishing quantitative need for both convenience and comparison floorspace before qualitative factors are considered. Examples of qualitative factors are stated to include co-location of facilities in district or village locations or issues such as “food deserts” in disadvantaged areas.

- 4.5. In the absence of specific guidance in Technical Advice Note (Wales) 4: Retailing and Town Centres on what may constitute quantitative and qualitative need, the advice in Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres (ODPM) is considered appropriate and relevant. This states that: -

- In assessing quantitative need for additional retail floorspace, regard should be had to a realistic assessment of:
 - existing and forecast population levels;
 - forecast expenditure for specific classes of goods to be sold within the broad categories of convenience and comparison goods; and
 - forecast improvements in productivity in the use of floorspace.
- In assessing qualitative need for additional retail development, PPS 6 advises that a key consideration will be to provide for consumer choice by ensuring that:
 - an appropriate distribution of locations is achieved, subject to the key objectives of promoting the vitality and viability of town centres and the application of the sequential approach, to improve accessibility for the whole community; and
 - provision is made for a range of sites for shopping ... which allow genuine choice to meet the needs of the whole community, particularly those living in deprived areas.

Other considerations may also be taken into account, such as the degree to which shops may be overtrading.

Pontypridd Catchment Area

- 4.6. The catchment area for the proposed development is based on Pontypridd as a sub-regional centre in the retail hierarchy, as defined in the Mid Glamorgan Structure Plan. Taking into account other sub-regional centres in the surrounding areas, Aberdare, Bargoed, Caerphilly and Merthyr Tydfil, the derived catchment area for Pontypridd serves the Taff Valley, the Rhondda Valleys and the lower Cynon Valley (Doc WMS7, Appendix CC1). This is divided into three zones, based on postcode areas: -

Zone 1: Pontypridd, including Lower Taff Valley (Treforest, Church Village and Taffs Well) and the Lower Cynon Valley (Abercynon and Mountain Ash);

Zone 2: Lower Rhondda (Porth, Tonyrefail and Gilfach Coch);

Zone 3: Upper Rhondda (Ferndale, Tonypany and Treorchy).

- 4.7. The population of the catchment area (Zones 1-3) was 160,128 at the 2001 Census date. According to population projections produced for the Council (Cardiff Research Centre January 2003) the population of the catchment area is forecast to decline by 1.3% from 2001-2005 and by 3.7% from 2001-2009 (Doc WMS7, App CC2), giving a population in 2009 of 154,154. Plan 1 in document WMS24 shows Pontypridd's retail catchment area, taking into account the retail catchment areas of other competing sub-regional centres of Aberdare, Caerphilly and Merthyr Tydfil. This excludes the catchment area of Talbot Green, which has a strong retail offer for a designated District centre. It is conceded that the northern catchment boundary would lie somewhere halfway between Asda Aberdare and Pontypridd.

Retail Expenditure in Catchment Area

- 4.8. The local expenditure per head estimates used by the Council and the Applicants are provided by Map Info (Doc WMS7, Appendix CC2, Tables 4 & 5, and Core Document CD39). Growth rates of 4.1% from 2001-2004 and 0.8% pa from 2004-2011 are applied to the retail expenditure figures and in 2005 there is an estimated available convenience goods expenditure of £206.82m in the primary catchment area Zones 1-3. This figure is forecast to grow at a modest rate to £208.34m by 2009. The estimated comparison goods expenditure in Zones 1-3 is £295.15m, which is forecast to grow to £339.68m by 2009.

Existing Turnover

- 4.9. Using Retail Rankings 2005 and making adjustments for petrol sales and VAT, the existing convenience stores in Zones 1-3 are estimated to have a benchmark convenience goods turnover of £110.97m. Assuming that these stores draw 90% of their trade from within Zones 1-3, this gives a benchmark turnover figure of £99.88m from the catchment area.

New Commitments

- 4.10. There are several planning permissions for additional developments of convenience goods floorspace within the catchment area, which may be trading by 2009. These are the Angharad Walk Scheme foodstore in Pontypridd, Tesco at Porth, Asda at Tonypany and Lidl at Porth. The combined benchmark turnover of convenience goods at these projected stores is £74.2m, of which 90% would be drawn from Zones 1-3, i.e. £66.93m.

Retail Capacity

- 4.11. The theoretical capacity in spending terms with Zones 1-3 is estimated by deducting the existing and committed benchmark turnover from the total available expenditure in the area, as summarised below: -

	2005	2009
(1) Total Available Expenditure	£206.82m	£208.34m
(2) Benchmark Turnover of Existing Stores in Zones 1-3, drawn from Zones 1-3	£99.88m	£99.88m
(3) Estimated Benchmark Turnover of Commitments in Zones 1-3 to be drawn from Zones 1-3 at 2009		£66.93m
Theoretical Capacity [(1) minus (2) minus (3)]	£106.94m	£40.01m*

*Inspector's Note: this figure calculates to £41.53m rather than £40.01m

4.12. Theoretical capacity is based on the assumptions that all stores trade at the company average and the catchment area retains 100% of its total available expenditure. It is not realistic for the catchment area to retain 100% of all available expenditure and the true capacity of the catchment to support additional retail floorspace is dependent on: -

- how much expenditure the new retail floorspace can claw back from that which is currently leaking to stores beyond the catchment area;
- how much the new retail floorspace would reduce any levels of overtrading at existing stores within the catchment area; and
- whether the impact of the proposed new retail floorspace on the town centres is acceptable.

Actual Turnover of Existing Retail Facilities

4.13. A sample household survey of a wider area than Zones 1-3 was carried out (Doc WMS7, Appendix CC6 & 7) to establish whether Pontypridd is drawing any significant levels of trade from beyond its primary catchment area. This shows that in 2005 the existing convenience stores in Zones 1-3 have an estimated combined total turnover of £157.08m, of which £136.18m (87%) is drawn from Zones 1-3. Compared to the estimated benchmark turnover of £110.97m, of which £99.87m is drawn from Zones 1-3, this indicates that the existing stores in Zones 1-3 are overtrading by up to £46.11m.

4.14. The estimated combined turnover of existing convenience retail stores in Zones 1-3 is equivalent to a retention rate of 66% of available expenditure on convenience goods, so that 34% (£70.64m) of available expenditure is going to facilities outside Zones 1-3 in the form of leakage. Compared to Zone 5, the Aberdare sub-regional centre, which retains 88% of available convenience goods expenditure, the Pontypridd catchment has a low retention rate. Five large stores; Tesco at Talbot Green, Asda at Coryton, Asda at Aberdare, Tesco at Aberdare and Asda at Caerphilly; which are mostly out-of-centre, draw 77% of the leakage from Zones 1-3. This leakage of expenditure could be reduced or clawed back as much as possible by a new convenience store in Zones 1-3 in order to reduce the need to travel and to support viability and vitality of existing town centres.

Assessment of Quantitative Need for Convenience Goods Floorspace

- 4.15. By taking the theoretical capacity figures from above and assuming that Zones 1-3 can retain 90% of available convenience goods expenditure so as to reduce leakage, the capacity in spending terms to support new development in Zones 1-3 would be: -

	2005	2009
(1) Total Available Expenditure at 90% retention rate	£186.14m	£187.51m
(2) Benchmark Turnover of Existing Stores in Zones 1-3	£99.98m	£99.98m
(3) Estimated Benchmark Turnover of Commitments in Zones 1-3 drawn from Zones 1-3 (Sainsburys, Tesco, Asda & Lidl)		£66.93m
Theoretical Capacity: (1) minus (2) minus (3)	£86.16m	£20.60m

- 4.16. However, it is not considered that a store with a turnover of £20.6m would claw back sufficient trade leakage to other areas, as it would only have a sales floor area of 2,000 sq m net, based on a turnover of £10,000 per sq m. A store of this size would not meet the identified capacity for a large bulk food shopping need in the area, which is a qualitative factor considered below.

Qualitative Need for Convenience Goods Floorspace

- 4.17. Currently, there is only one large foodstore in the retail catchment area of Pontypridd, Tesco at Midway Retail Park, Upper Boat, which is out-of-centre and has an estimated net sales area of 4,105 sq m. Apart from this, food retailing in the catchment area is characterised by a large number of small stores with an average net sales area of 733 sq m, such as the Co-op, Iceland, Kwik Save and Somerfield. Whilst the smaller stores provide for 'top-up' shopping in the Pontypridd area, main or 'bulk' food shopping trips are limited to the out-of-centre Tesco store at Upper Boat. Trips are also made outside the catchment area to Asda and Tesco at Aberdare, Asda and Tesco at Merthyr Tydfil, Tesco at Ystrad Mynach, Asda and Safeway at Caerphilly, Asda, Sainsbury and Safeway at North Cardiff, and to Tesco Extra at Talbot Green.
- 4.18. The household survey indicates that up to 34% of total available expenditure is currently leaking to stores outside the catchment area. Allied to the poor provision of large foodstores in Pontypridd's catchment area, this demonstrates that there is a pressing qualitative need for large foodstore development in Pontypridd. Other sub-regional centres such as Aberdare already have large foodstores and retain up to 88% of their available convenience goods expenditure. Therefore, any new large foodstore in Pontypridd needs to be of sufficient size and scale to be able to cater for main or bulk food shopping trips and to compete successfully for trade against Tesco at Upper Boat and other large food superstores beyond the catchment area.
- 4.19. Table 8 of Appendix CC2 (Doc WMS7) lists the new foodstores already planned to be built in the catchment area:
- Asda – 2,787 sq m, out of centre at Tonypanydy

- Tesco – 2,634 sq m, edge of centre at Porth
- Lidl – 1,286 sq m, out of centre at Porth

Whilst these planned stores will decrease expenditure leakage from Zones 1-3, they will not meet the identified need for a large new foodstore in Pontypridd, nor will they reduce the levels of overtrading in the town centre and at Tesco, Upper Boat.

- 4.20. Whilst the Angharad Walk development would provide a large new foodstore of approximately 4,000 sq m in Pontypridd town centre, some doubts are expressed about its deliverability and implementation:
- The site has been acquired by a new owner who is pursuing a non-food retail development
 - The Angharad Walk Scheme would therefore be dependent on the use of CPO powers.
 - The WDA has received a grant application for funding for the Angharad Walk Scheme, but this is not being progressed due to the emergence of the alternative scheme.
 - Car parking for the new store would be multi-storey with charging, which would not compete well with other stores with free surface level car parking access.
- 4.21. It is considered that shoppers would continue to use the large out of centre Tesco store for bulk food buying trips with its large surface level free car park, whilst only using the proposed Angharad Walk Sainsbury's store for small scale top-up shopping. Therefore, if developed, the Sainsbury store would be unlikely to claw back significant amounts of trade from out of centre stores and it would fail to meet the qualitative need for a large foodstore capable of providing a main food shopping destination in Pontypridd.

Need for Comparison Goods Floorspace

- 4.22. With regard to comparison goods shopping, it is estimated that there is available some £295.14m expenditure in the catchment area, which is forecast to increase to £339.67m by 2009 (Table 5, Appendix CC2, Doc WMS7). The household survey shows that the comparison goods turnover of Pontypridd town centre is approximately £86.6m, which is a market share of 29%. This is a low market share for a sub-regional centre and there is scope to claw back spending from Cardiff and other centres.
- 4.23. In order to retain its current market share of comparison goods shopping, Pontypridd town centre would need to increase its turnover by £11.9m to £98.5m, but it is necessary to increase its turnover to increase its market share as a sub-regional centre. The Angharad Walk Scheme could increase the town centre's comparison goods turnover by approximately £43m to an estimated £133m.
- 4.24. Taking an average figure for Morrison stores, the proposed development would have a predicted comparison goods turnover of £5.18m (90% of available expenditure in Zones 1-3). This shows that there is sufficient capacity to support the likely comparison goods floorspace, from available expenditure and from the scope to claw back expenditure.

Likely Impact on Shopping Patterns

- 4.25. It is estimated that, with the planned Asda, Lidl, Tesco and Sainsburys all trading in 2009, the catchment area would retain 76% of available convenience goods expenditure, and leakage would be reduced to £50m (from a 2005 level of £68.14m), and there will be scope for a new store to claw back expenditure leaking to stores beyond the catchment area. It is likely that the cumulative impact of all four stores (without Morrisons) would

reduce the trading level of the Co-op store in Porth and Somerfield in Pontypridd to well below company averages, which would threaten their continued viability as foodstores.

- 4.26. The proposed Morrison store would have an annual convenience goods turnover of £31.4m, of which 90% (£28.26m) would be drawn from its primary catchment area. Its location on the A470(T), adjacent to the sub-regional town centre of Pontypridd, means that the store would draw 80% of its turnover from similar large stores and 20% from small stores. This pattern of trade draw would not adversely affect the viability of any existing or planned foodstore.

Impact on Pontypridd Town Centre

- 4.27. Policy R1 of the Structure Plan and paragraph 5.01 of the Local Plan set out objectives for Pontypridd to maintain its position as a major sub-regional town centre and to enhance its vitality and viability. A 'healthcheck' on the vitality and viability of Pontypridd town centre reveals that its main assets are:
- Pontypridd is the largest shopping centre in the County Borough, both in terms of the number of shops and the amount of retail floorspace;
 - It has a reasonable range of comparison retailers;
 - A number of national multiple stores are represented in the town centre;
 - The Brown Lenox Retail Park is in close proximity and there is evidence of linked trips to the town centre;
 - The town centre has a number of small top-up specialist convenience retailers such as Somerfield, Marks and Spencer and Iceland;
 - It contains other town centre uses such as local authority offices, professional services and leisure uses.
- 4.28. The town centre is considered to be vital and viable. The existing Somerfield store appears to be significantly overtrading at over £8m pa compared to an expected 'benchmark' turnover of £2.5m pa. Both Iceland and Marks and Spencer stores are also overtrading to a degree, and there are 18 other small convenience retailers in the town centre which the household survey shows exceed their benchmark turnover. The proposed Morrison store would function as a main or bulk food shopping destination and would therefore draw most of its trade from existing large foodstores.
- 4.29. Table 10 in Appendix CC2 (Doc WMS7) indicates that the Morrison store would draw some £7.33m of convenience goods expenditure from Pontypridd town centre: £5m from the planned Sainsburys store and the remaining £2.33m away from the existing Iceland, Somerfield, Marks and Spencer and other small shops. This equates to an impact of 21.35% on the town's convenience goods retail turnover, and a 20.49% impact on Sainsburys. It is assumed that Morrisons would draw 50% of its comparison goods expenditure from town centre shops, i.e. £2.59m, and the total trade diversion would be £9.92m. In the context of a total estimated turnover of the town centre in 2009 of £167.5m, the impact of the development would be a trade draw of 5.9%.
- 4.30. It is estimated that the town centre Somerfield store would be vulnerable to closure due to the impact of the planned Sainsburys store, but the Sainsburys store would provide an acceptable alternative within the town centre. Therefore, the closure of Somerfield, were it to happen, would not adversely affect the viability or vitality of the town centre. Its location opposite the new Sainsburys store would make an attractive unit for other forms of retailing.

- 4.31. The Morrisons store would draw the majority of its trade from existing and committed large foodstores, from both within and beyond Pontypridd's catchment area. The likely impact on these large out of centre foodstores is not a material planning consideration, but it would not threaten the viability of any of these large stores. The proposed store would divert some 5.9% of estimated turnover from the town centre in 2009, but this would not adversely affect the viability and vitality of the town centre, which is the subject of developer interest in improving its non-food retail offer. The location of the proposed Morrisons store would encourage linked trips to the town centre, which would help to offset any potential impact.
- 4.32. It is concluded that there is a clear and pressing need for another large foodstore in Pontypridd, capable of providing for bulk/main food shopping needs above and beyond the existing and planned provision. As a sub-regional centre, Pontypridd needs to claw back leakage of convenience goods expenditure by increasing its retention from 66% to 90% of expenditure within its catchment area. This would increase the capacity for convenience goods expenditure to £86.16m in 2005 rising to £87.53m in 2009.
- 4.33. There is a clear retail need for the proposed Morrisons store, and any retail impact on Pontypridd town centre would be acceptable. Without the Morrisons proposal, the amount of expenditure leakage would increase as other town in the wider area continue to improve and expand their foodstores to the detriment of stores in Pontypridd.
- 4.34. The proposal complies with the relevant guidance in Planning Policy Wales – March 2002 and Local Plan Policy S11, as it is demonstrated that there is a need for the proposed Morrisons store and there would be no adverse impact on existing centres. The proposed development would help Pontypridd to function as the 'county town'.

Case for Morbaine Ltd

The material points are: -

- 4.35. Pontypridd's shopping catchment area is defined by the influence of major shopping centres in the surrounding area, notably Cardiff, Caerphilly and Merthyr Tydfil. Pontypridd and Aberdare are defined as sub-regional centres in the Structure Plan, with Porth, Treorchy, Tonypany, Mountain Ash and Talbot Green as district centres.
- 4.36. Pontypridd is a linear shopping centre, with retailing concentrated mainly on Taff Street, Market Street and High Street. The primary shopping frontage runs along the length of Taff Street and contains a diverse representation of national multiples and independent retailers. There is an open market in Mill Street every Wednesday and Saturday. The 3 main food stores are Somerfield (451 sq m net retail area), Iceland (501 sq m) and Marks & Spencer (400 sq m), none of which has dedicated customer car parking. The nearest bulk food superstore is Tesco at Upper Boat, 4km south of the town centre on the A470T.
- 4.37. A household survey of shopping patterns in the area was jointly funded by Morrisons and Morbaine Ltd. The defined catchment area for a Pontypridd store as Zones 1-3 is agreed.

Quantitative Need

- 4.38. The convenience goods expenditure growth in Zones 1-3 is agreed to be £206.9m in 2005 and £208.4m in 2009, and comparison goods expenditure in the catchment area is set to grow significantly over the same period. This means that there is a favourable context for additional investment in new food shopping provision in the area and significant potential for comparison goods shopping.

- 4.39. Table 3 of Appendix JDW12 (in Doc MOR3) sets out the combined convenience goods expenditure pattern for Zones 1-3 at 2005 according to the household survey. This shows that the shops existing in the area attract only 67.7% of convenience goods expenditure (£140m out of £206.9m), and therefore one third of this expenditure is leaked to stores outside the catchment area. Table 4 shows that in total these stores are overtrading by some £26.3m, compared to their benchmark turnover of £113.7m (£140 less £113.7m).
- 4.40. Currently, therefore, there is a potential £93.2m capacity for additional convenience goods spending in the catchment area of Zones 1-3 (expenditure leakage of £66.9m plus overtrading of £26.3m). There are however a number of existing retail floorspace commitments, which would have a combined convenience goods turnover of £76.3m (Table 5, Appendix JDW12, Doc MOR3). The Morbaine Ltd proposal would have a convenience goods turnover of £33.3m in 2009.
- 4.41. Allowing for growth of £1.5m on top of the current surplus of £93.2m convenience goods turnover between 2005 and 2009, and making allowance for the combined commitments of £76.3m, the capacity for additional convenience goods turnover would reduce to £18.4m. This is forecast to grow to £19.2m by 2011 and to £21.2m by 2016.
- 4.42. The amount of surplus convenience goods turnover at 2009 would be £18.4m, which would be equivalent to 55% of the turnover needed by the proposed Morbaine store. Therefore, there is more convenience goods expenditure capacity in Zones 1-3 than is required to support the identified commitments, including the approved Angharad Walk Scheme. Accordingly, there is a clearly identifiable quantitative need for significant additional convenience retailing.

Qualitative Need

- 4.43. Pontypridd lacks large foodstore provision to satisfy main food shopping requirements. There are no large supermarkets within a 5 minutes drive time of the town centre, as the nearest such stores are Tesco, Upper Boat and the Co-op, Porth, both some 10 minutes drive time away. Therefore, there is an immediate and urgent need for a more centrally located foodstore, widely accessible to the population of Pontypridd by a range of means of transport. In this context, the Morbaine site is within walking distance of the town centre shopping area and conveniently accessible by non-car means to a large number of households.
- 4.44. Even if the Angharad Walk Scheme is developed, as envisaged, to include a food superstore, the Morbaine proposal would have the advantage of providing a choice of large foodstores which are conveniently accessible to the population of Pontypridd, to the significant benefit of the shopping public.

Application of Sequential Test

- 4.45. Paragraphs 10.2.9 to 10.2.14 of Planning Policy Wales outline the sequential approach to be adopted in identifying a site for major retail development. This gives first preference to town centre sites, where suitable sites or buildings suitable for conversion are available, followed by edge-of-centre sites, then by district and local centres and, only then, out-of-centre sites in locations that are accessible by a choice of means of transport.
- 4.46. In accordance with the definition of edge-of-centre in Annex A of TAN4, i.e. not normally more than 200-300m from existing town centre shops, the Rugby Club site could be regarded as edge-of-centre as the nearest part is 264m walking distance from the boundary

of the defined shopping area, and within 300m of the primary and secondary shopping frontages in Pontypridd town centre. However it has been assessed as an out-of-centre location in the application of the sequential approach.

- 4.47. The following alternative sites were considered in the light of their suitability for the proposed development, their viability for the proposed use, and their availability within a reasonable period of time: -

Town Centre Sites

- (1) Gas Road/Taff Vale Precinct Site (Angharad Walk)
- (2) Former Co-op site
- (3) Buildings on Broadway
- (4) Railway Goods Yard Car Park

Edge-of-Centre Sites

- (5) Millfield Site
- (6) Sardis Road Car Park

Out-of-Centre Site

- (7) Brown Lenox (Morrison)

- 4.48. The Gas Road/Taff Vale Precinct site is allocated for redevelopment under Policy s1 of the Local Plan and planning permission has been granted for the Angharad Walk Scheme in early 2005 for:

- 46 non-food units totalling 15,363 sq m gross floorspace
- A foodstore of 6,987 sq m gross floor area
- 5,428 sq m of office floorspace
- A health and day centre, and
- 605 car parking spaces

In view of the recent planning permission and interest from Sainsbury's as occupier of the foodstore, the site is regarded as a suitable location for meeting part of the identified retail need. However, in view of the interest of the new owner in pursuing a department store as a main occupier, and the WDA's reconsideration of public funding for the CPO, there are doubts about the availability of the site and the feasibility of the development.

- 4.49. Even if the Angharad Walk Scheme were to proceed, there is identifiable quantitative need for convenience goods floorspace on a greater scale than would be provided in the approved development. Therefore, the implementation of the Angharad Walk Scheme should not preclude the development of another foodstore in Pontypridd.
- 4.50. The Co-op site is not currently available for development and, owing to its small size, it is considered to be unsuitable and unviable for a main foodstore. The buildings on Broadway site are physically incapable of accommodating a foodstore to meet the identified need, and the Railway Goods Yard is allocated for public car parking in the

Local Plan and cannot be regarded as being genuinely available. Having carried out a detailed assessment of each of the seven alternative sites, it is considered that none meets the key tests of suitability, viability and availability within a reasonable time period.

- 4.51. In addition, there are no existing vacant premises in Pontypridd town centre suitable for meeting the identified need and disaggregating the components of the proposed foodstore to the extent necessary to accommodate them in available town centre premises would demonstrably fail to meet the identified need.

Retail Impact of the Proposed Store

- 4.52. The potential trading impact of the proposed development has been assessed in terms of the diversion of retail trade from existing stores and centres. The total turnover of the proposed store is estimated to be £37m based on the company average figure for Morrison. The likely trading effects of the existing retail commitments are assessed as:

- Pontypridd town centre will increase its turnover from £68.6m in 2005 to £134m in 2009 (95% increase) as a result of the Angharad Walk development;
- The out-of-centre foodstores in Pontypridd will experience a fall in turnover from £51.6m in 2005 to £37.4m in 2009;
- The combined turnover of foodstores in Porth will increase substantially from £5.7m in 2005 to £22.1m in 2009;
- The combined turnover of foodstores in Tonypanydy will increase significantly from £22.6m in 2005 to £34.9m in 2009.

- 4.53. The following table sets out the predicted main impacts of the Morbaine proposal:

Centre/Store	2009 Pre-Morbaine	2009 Post Morbaine	Change in Turnover	
			£M	%
Pontypridd Convenience Shops	£51.9m	£44.4m	-7.5	-14
Pontypridd Town Centre Total	£134.0m	£124.7m	-9.3	-7
Pontypridd Out of Town Food Retailing	£37.4m	£28.1m	-9.3	-25
Porth Convenience Shops	£22.1m	£18.0m	-4.1	-19
Tonypanydy Convenience Shops	£34.9m	£31.9m	-3.0	-12

- 4.54. The largest impact in Pontypridd would be on the new foodstore at Angharad Walk (assumed to be Sainsbury's), which is forecast to experience a fall in trade from £30.3m to

£24.7m, whilst the other convenience stores in Pontypridd would be less affected by a total reduction in trade from £21.6m to £19.7m.

- 4.55. The greatest impact of the Morbaine proposal would be on out-of-centre foodstores in Pontypridd with a 25% reduction in turnover from £37.4m to £28.1m. The recovery of trade from out-of-centre stores is regarded as a positive aspect of the proposal, and the effect on the viability of such stores should not be a material consideration. However, the trade attracted to Morbaine from out-of-centre stores in Pontypridd would be of benefit in terms of the potential of linked shopping trips between the foodstore and the town centre.

Case for Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council

The material points are: -

Quantitative Need

- 4.56. The Council uses the same catchment area as the main parties (Zones 1-3) for assessment of the capacity for additional convenience goods retailing in Pontypridd. It is accepted that the southern boundary of Zone 1 should fall at a point along the A470T between Tesco, Upper Boat, and the North Cardiff stores, rather than include the populations of Taffs Well (3,500) and Tongwynlais (2,500), which would account for £8.2m in convenience goods expenditure (10% of the catchment area). It is considered that a smaller catchment area would rely on the retention of all its expenditure, whereas the NLP and others approach is to look at all the commitments in the catchment area within the regional area on the basis that zones of influence overlap.
- 4.57. The retail capacity figures are based on the Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners estimates for 2003-2006 (Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council Retail Capacity Assessment Final Report NLP August 2003 - Doc CD12), updated and revised for 2005 and 2009. In contrast to the NLP figures for turnover of stores in the catchment, an allowance is now made for the sale of comparison goods from various stores, which had been excluded from the earlier assessment. For example, Table 1A in Appendix A of NLP (CD12) provides a convenience goods turnover for the Tesco store at Upper Boat of £47.9m. This is considered to be excessive because the IGD directory suggest that the Tesco store has a net sales area of 4,105 sq m, compared to 4,912 sq m estimated by NLP. By applying a company average turnover to a reduced net food sales area of 3,489 sq m (90%) the store's turnover is now estimated at £37.5m as opposed to £47.9m.
- 4.58. Similar floorspace adjustments have been made to Somerfield, Talbot Green (since closed), Aldi, Talbot Green and Somerfield, Treorchy. In this way, the NLP total estimated store turnovers of £235.0m in the catchment area have been recalculated to be a figure of £221.5m. The theoretical capacity for convenience goods expenditure in the catchment has therefore been revised from the NLP 2003 figures as follows:

	2003	2006
Total available convenience goods spending (£m)	331.2	332.5
Actual spending by catchment area stores (£m)	283.7	329.6
Benchmark turnovers (£m)	221.5	221.5
Surplus (£m)	62.2	108.1

- 4.59. The NLP assessment of commitments in terms of convenience goods turnovers (without the proposed Morrisons store) has been updated by making adjustments for turnover and floorspace: -

Scheme	NLP (£m)	Update (£m)
Angharad Walk	43.3	32.5
Tesco Talbot Green extension	30.2	30.2
Tesco Porth Bus Station	16.7	24.0
Lidl Porth		5.0
Asda Tonypanyd	25.1	24.8
Tesco Upper Boat	11.0	
Sub Total	126.3	116.5
Morrisons	31.1	33.3
Total	157.4	149.8

- 4.60. Proposed commitments have been revised with regard to Sainsbury's at Angharad Walk to take account of the reduced floorspace from 4,916 sq m to 4,000 sq m, of which 75% would be convenience goods with a turnover in the region of £29m. Total development commitment for the catchment has been recalculated to have a turnover of £119.6m.
- 4.61. The growth estimates for spending per head have been revised by using MapInfo Information Brief 05/2, published in September 2005, and the figure of 0.8% per annum is used. Within the primary catchment area there will be an additional £8.2m growth in 2005-2009 solely as a result of the revised growth estimate.
- 4.62. A new household survey showed a low figure of 71% of available expenditure in Zone 1 (Pontypridd), which indicates an unrealistic level of leakage, and the survey indicates that existing stores in the catchment trade at £290.4m, which would grow to £297.7m by 2009. Consequently, existing stores would be over-trading by £47.33m in 2009.
- 4.63. The revised figures on expenditure in the core catchment area of Zones 1-3 show that there is a total of £208.5m of available spending in 2009. Existing stores in Zones 1-3 have a total benchmark turnover of £115m, of which 86% (figure from household survey) or £100m is retained within the catchment. This gives a surplus expenditure capacity of £108.5m compared to existing and proposed commitments (including Morrisons) of £119.6m. If it is assumed that some of this spending would come from beyond Zones 1-3, i.e. 10%, only 90% of the commitment turnover need be accommodated, i.e. £107.6m, which is compatible with the amount of spending that would be available in 2009. The table below suggests that there will be capacity for all the existing commitments, including the Morrison's proposal with a turnover of £33m:

Total available convenience goods spending (£m) Zones 1-3	208.5
Benchmark turnovers (£m)	115@87% = 100.0
Surplus spending (£m)	108.5
Development commitments including Morrisons (£m)	119.6@90% = 107.6

Qualitative Need

- 4.64. Food shopping in Pontypridd is limited to Marks & Spencer, Iceland, Somerfield, the indoor market and other small unit shops. This retail offer is small scale and orientated towards top-up shopping rather than once a week bulk food shopping. Opportunities for main bulk shopping are limited to Tesco at Upper Boat, which is some 5.6km to the south of Pontypridd.
- 4.65. Whilst the Angharad Walk Scheme includes a large scale superstore with adjacent parking, which would add significantly to the attractiveness of Pontypridd town centre, the retail capacity assessment indicates that available spending would support floorspace in excess of the approved scheme. There is a qualitative need in Pontypridd in addition to the Angharad Walk Scheme.
- 4.66. The Angharad Walk development would provide a modern superstore, but it would also have the drawbacks of congestion, complex traffic circulation and car parking, and many shoppers may continue to use existing out-of-centre stores, such as Tesco at Upper Boat. With the development of a store with surface level car parking at the Brown Lenox site, shoppers would be able to visit a store that is still close to Pontypridd without experiencing the congestion of the town centre itself, or undertaking longer trips to visit Tesco at Upper Boat. The proposal for a Morrisons foodstore on the Brown Lenox site would make a qualitative improvement to food shopping facilities in Pontypridd.

Sequential Site Selection

- 4.67. The revised retail capacity assessment indicates that sufficient surplus expenditure exists to support a modern foodstore with a net sales floor area of some 2,700 sq m (gross area 6,900 sq m) in addition to the Angharad Walk Scheme. Accordingly, the Council has considered the availability of sites within or adjacent to the town centre capable of accommodating this retail need.
- 4.68. Of the existing buildings within the town centre, the vacant units within the Taff Vale Shopping Centre were examined but not considered to be capable of accommodating the retail need and their occupation would prejudice the Angharad Walk Scheme. Within the town centre, sites at Angharad Walk (1.4 ha), former Co-op site (0.4 ha), St Catherine's Street car park (0.3 ha), buildings on Broadway (0.6 ha), Millfield (0.6 ha), Sardis Road car park (0.9 ha) and land at the rear of the Bus Station (1.0 ha) were considered.
- 4.69. It is understood that Sainsbury's are committed to occupying the anchor foodstore of the Angharad Walk Scheme, and this is no longer available for other food retailers. The site is suitable for retail development but there are no other large units suitable for a further foodstore. It would not be possible to develop the Angharad Walk site for a surface level foodstore on about 2 ha, as this would prevent the implementation of the approved

scheme. For these reasons it is concluded that the site of the Angharad Walk Scheme is not available as a sequentially preferable site.

- 4.70. The former Co-op store site would not be sufficient to accommodate a foodstore of any significant size to meet the identified retail need. St Catherine's Corner is no longer available as planning permission has been granted for office development and a multi-storey car park, and the site is too small to accommodate a modern large foodstore. The Broadway buildings are not available and the total site would be too small to accommodate the identified floorspace requirements. The Millfield site is proposed for residential uses with a replacement day nursery in the Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy, which is more compatible in vehicle generation terms with the surrounding area. The Sardis Road car park is proposed to retain its current use in a multi-storey form with some new Local Authority offices in the Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy, and it is unlikely to be released for a new foodstore development.
- 4.71. There are no sites within the town centre or on its edge that would accommodate the 2 ha size threshold and therefore none of the sites would be capable of accommodating a modern foodstore aimed at satisfying bulk shopping trips. The Angharad Walk site is not available and there are no other large units in the scheme. Whilst it would be possible to combine smaller units in the Angharad Walk Scheme, this would displace other more valuable non-food and service facilities that would make a more significant contribution to the vitality and viability of the town centre. Therefore, it is concluded that there are no sequentially preferable sites either within or on the edge of Pontypridd town centre.

Retail Impact

- 4.72. The above analysis indicates that there would be sufficient capacity to support all retail commitments, including Morrisons, because there would be sufficient expenditure in the catchment of Zones 1-3. It is anticipated that the combined effect of existing store commitments (including Angharad Walk) and the Morrison's proposal would have the following percentage impacts on the benchmark turnover of existing centres/stores at 2009:

• Pontypridd Town Centre	-1%
• Angharad Walk	-17%
• Tesco, Upper Boat	-36%
• Somerfield, Church Village	+109%
• Porth Town Centre	-44%
• Tesco, Porth	-24%
• Tonypandy Town Centre	+38%
• Asda, Tonypandy	-16%

- 4.73. The revised household survey has shown that existing stores are achieving turnovers in excess of benchmark figures. As there are a significant number of development commitments to be taken into account, it is inevitable that there would be some impact upon existing stores, although most of the proposed floorspace can be supported by increasing the level of trade retention within the core catchment area.
- 4.74. It is anticipated that the proposed Morrisons store would divert the greater part of its trade from existing out-of-centre stores, and it would have some impact upon the approved Angharad Walk Scheme. Despite this, Pontypridd town centre would experience a significant improvement in its overall turnover due to the Angharad Walk Scheme, which would record a turnover only £1.7m below the turnover projected by Sainsbury's. This is

not considered to be so significant as to prevent the store from opening or trading in the longer term. The proposed Morrisons store would achieve a more sustainable pattern of development with the creation of spin-off trade to the town centre, which might secure an improvement in the use of other facilities, non-food shopping and services. Accordingly, the Morrisons proposal would not have an adverse impact upon defined town centres.

The Morbaine Proposal

- 4.75. The Council's position with regard to the Morbaine proposal is that whilst there is sufficient expenditure in the catchment area to support an additional modern food superstore with a projected turnover of £33m, there only exists the need for one rather than two further stores in the catchment. It is not considered that there would be any qualitative benefits arising from the Morbaine proposal over and above those that would come from the Morrison scheme. The Morbaine site could accommodate a modern foodstore that could add to the range of shopping facilities in the town centre, but it is considered to be an inappropriate location for other planning reasons, i.e. it would result in the loss of recreational facilities without alternative provision.
- 4.76. Apart from the Local Plan policy objection to the site, the Morbaine food store proposal would meet the tests for sequential selection of sites and the retail impact would be similar to that of the Morrisons store. Whilst it is conceded that the Rugby Club site lies closer to the defined shopping centre of Pontypridd, it is not located next to an existing generator of trips, unlike Morrison's site, which adjoins the existing Brown Lenox Retail Park. Whilst the Morbaine development would achieve some new link trips with the town centre, these would not be as significant as those that would be generated by the Morrisons scheme.

Case for Scarborough Development Group/Sainsbury's Plc.

The material points are: -

Catchment Area

- 4.77. There are serious reservations about the choice of catchment area for Pontypridd adopted by consultants in their retail assessments for both main parties and the Council (Core Docs CD25 & CD33). Zones 1-3 of the catchment area plan in the Statement of Common Ground (Doc. CD56) are considered to be far too extensive in that they fail to take into account:
- Commitments to large new foodstores at Porth (Tesco) and Tonypanydy (Asda), and
 - Other large foodstores just outside the defined catchment area.

With regard to the Porth and Tonypanydy stores, it is considered that most of the Rhondda Valley section of the catchment should be excluded from the analysis. In the south, the Asda store at Coryton is twice the size of the proposed foodstores and it is immediately adjacent to the boundary of the defined catchment. The population of North Cardiff and Taffs Well is substantially closer to Asda at Coryton than it is to either of the proposed Pontypridd stores. The Nelson area, which lies in Caerphilly CBC, is significantly closer to the Tesco store at Ystrad Mynach and much of the Cynon Valley section of the catchment area is closer to the Asda and Tesco stores in Aberdare. Similarly, the northern sections of the Taff section of the catchment, which are within Merthyr Tydfil CBC, are closer to the stores in Merthyr Tydfil.

- 4.78. In order to assess convenience goods 'need', it would be necessary to pull in the boundaries of the catchment area used by the Council and the main parties by a substantial amount. The NLP Retail Study of Rhondda Cynon Taff (Doc CD12), undertaken on behalf of the Council in 2003, identified a Pontypridd Zone (Zone 3) extending to approximately 50,000 population, compare to the 170,000 in the Peacock & Smith and Barris Liptrott studies, and a total of over 350,000 in Table 4.1 of the 2005 Statement of Common Ground (Doc CD56).
- 4.79. A revised "area of need" is suggested (Appendix 2, Doc SB6), where the population might reasonably be expected to look to Pontypridd for convenience shopping. The study area takes account of the new store commitments in the Rhondda Valley and existing stores in Cardiff, Caerphilly, Ystrad Mynach, Merthyr, Aberdare and Talbot Green. This RPS Study Area represents a more appropriate area for a retail needs assessment to establish whether there is scope for one or two new stores in Pontypridd.

Population and Expenditure

- 4.80. MapInfo were commissioned to provide existing population and expenditure figures for the revised catchment, which are projected forward to 2009 and 2011 as follows (2000 prices):

	2001	2005	2009	2011
Population in catchment	59,956	60,000	60,000	60,000
Convenience Goods Expenditure per head (£)	1278	1342	1385	1408
Total Convenience Goods Expenditure (£m)	76.62	80.52	83.10	84.48

Therefore, the estimates for convenience goods expenditure of £80.5m in 2005, rising to £83.1m by 2009 and £84.5m by 2011, are substantially lower than the equivalent estimates used by the main parties and the Council.

- 4.81. The estimated total turnover of the study area at 2005 is £70.4m, of which £62.69m would be in convenience goods and £51.08m from within the catchment. This is based on Table 4.6 of the Statement of Common Ground (Doc CD56), but it is considered that the Table underestimates the amount of floorspace in local centres and freestanding convenience goods shops. The local centres falling within the catchment but excluded from the Table are Abercynon, Church Village, Penrhiwceibr, Pentre, Penygraig, Taffs Well, Ton Pentre, Treforest, Treherbet, Tylorstown, Ystrad and Ynysbwl, all within the Rhondda Cynon Taff area.

Retail Capacity

- 4.82. When the estimated turnover of the approved Angharad Walk store and the permitted extension and mezzanine at Tesco, Upper Boat are added to the turnover of existing stores, the combined turnover of existing and committed stores shows a total benchmark convenience goods turnover of £103.4m. Therefore, a simple comparison shows that with floorspace capacity of £103.4m and available expenditure in the study area of only £80.5m, there would be a shortfall of almost £23m. Thus, there would be insufficient expenditure capacity to fully support both the existing and committed food retail floorspace in 2005.

- 4.83. With estimated expenditure rising by only £2.6m between 2005 and 2009 and by a further £1.4m to 2011 (a total of £4m between 2005 -2011), there is clearly insufficient expenditure in the study area to make up the shortfall or to support a further superstore. Even when making estimated allowances for inflow and outflow there is a shortfall in capacity of more than £18m in 2005, and projected growth would only partly reduce this total:

	2005
Benchmark Convenience Goods Turnover (after allowing for inflow)	£51.08m
Committed Floorspace Turnover (after allowing for inflow)	£35.14m
Outflow to Stores in Cardiff, Talbot Green, Merthyr, Ystrad Mynach, Aberdare	£12.50m
Subtotal	£98.72m
AVAILABLE CONVENIENCE GOODS EXPENDITURE IN 2005	£80.50m
Capacity for further convenience goods floorspace over and above existing and committed floorspace	-£18.22m

- 4.84. It is considered that an appropriate turnover for either the Morrison or Morbaine scheme would be £33m, allowing for a deduction of comparison goods floorspace and a limitation on the amount of floorspace. It is clear that there is insufficient capacity to accommodate the new store in addition to the existing and committed retail floorspace within the catchment.
- 4.85. Whilst there has been an identified qualitative need for additional large foodstore provision in the Pontypridd and Rhondda Valley area for some years, it is also recognised that the existing offer is due to be improved by a number of new developments:

- Angharad Walk, Pontypridd 4000 sq m net sales
- Tesco, Porth 2743 sq m net sales
- Asda, Tonypandy 2787 sq m net sales
- Lidl, Porth 1000 sq m net sales

The Porth and Tonypandy commitments meet the needs of the Rhondda Valley and the Angharad Walk Scheme will meet the identified qualitative need for additional foodstore provision in Pontypridd.

- 4.86. Taking into account the commitments to new foodstore development in Pontypridd, Porth and Tonypandy, there is no quantitative or qualitative need that would justify the selection of an out of centre site for development. The Council's resolution to support the Morrison's store on the Brown Lenox site appears to have been based on the belief that there is capacity for 2 new foodstores in Pontypridd, but it is evident from the quantitative analysis that this is no longer the case following the Council's resolution to approve the Asda Store at Tonypandy and Tesco's commitment to develop the store at Porth.

Sequential Approach

- 4.87. Both the Morrisons and Morbaine proposals are out-of-centre sites. According to the approach set out in Planning Policy Wales, it is necessary to consider whether there are suitable sites for redevelopment within or on the edge of the town centre. As the Angharad Walk Scheme already has planning permission and is a recent commitment, both proposed developments fail the sequential approach.
- 4.88. Using the most direct routes available, having regard to safety and the needs of the infirm, wheelchair-bound and push-chair users, the relevant distances of these proposed stores from Pontypridd town centre would be as follows:

	Morrisons	Morbaine
Site edge to secondary frontage	690m	400m
Site edge to primary frontage	810m	450m
Store entrance to primary frontage	960m	700m

These distances fall well outside the requirements for an edge of centre location advised in TAN 4. Neither route would be attractive to shoppers, particularly from the Morrisons store across two busy slip roads serving the A470 trunk road, and they would not be conducive to linkages between the sites and the town centre.

Retail Impact

- 4.89. Pontypridd has seen some minor improvement in recent years, but it lacks adequate supermarket provision. Unlike most comparable centres in South Wales, Pontypridd does not have a large foodstore to act as an anchor trader within or on the edge of the town centre, which is capable of encouraging linked trips and improving pedestrian flows.
- 4.90. The current vacancy rate in Pontypridd is slightly below the national average, but it has not improved at the same rate as in nearby centres, which have seen recent foodstore schemes. Investment yields over the period 1994-2005 have increased from 7.25% to 9.0% in 1996 and have hovered in the 9.0-9.5% range since then. Of its competitors, Caerphilly, Bridgend and Merthyr have fared better, and only Aberdare has a higher yield than Pontypridd. Investment yields are an indicator of investor confidence in a town centre. Whereas low yields indicate confidence and perceived vibrancy and security, high yields reflect lack of confidence and a perception of limited potential.
- 4.91. Retail rents in Pontypridd have declined and stagnated since 1990, and performed poorly in relative terms compared with other centres in the region. In 1990, Caerphilly and Merthyr had rental levels significantly below that of Pontypridd, but by 2005 they were ahead of Pontypridd. Whilst other centres have such as Caerphilly and Merthyr Tydfil have seen new foodstore developments in their centres, which have improved their vitality and viability, currently Pontypridd has very poor supermarket provision. Its highly accessible location is both an advantage and a disadvantage because it is vulnerable to competition from other centres and it is close to Cardiff, one of the largest comparable goods centres in the UK.
- 4.92. The principal effects on Pontypridd town centre of a new foodstore on either the Brown Lenox or Sardis Road sites are expected to be: -

- A level of trade withdrawal from the town centre;
- Limited spin-off trade for the town centre;
- The shelving of plans for the comprehensive redevelopment of the town centre site identified in the Local Plan;
- The loss of an opportunity for comprehensive upgrading of the northern end of the town centre and opening up of the riverfront;
- The loss of an opportunity to provide a convenient, integrated shopping facility providing food and non-food shopping together with other services in one location;
- A lack of improvement to yield and rental levels and a poor environment for new property investment.

These effects would be contrary to local and national policies, which seek to regenerate Pontypridd town centre and provide high quality, integrated shopping facilities to serve the community as a whole.

5. TRANSPORT & ACCESSIBILITY

Case for Morrison/Shoparama Development

The material points are: -

- 5.1. A Transport Assessment was submitted with the Morrison's planning application in May 2003, which at that time did not include the likely effects of the Angharad Walk Scheme development. A revised Transport Assessment was submitted in April 2004, which considered the traffic impact of both the proposed Morrison development and the Angharad Walk Scheme. This was amended following comments received from Glamorgan Engineering Consultancy on behalf of Rhondda Cynon Taff CBC and from the Welsh Assembly Government. This resulted in both the Council and Welsh Assembly Government removing their highway objections to the proposed development.
- 5.2. Access to Brown Lenox and the existing non-food retail park is only available from the Bridge Street roundabout. The Brown Lenox roundabout, abutting the proposed site, operates with reserve capacity at all times, as does the Broadway signal-controlled junction some 280m west of the roundabout.

Walking Access

- 5.3. Pedestrian surveys, undertaken in July 2005, revealed that over 3000 people walked between the town centre and the adjacent retail park during a seven day period. The existing route is some 525m long and includes uncontrolled crossings of slip roads at the Bridge Street roundabout. The scheme would include the provision of off-site pedestrian linkages between the site and the town centre. It is proposed to introduce signal-controlled pedestrian crossings of the slip roads at both roundabouts on the southbound and northbound connector roads. A significant number of households would be within 1.6 km of the new store and in common with other Morrison stores a large proportion of staff would be employed locally and live within one mile.
- 5.4. The applicants have prepared a Travel Plan as a long term strategy for reducing supermarket employees dependence on private car travel. This deals with the proximity of residential areas, the likelihood of employees walking to work, cycling facilities and

public transport

Public Transport

- 5.5. Both the existing non-food retail park and the proposed Brown Lenox site are poorly served by public transport. Bus stops would be provided within the site and on the retail park access to accommodate diverted bus services agreed with the bus operator (Appendix DJP4 in Doc WMS13 and Docs WMS28 & G5). This would connect the development with the town centre, the bus station and the railway station. In total, diverted services would provide a frequency of one bus every 7.5 minutes in each direction.
- 5.6. The development would incorporate a new access from Brown Lenox roundabout in addition to the existing access from Bridge Street through the retail park. This would provide a traffic link through the existing retail park access road from the Brown Lenox roundabout. Traffic from the south would be able to by-pass the Bridge Street interchange, reducing traffic flows at the roundabout.

Level of Car Use

- 5.7. The Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessment, published by the Institution of Highways and Transportation, suggest that some 95% of trips to a new superstore are trips already on the network, albeit not necessarily in the same location. Accordingly, the majority of trips to the new store would be existing trips that are diverted from existing centres and stores.
- 5.8. It is estimated that the Morrison's store would draw some 80% of its turnover from similar large stores in the catchment area and 20% from smaller stores, and the location of the new store on the A470T would help to reduce trips to Aberdare, North Cardiff and Talbot Green. Construction of the new store would therefore reduce the need for shoppers in the catchment to travel to more distant stores for their bulk food shopping, and overall the development is likely to result in a reduction in car usage.

Car Parking

- 5.9. The proposals include 421 car parking spaces, which equates to one space per 16.4 sq m of gross floor area. This is less than the maximum standard set out in national and local guidance and therefore would not encourage unnecessary use of the private car. The number is consistent with Morrisons normal operational parking requirements and it would be sufficient to ensure that parking does not cause traffic difficulties at the Brown Lenox roundabout at peak trading hours.
- 5.10. As set out in the Highways Statement of Common Ground (Core Document CD61), the local highway network in the vicinity of the new store is able to accommodate the likely volume of generated traffic, and the proposals would have some highways benefits. It is concluded that there are no transport related reasons why the Wm Morrison development should not go ahead.

Comments on the Morbaine Scheme

- 5.11. It is argued that as the Morbaine development would be dependent on the Sardis Road gyratory for access to the site, almost all the traffic to and from the proposed store would use the gyratory. This would add about 5 times more traffic to the already congested gyratory than would the Morrisons development. The gyratory would have additional traffic upon it as a result of the Angharad Walk development. Significant queuing would occur from Rhondda Road, extending back to other links, where queues are already seen

on the ground. It is doubted whether traffic leaving the proposed store on Sardis Road would be able to access the gyratory on a regular and adequate basis.

- 5.12. Whilst it is recognised that the Morbaine site is marginally closer to the town centre than the Brown Lenox site for pedestrian links, the route from Brown Lenox to the town centre is perceptually better in term of its overall streetscape and level approach.
- 5.13. In terms of accessibility by public transport, Morbaine have come to an agreement with Shamrock Travel to divert services and to provide a new service to the Sardis Road site. However, the section 106 Agreement would not secure the necessary improvements to public transport because it only attaches to Morbaine rather than to any other developer or operator with an interest in the land. Without it, public transport accessibility to the Rugby Club site would be inferior to the Morrisons proposal.

Case for Morbaine Ltd

The material points are: -

- 5.14. The planning application for the Sardis Road Pontypridd Rugby Club Site was accompanied by a Traffic and Highways Report, which was considered adequate for an outline application. This provided an assessment of the accessibility of the site by a choice of modes of transport, which showed that it would be accessible by all the usual means of transport and that the development would have minimal effects on vehicular traffic.
- 5.15. One of the reasons that the Council would have refused planning permission is that a full Traffic Impact Assessment, although requested, had not been provided, but the request was never put to the applicants or their agents. The September 2005 Transport Assessment was carried out in accordance with the parameters established for the Angharad Walk Scheme and Morrison proposal. This TA and further evidence to the inquiry covers traffic impact effects of the proposed development (singly and in combination with the other developments), details of accessibility of the site by modes of transport other than the motor car, details of the proposed Travel Plan, and assessment of parking needs of the development.
- 5.16. The most critical location on the highway network is the Sardis Road/Rhondda Road gyratory, the large traffic signal controlled junction to the east of the site where Sardis Road, Rhondda Road, Mill Street and Catherine Street all meet. Although it operates well with minimal queuing and delays for traffic or pedestrians, during the evening peak period queuing occurs on the Sardis Road eastern approach to the gyratory. This is caused by the necessity for 2 lanes of traffic to merge into one lane on Rhondda Road some distance to the north of the gyratory, where there are two pedestrian crossings (Supplementary Transport Assessment – December 2005, Appendix JLS4, Document MOR8).
- 5.17. The operation of the pedestrian crossings causes traffic flows in Hopkinstown Road to stop/start very frequently, rippling back along Rhondda Road as a slow moving queue of traffic, blocking the merge manoeuvre on the gyratory and causing queuing onto Sardis Road (east). There are also peak period queuing problems at the Catherine Street entry onto the gyratory and at the northbound A470 link road junction with the Bridge Street roundabout in the pm peak.
- 5.18. The Highway Authority has confirmed that the critical time for the gyratory is the weekday pm peak hour and this period has been tested using the town centre Paramics model for 2007 and 2022 traffic levels. In the tests, the Sardis Road gyratory performs

with reserve capacity, apart from the problem of congestion on Rhondda Road, which extends onto Sardis Road east. The Rhondda Road bottleneck is currently operating in excess of its practical capacity at around 108%, giving an average queue of 66 vehicles extending back from the pedestrian crossing at the lane merge in Rhondda Road. In 2007 with the Angharad Walk development, the bottleneck would go up to 126% capacity with an average queue of 135 vehicles, and with the additional traffic of either the Morrison or Morbaine developments and no alterations to the highway network this would further increase to 134% with an average queue of 170 - 172 vehicles.

- 5.19. In order to improve the traffic flow in Rhondda Road, as part of the development it is proposed that the pedestrian crossings to the north would be upgraded from the old "Pelican" type to the modern "Puffin" standard with detectors, linked to minimise disruption to traffic. Although the Morbaine proposal would result in significantly less additional traffic through the gyratory than the Angharad Walk and Morrisons developments, the proposed improvements (see Drawing No. 031102/01, Doc MOR8) would reduce delays for traffic on Rhondda Road.
- 5.20. At a conservative estimate, the proposed improvements to the bottleneck would allow at least one additional vehicle per minute to pass through the gyratory, and traffic flows would return to the situation that would have existed without the Morbaine development. Should more than one additional vehicle per minute extra capacity be achieved, which is considered to be likely, the highway network would perform better than it would without the development.
- 5.21. Other improvements to the bus lane on Catherine Street and detectors to enable the junction to operate in optimum form would be carried out as part of the development, and the signalisation of the A470/Bridge Street roundabout junction, already planned as part of the Angharad Walk Scheme, would assist pedestrian movements to and from the town centre. Additional highway improvements would be incorporated to increase accessibility to the site by all modes of transport including a new slip lane from the site onto the gyratory with signal controlled crossing for pedestrians and cyclists, and the widening of the footway on the south side of the gyratory/Sardis Road.

Pedestrian Access

- 5.22. The town centre is within easy walking distance of the site. There is a public footpath along the River Rhondda on the east side of the site that is well used and links the residential areas of Seatons Place, Lee Street and Pwllgwaun Road with Sardis Road and beyond to the town centre. The existing footway route to the town centre would be widened in places for pushchairs and wheelchairs with improvements to the road crossings.
- 5.23. A pedestrian ramp would be provided by the developer to link the Catherine Street bus stops to Mill Street and the Market area and the subway beneath Catherine Street would be upgraded. The existing riverside footpath could be upgraded as part of the development with improved lighting and links provided into the store. The proposed development would be accessible on foot and the improvements proposed would provide a high quality route between the site and the town centre, and to residential areas.

Cycle Access

- 5.24. Most of the improved pedestrian facilities would be useable by cyclists. The existing Celtic Trail, which forms part of Route 4 on the National Cycle Network, passes the site

on Sardis Road. Cycle Route 47 passes along Maesycoed Road, connecting Pontypridd to Porth, and therefore the Morbaine site lies directly adjacent to two main cycle routes. These routes meet at the site entrance on Sardis Road and pass through the middle of the gyratory into the town centre. The developer would improve footways and crossing points and carry out further improvements to the Maesycoed Road route. The proposed development is therefore accessible by cyclists on high quality routes that would provide benefits to all cyclists using the area.

Public Transport

- 5.25. Sardis Road and the other roads passing through the gyratory are bus routes and Pontypridd Railway Station is also within easy walking distance, and therefore the site is well-served by public transport. The site would be designed to enable buses to enter and drop/collect passengers close to the store entrance. In addition, Morbaine and Pontypridd Rugby Club have entered into an agreement with Shamrock Travel (Doc G6) to divert Bus Service 1 through the site as a new Bus Service 1A to connect the development with Pontypridd town centre, the Bus Station and the Railway Station.
- 5.26. In addition, a Travel Plan has been drafted to promote the use of public transport by staff, to display bus service information for customers, to provide and maintain cycle parking facilities and to restrict staff car parking to those taking part in the staff car sharing scheme.
- 5.27. Following the provision of supplementary evidence to the inquiry (Doc MOR8), the Council no longer objects to the proposed development on highway grounds. It is concluded that there are no highways, traffic or transportation related reasons why the Morbaine development should not be allowed, as it would have positive benefits for all classes of highway users

Case for Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council

The material points are: -

Morrison's Proposal

- 5.28. With regard to the Morrisons application, the original Transport Assessment April 2003 was amended in April 2004 to take into account the committed development of the Angharad Walk Scheme in the town centre (Document CD27). The traffic data and growth rates, TRICS trip rates for a Morrison Store and the distribution on the network were all considered to be acceptable.
- 5.29. The original store access layout from the Brown Lenox roundabout was considered unsatisfactory and the layout was amended so as to avoid the possibility of vehicles queuing back onto the roundabout. In order to accommodate the number of pedestrians accessing the site from Broadway to the west, the developer has agreed to provide a series of "Puffin" crossings at four locations, commencing approximately 170m west of the Brown Lenox site and following the northern route around the periphery of the roundabout to the pedestrian access.
- 5.30. In addition to the signal-controlled junctions of the A470 slip roads onto the Bridge Street roundabout, which are to be part of the Angharad Walk development, the Morrisons scheme would introduce pedestrian crossings. This would enhance the safety and convenience of the route between the Morrisons store and the town centre. With the provision of a Travel Plan, including cycle parking, and funding for an extension of the

existing bus services into the site, the revised Transport Assessment 2004 was found to be satisfactory, subject to the various mitigation measures agreed: -

- Provision of a new access as a fourth arm on the eastern side of the Brown Lenox roundabout;
- The store and car parking areas to be serviced by a series of priority junctions throughout the site;
- Puffin crossings and appropriate pedestrian footways are to be provided, linking the crossings at four locations from Broadway;
- Guardrails are to be provided on both sides of the internal access road from the entrance to the site from the A470 roundabout; and
- Morrisons are to fund an extension to existing bus services or provide a new service.

Morbaine Proposal

5.31. The initial Transport Assessment submitted with the Morbaine application was considered inadequate, and the Highway Authority expressed concern about the impact that the proposed development would have on the highway network, summarised as follows: -

- (1) The A4058 is a principal road, which is busy and of more than local importance, serving the Rhondda Valleys and linking to the A470, M4 and Cardiff;
- (2) The Rhondda Road carries a large volume of traffic and is very congested in the vicinity of the proposed development. The applicants' Transport and Highways Report provided insufficient detail to assess the highway capacity and safety;
- (3) Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle movements at the Sardis Road access junction would be unsafe without mitigation measures;
- (4) The development was considered premature until a full Transport Assessment has been carried out to ascertain the full impact of the proposed development on the surrounding highway network;
- (5) In the absence of a full Transport Assessment, it is expected that there would be a significant increase in traffic as a result of the proposed development;
- (6) The proposed location of the petrol filling station and vehicular access off Pwllgwaun Road would be detrimental to the safety and free flow of traffic; this issue has now been addressed in the submitted revised layout, Drawing No 5928/34 Rev D on 31/08/05;
- (7) The development is considered to be contrary to Policies T10, T11, R4 and S11 of the adopted Structure Plan, and Planning Policy Wales and Local Transport Plan 2000;
- (8) The dismissal on appeal of a smaller development less than 100m away from the site included traffic impact as a material consideration, which is relevant to this decision.

5.32. The Council's main concerns relate to impact of the development on traffic queuing at

Rhondda Road during the pm peak hour, and whether this could be eliminated by the installation of Puffin crossings, the effectiveness of a signalised site access junction onto Sardis Road and the gyratory, and the suitability of the proposed mitigation measures.

- 5.33. However, after having received updated information in the form of supplementary evidence, the Council now concludes that the proposed Morbaine foodstore (together with various mitigation measures) would not be likely to cause undue traffic/transport problems. Therefore the Council does not maintain its objection to the Morbaine development on highway grounds, subject to the imposition of a number of conditions.

Case for Scarborough Development Group

The material points are: -

- 5.34. It is considered that the Angharad Walk Scheme meets the objectives set out in Chapter 8 of Planning Policy Wales – March 2002. The development will be within the town centre, close to other shops and facilities and it is well served by public transport, with bus and rail stations located 150m and 650m away respectively. Access to bus transport is most important. The scheme will provide improvements to the pedestrian environment on Taff Street, pedestrian linkage between Ynysangharad Park and the town centre, with access to a new town centre car park near Bridge Street.
- 5.35. The Morbaine and Morrison proposals would not meet these objectives and would not provide the scope for linked trips. Both proposals conflict with national planning policy in PPW (paragraph 8.1.3), which aims to reduce travel to new developments, especially by private car, by locating development where there is good access by public transport, walking and cycling. There would be little linkage between these sites and the town centre, which would lead to greater travel demand for single purpose trips, and vehicle trips between the store and the town centre. This is contrary to guidance in Chapter 10 of PPW regarding planning for Retailing and Town Centres and the policy in TAN 18 on transport.
- 5.36. Morrisons would be located out of centre some 900m from the bus and rail stations, and it would have poor accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport. Situated adjacent to the A470T, it would be highly accessible by private car, but the A470 effectively severs the site from the town centre. Although 5 bus services pass through the Broadway roundabout close to the site, these are express services to Cardiff and do not stop near the site, and are therefore unsuitable for shopping purposes. Some improvements would be made by diverting existing bus services into the site, but it would not be comparable to the accessibility of the Angharad Walk site in the town centre.
- 5.37. Pedestrian movements between the Brown Lenox site and the town centre would have to use Bridge Street or Broadway. Although these routes would be made easier for pedestrians by providing signalised crossings on the A470 slip roads, the distances between the site and town centre are in the order of 1 km. This would discourage linked trips on foot between the proposed store and the town centre. This would lead to greater travel demand in the form of single trips to the site and further car trips between the site and the town centre. The high accessibility by car from the A470 and the lack of alternative means of transport would be most likely to result in additional car trips.
- 5.38. Similarly, the proposed Morbaine store would be located out of centre, some 950m from

the bus station and 550m from Pontypridd railway station. The site is severed from the town centre by the Sardis Road gyratory, the river and the railway line, and it would have poor accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport. All traffic attracted to the proposed store, except for Sardis Road itself, would have to pass through the heavily trafficked A4058/A4228/Sardis Road gyratory, where the A4058 Rhondda Road is recognised as one of the busiest roads in the County Borough and suffers from significant queuing at peak times.

- 5.39. There are currently no bus services that pass the site entrance on Sardis Road, and although there are numerous services circulating around the gyratory system, the nearest bus stops are on Catherine Street, more than 500m from the proposed store, or at the bus station itself. The inbound and outbound bus stops for the 6 services on Rhondda Road are the most accessible to the site, but they are not conveniently placed.
- 5.40. The Sardis Road site is reasonably accessible on foot or by cycle to the residential areas of Pwllgwaun, Maesycoed and Graig to the south of the A4058. At some 700m distance from the town centre, the site is not conveniently located for linked trips on foot.

6. EMPLOYMENT USE OF BROWN LENOX SITE

Case for Morrison/Shoparama Ltd

The material points are: -

- 6.1. The existing Brown Lenox property comprises an old dilapidated and vandalised heavy engineering workshop, with a two-storey office frontage. The buildings extend to 8,623 sq m on a site of 2.98 ha. Whilst the site and buildings are prominent and have good access to the highway network, the existing building would not meet the requirements of most modern occupiers of industrial buildings.
- 6.2. It is unlikely therefore that a new occupier would come from the manufacturing or distribution sector. It would be more likely that a user from the transport/haulage sector would be attracted by the large site area for parking vehicles and secure external storage. Such a use would create only a low number of low-grade employment opportunities.
- 6.3. The site was marketed before it became vacant in April 2000 for retail purposes (see letter from Fuller Peiser in Doc WMS32), and the site was acquired by Shoparama Ltd in late November 2001. There are no sales particulars for industrial purposes and no sale board was erected on the site. The Brown Lenox site was not marketed for employment uses.
- 6.4. The Brown Lenox site is assessed in the context of the South East Wales property market as well as the Rhondda Cynon Taff area. Across South East Wales occupier demand is low and accordingly the take up rates for industrial/distribution space is also low. Demand comes primarily from the manufacturing sector and the supply in this area is a mixture of some new build, some modern second hand and considerably older space, some refurbished, some not. There is a larger supply of secondary space on the market, some of which is in need of refurbishment and updating.
- 6.5. Whilst the main office market for South East Wales is based in and around Cardiff city centre and Cardiff Bay, there is a growing market for out-of-town business park offices close to the M4. In Rhondda Cynon Taff, occupier demand is strongest in the south, closest to the M4 for accessibility reasons. The only significant new private sector industrial development in the Borough in the past 6 years has been the Forest Court

- development on the Treforest Industrial Estate, built in 1998, but the units have proved difficult to let.
- 6.6. If the Brown Lenox building was to be extensively refurbished there is a prospect that an occupier could be found for the site. However, there is no shortage of similar types of refurbishment projects that are currently available across South East Wales, many of which are finding it difficult to secure occupiers.
- 6.7. There is little prospect of the site being redeveloped for new industrial/distribution use, because it is a large site for such an undertaking and the market interest in such floorspace is insufficient to support new speculative development on this scale. It is also unlikely that the site would be redeveloped for office/business park space for the same reasons.
- 6.8. There is currently in the region of 156,044.7 sq m of buildings in Rhondda Cynon Taff area available for employment uses and some 64% of this space is new/modern or secondary accommodation. From available information the likely annual take up rate of available buildings is around 41,806 sq m. This suggests that there is industrial/distribution employment land availability for the next 3.5 years, which is an adequate supply of buildings to meet current demand. The supply is continually replenished by market processes as companies come and go, and refurbishment adds to the supply.
- 6.9. The current supply of land/development sites designated for employment uses in the Borough area is estimated to be in the region of 249.6 ha. The likely annual take up rate of land/development sites in Rhondda Cynon Taff is between 5.26 and 7.30 ha, which suggests that there is currently 34 years supply of available land/sites for development. Therefore, there is an adequate supply of available land/development sites to meet current and foreseeable demand and the release of the Brown Lenox site for alternative uses would have no notable impact on the market for employment uses in Rhondda Cynon Taff, or in the wider South East Wales context.

Case for Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council

The material points are: -

- 6.10. The Mid Glamorgan Structure Plan requires the allocation of 280 ha of land for employment uses (B1, B2 and B8) in the Borough for the years 1991-2006 at a rate of 1 year's supply readily available to be developed. Over the 15 year plan period an annual land supply of 18.7 ha should be maintained, calculated on the basis of reducing levels of unemployment to those of 1991.
- 6.11. Monitored figures for employment land take up show that in 2005 there were 242 ha of available employment land in the Borough and of this, 127 ha were available for development within a one year period. The annual average take up in the period 2003-2005 is 31.1 ha, indicating an 8 year available land supply in the district.
- 6.12. Unemployment levels in the period 1991-2005 have declined significantly, and have fallen well below the 1991 level. Therefore the need for employment land has been reduced and there is already a significant surplus. Based on guidance in Planning Policy Wales and the clear over-supply of employment land, it is appropriate to consider the re-allocation of the Brown Lenox site for non-employment uses.
- 6.13. The Brown Lenox site is not allocated under Policy E1 of the Local Plan (allocating 240 ha of land for employment uses) that seeks to address Policy E4 of the Structure Plan by

allocating a sufficient supply of land. Consequently, a non-employment use of this site would not reduce the amount of land allocated for employment in the policy. The Brown Lenox site is allocated under Policy E4 as an existing employment site where the plan encourages re-use and redevelopment for B1 and B2 uses. The loss of the site for employment use would not affect the supply of allocated employment land to satisfy Structure Plan Policy E4. Moreover, Structure Plan Policy R6 permits the alternative use of employment sites if a land supply can be maintained and where the supply of retail land is scarce.

- 6.14. The prominent position of the Brown Lenox site, which is level and close to the town centre, makes it suitable for a range of employment uses, including office use, but historically, there has been little office development in the district. The Hirons Morgan Yapp Report (Doc CD26) indicates that the demand for office uses is unlikely to materialise due to the availability of strategically better located sites along the M4 corridor and local office rents that prevail in the Pontypridd area.
- 6.15. There is a demonstrable need for retail land at the current time and an over-supply of employment land, which indicates that the loss of the Brown Lenox site from employment use would not have an adverse impact upon the economy of the district as a whole. There are a number of sites allocated under Local Plan Policy E1 available in Pontypridd for employment/office development, including land at Upper Boat.

7. SPORTS/RECREATION USE FOR RUGBY CLUB SITE

Case for Morbaine Ltd

The material points are: -

- 7.1. Policy L4 of the Mid Glamorgan (Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough) Replacement Structure Plan 1991-2006 only permits development that would result in the discontinuance of an existing leisure facility where an alternative facility can be provided to at least an equivalent level and it can be demonstrated that its continued use as a leisure facility is no longer required. Policy r7 of the Rhondda Cynon Taff (Taff Ely) Local Plan 2003 states that proposals involving the loss of part or all of any sports grounds, play grounds etc will not be permitted except as part of a scheme which: -
 - (1) Enhances provision of the same facility in the same neighbourhood; and
 - (2) Includes acceptable proposals for future use of the existing site.
- 7.2. The Morbaine proposal has the full support of the Pontypridd Rugby Club, as confirmed in letters (Docs MOR10, MOR11). The proposed development is intended to provide the club with ability to fund a new purpose-built stadium within the Pontypridd area, and to give the club financial stability. Without such funds from the redevelopment, there is a real possibility of the loss of the club. Relocation of the Rugby Club to Ynysangharad Park is under active consideration.
- 7.3. The Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy identifies the Rugby Club site as a "key regeneration site" and envisages its possible redevelopment for residential and leisure uses. This proposal would require the relocation of the Rugby Club, and the Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy acknowledges this and refers to Ynysangharad Park as being an "appropriate home" for the club.

- 7.4. The loss of an area of land including a small equipped children's play area would be compensated by the provision of a new enhanced play area, including an equipped playground and adjoining open space on the remaining part of the current play area.

Case for Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council

The material points are: -

- 7.5. The Sardis Road site has been used as a sports ground since 1974. The Rugby Ground has been recognised as the main rugby stadium within the Borough and has hosted major club fixtures and fixtures supported by the Welsh Rugby Union. The ground was leased to the Trustees of the Pontypridd Rugby Club in 1993/94 by the former Taff Ely Borough Council in order to enable the club to undertake major ground improvements to allow the club to play at a premier level.
- 7.6. The Sardis Road ground has a capacity of 7,504 and includes covered grandstands, open terracing, car parking, 2 club houses and a floodlit rugby pitch. Whilst there are a number of rugby grounds located throughout the Borough, none are in Pontypridd and none have comparable facilities.
- 7.7. Ynysangharad Park has 2 football fields that are well used by local teams. One of the pitches is part of an open area of the cricket pitch outfield, and the other is enclosed with floodlights and a small grandstand. This is the home of Pontypridd AFC, who play Welsh League football. The park, which has limited car parking facilities, has charitable status. The football pitches were used by 10 different teams last year and this is due to increase to 16 teams in 2006.
- 7.8. The facilities at Dan y Llan Recreation Ground, Ynysangharad Park and Taff Vale Park are fully used by local teams, and there is no spare capacity to allow for increased use. Therefore, if any of these grounds were to be used as a replacement for Sardis Road, it would result in teams being displaced with very little prospect of finding an alternative sports field in the Pontypridd area.
- 7.9. Most of the Sardis Road site is held by the Pontypridd Rugby Football Club Trustees on a 99 year lease (Appendix 8, Document RCT 1a) and Rhondda Cynon Taff CBC are the freeholders. Under the terms of the lease, the permitted use is restricted to the playing of, or training for, rugby football and ancillary purposes. The lease contains an absolute restriction against assignment and a covenant against under-letting, and the Council has not consented to the release of those terms. The Council has made it clear that it has no intention of disposing of the site for retail development, and no planning application has been made for replacement facilities for the Rugby Club.

Case for Wm Morrison/Shoparama Ltd

The material points are: -

- 7.10. The speculative nature of the Morbaine proposal is demonstrated in that the landowner, the Council, does not support the development, but rather opposes it on the grounds that if the site is to be redeveloped, the new development should be leisure based. Any proposals for relocating the Rugby Club are at a very early stage. Of the possible alternative sites, there has been no formal approach to the owners of Ynysangharad Park and discussions with Glamorgan University were unsuccessful. Taff Vale Park is also suggested, but its capacity to accommodate Pontypridd Rugby Club without displacing other users is in doubt.

- 7.11. There is a clear policy objection to the loss of this recreational facility which attracts objections from the Sports Council for Wales and the Council's Parks and Amenities Officer. In the absence of replacement proposals, which would meet the requirements of development plan and national policy, it is clear that the proposals fail the test of suitability on this ground.

Case for Scarborough Development Group

The material points are: -

- 7.12. Section 10 of the Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy identifies the Rugby Club site as a development opportunity, although neither the strategy nor Morbaine Ltd positively identifies a relocation site for the Rugby Club itself. The Regeneration Strategy recommends that the most appropriate use for the site would be a mix of leisure and residential development. These uses reflect the contribution the site has made to the sporting prowess of the town and to meet long standing needs for leisure and swimming pool facilities at the riverside location. A foodstore development would fulfil none of these objectives and the illustrative layout for the Morbaine scheme would ignore the site's riverside location.

8 CASES FOR INTERESTED PERSONS

The material points are: -

- 8.1. In his evidence to the inquiry, **Mr J S Coduri** objects to the development of a 550 space multi-storey car park, needed for the Angharad Walk Scheme, at the main entrance into the Ynysangharad War Memorial Park. It is pointed out that the Morrisons development would not require such a parking facility, and the pressure of traffic in this part of the town centre would be relieved. Shoppers would have adequate access to Morrisons store via the proposed shuttle bus services, which would also provide good links from the town to the existing Brown Lenox Retail Park.
- 8.2. Mr **B Talbot** also supports the proposal to redevelop the derelict Brown Lenox site because it would bring about environmental benefits to the historical site of the old Glamorganshire Canal and remove a derelict eyesore. The proposed Morrison store development would not have a harmful impact upon Ynysangharad Park and it would benefit the economic development of the town centre of Pontypridd. He also considers that in this location next to the A470, the car parking facilities and access to the road network would complement the traffic flows in the area, and the proposed additional bus services would help alleviate traffic congestion. With regard to the Morbaine proposals, this would cause traffic problems on the one-way gyratory system.
- 8.3. In his capacity as the Secretary of the Y Celtaiddwyr Arts and Environmental Group of Pontypridd, **Mr A Carter** submits documents relating to the recent planning history of Pontypridd, the Atkins Restoration Feasibility Report on the Glamorganshire Canal at Pontypridd for the Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales, Visual Projections of the Proposed Canal Improvements and a bundle of correspondence and petitions (Document IP3). The history of the proposed Angharad Walk/Fountains Walk development has been discussed since 1983 and could go on until 2011, whereas the Morrison development would enhance the environment of Pontypridd, improve access and relieve traffic congestion in the town centre. Unlike the Angharad Walk Scheme, the Morrison development would be privately financed without the need for public subsidy. A financial contribution from the Morrison development would kickstart the canal improvement

scheme. The Glamorganshire Canal is important historically and would also attract Cadw grant aid. With regard to the Morbaine scheme, the increased traffic into a cul-de-sac situation would cause rat-running via the Graig to avoid the gyratory system. The Sardis Road site should be reserved for a leisure centre.

- 8.4. The Secretary of "PontyPride" – representing the people and taxpayers of Pontypridd, **Mr M Duxbury**, seeks schemes that would enhance and regenerate the town. Local people have watched powerless as the retail development proposals for the town centre have failed to come to fruition and adjoining centres such as Caerphilly, Merthyr Tydfil, Talbot Green and Aberdare have overtaken Pontypridd in position and reputation. The Morrison development would be a catalyst for the resurgence in importance of Pontypridd as a sub-regional retail centre. Petitions totalling 860 signatories support the plans for a family foodstore on the old Brown Lenox site. It is believed that the development would: -
- (a) Provide a food retail outlet close to the town centre, which would complement and not overwhelm the existing retail units near this site and within the town centre. It is accepted that this would be likely to lead to the collapse of the Angharad Walk Scheme, which would provide the opportunity for a more appropriate development;
 - (b) Provide a quick and easily realisable retail enhancement to the town, whereas the town centre development would be years away due to problems of land assembly;
 - (c) Help to prevent further trade leakage to Talbot Green and Merthyr Tydfil;
 - (d) Have less impact upon the town during the construction phase than development closer to the town centre, with less disruption to the traffic system and congestion;
 - (e) Provide healthy competition in food retailing within its catchment area;
 - (f) Have easy access via the A470 for communities to the north and south of Pontypridd who would otherwise travel to Tesco at Upper Boat. Many would be able to use it as they commute home from Cardiff;
 - (g) Improve a derelict brownfield site and bring it back into the local economy;
 - (h) Improve pedestrian access to the Retail Park east of the A470, which currently has dangerous road crossings at the Bridge Street roundabout;
 - (i) Provide access from the Brown Lenox roundabout from the south which would alleviate congestion at the Bridge Street roundabout and the northern route into the town centre;
 - (j) Avoid the construction of a car park on the Ynysangharad Memorial Park and reduce traffic congestion and pollution in the Bridge Street area;
 - (k) Provide a link to the National Cycle Network (Route 8 – The Taff Trail and Route 4 – The Celtic Trail) in the form of a traffic free route from the communities of Glyntaff and Rhydyfelin to the south of Pontypridd;
 - (l) Provide a safe and pleasant walking route from Glyntaff into the town centre.
- 8.5. The centre of the town is regarded as being the junction between Mill Street and Taff Street, where there are anchor stores such as W H Smith, Marks & Spencer, Woolworths and Burtons and the covered Market. This would be 425m from the proposed Morrison store and easily accessible via new ramps from the Brown Lenox roundabout. New car parking facilities at the Morrison site would also serve the users of Ynysangharad Memorial Park for public events, and funds provided by the developer would help pay for environmental and historical enhancement of the Glamorganshire Canal. This would become an attraction for visitors and a public amenity for the area.
- 8.6. **Mr R Baldwin** gave evidence that the Memorial Park had been in existence since the Great War and it was a health-giving "lung" for the people of Pontypridd. Friends of the

Park have been fighting the Sainsbury's development since 1987 as it would destroy part of the park for commercial profit. On the other hand, Morrisons would offer pensioners of Pontypridd a lot for no cost to their amenity. The Memorial Park is sacrosanct, and the people prefer the Morrison scheme, which unlike Sainsbury's, would not require grants. With additional bus services and improved pedestrian access, the Morrison development would be in a good location.

- 8.7. **Mrs M Davies** and **Mr G Davies** support the Morrison application on the grounds that the redevelopment of the Taff Vale site is taking too long and a section 106 Agreement has not yet been completed. The proposed Angharad Walk Scheme is too large in scale and it would adversely affect the inner area in terms of traffic, roads, roundabouts and conflict with pedestrians. The town centre has not attained pedestrianisation or the Angharad Walk development over recent years, and it is now in danger of losing the Rugby ground and part of Ynysangharad Park to car parking. The Park needs to be saved from the intrusion of a multi-storey car park and pollution. The Morbaine scheme would have poor access and cause traffic congestion. The Brown Lenox site should not be reserved for industry as it is needed for new shopping development. It is not too far to walk from the rest of the town and it would not take business away from the town centre if the town is developed correctly. The proposed development of the canal basin would be a vast improvement on the silted up condition.
- 8.8. **Mr L Jones** presented a plan (Doc IP6) to show how all three sites at Angharad Walk, Brown Lenox and Sardis Road should be developed in a partnership to provide good access for communities from the north, the Rhondda valley and from the south. The sites could share facilities and business. The congested town centre is not considered to be safe for pedestrians, and there should be free access for cycles to use Ynysangharad Park.
- 8.9. As Chairman of PontyPride, **Mr B Watts** represents tax-payers of Pontypridd who take an interest in the regeneration of the town. This group objects to the Morbaine proposal to develop the Pontypridd Rugby Club site. The site should be used only for leisure purposes and the proposed use for a retail store is contrary to the existing uses allowed in the Local Plan. A petition signed by 598 people is against retail development of the Rugby Club site. They are concerned about increased traffic congestion on the over-loaded Gelliwion by-pass road due to an increase in large delivery lorries and shoppers cars on the one way system. There would also be an increase in rat-running along Llanwern Road past Maesycoed Primary School where there are 350 pupils aged 3.5 to 11 years. There is congestion outside the school in the morning and afternoon and any increase in traffic would put the children at risk.
- 8.10. **Mr B Taylor** wants to see development that will enhance the town. The Morbaine store would be in a residential area and increased traffic would be added to the roundabout where the single lane on Rhondda Road causes queues. Drivers would take shortcuts through the residential area to reach Sardis Road. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Rugby Club needs help, it would be feasible to have the Rugby Club and a sports centre on the site.
- 8.11. As the manager of Shamrock Travel and a member of the Confederation for Passenger Transport for Wales, **Mr Clayton Jones** opposes both the Morrison and Morbaine proposals. He referred to 3 government reports on the Effects of Major Out of Town Retail Developments (HMSO), the Impact of Large Foodstores on Market Towns and District Centres (DoE) and Social Exclusion and the Provision and Availability of Public Transport (DoE). In his company's experience, as a public transport operator that

provides 80% of local bus services, large foodstore developments have a harmful impact upon town centre trade. The Tesco development at Upper Boat affected bus services and impacted upon the town itself. The existing Tesco store in Pontypridd closed and there are no public service links to the new Tesco store.

9. WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

The material points are: -

Re: Wm Morrison/Shoparama Development

- 9.1. Letters (5) objecting to the proposed Morrison store on the following grounds:
1. loss of privacy
 2. unsociable operating hours
 3. increase in numbers of pedestrians passing
 4. retailing not allowed on the site
 5. waste food attracting vermin
 6. existing building contains asbestos
 7. focus for congregating youths
 8. 24 hr operation deliveries causing noise and disturbance
 9. removal of trees
 10. increase in traffic
 11. out of town proposal would be in breach of planning guidance
- 9.2. An objection was received from Roger Tym & Partners on behalf of Somerfield Stores Ltd claiming:
1. the proposal is contrary to Planning Policy Wales
 2. proposal contrary to the development plan
 3. the out-of-centre location does not meet the sequential test
 4. the catchment area has been over-estimated
 5. retail expenditure has been over-estimated
 6. the retail turnover of the proposed store has been under-estimated
- 9.3. Several letters from the Y Celteiddwyr Arts and Environmental Group support the proposal on the grounds that:
1. it enjoys widespread support from the public
 2. it is the most viable option for the retail regeneration of Pontypridd
 3. it will relieve traffic congestion around the existing retail park
 4. it will encourage the reinstatement of the canal basin
 5. the scheme is likely to go ahead if permission is granted, unlike the Taff Vale Shopping Centre scheme
 6. Petitions submitted by over 800 local people.

Re: Morbaine Proposal

- 9.4. Sustrans express concern that the Morbaine development would have the potential to generate significant levels of traffic. Efforts need to be made therefore to accommodate cyclists, pedestrians and public transport. The site needs direct access and through routes for pedestrians and cyclists from Maesycoed Road, Pwllgwaun Road and Seatons Place along the riverside route. The Sports Council for Wales object to the proposal, which would result in the loss of the Rugby Football Ground without any alternative facility being proposed.

- 9.5. The Pontypridd Town Council objects to the proposal on the grounds that the Rugby Football Club site should be used for leisure and sports facilities only. A petition of 568 signatures objects to the proposed development of the Rugby Club and some 204 letters of objection are submitted on the following grounds:
1. considerable extra traffic would be generated in an area that is unable to cope with existing traffic levels
 2. it would further harm the town centre of Pontypridd
 3. its design would detract from privacy
 4. removal of the park would reduce play and leisure facilities in Pwllgwaun
 5. property values would reduce while the directors of Pontypridd Rugby Club would benefit
- 9.6. Other letters add the following objections:
1. the site is owned by Rhondda Cynon Taff and should not be sold for a supermarket
 2. the roads in Pwllgwaun are too narrow to cope with increased traffic
 3. 24 hr opening would increase noise and disturbance from lorry deliveries
 4. loss of children's park and play area
 5. loss of the site to Pontypridd and the Rhondda Cynon Taff Valleys Community as a whole
 6. loss of rugby heritage that put Pontypridd on the sporting map
 7. economic and social benefits would be lost
 8. adverse impact upon the town centre
 9. Pontypridd lacks sporting facilities not supermarkets
 10. light pollution
 11. increase in dust, litter and odours
 12. loss of trees and bushes, reducing local wildlife habitat
 13. affects pedestrian access to local school
 14. Maesycod is losing its character as a pleasant residential area
 15. no need for another foodstore
 16. extra traffic would detract from pedestrian safety, especially school children
 17. a new supermarket results in job losses elsewhere
 18. the Traffic Assessment contains serious omissions
 19. loss of privacy and safety.
- 9.7. A letter from Roger Tym & Partners, Planning Consultants, on behalf of Somerfield Stores Ltd raises objections:
1. The proposal is contrary to Planning Policy Wales and the development plan because there is no need for the development, the sequential approach to site selection has not been properly undertaken, which would have an impact on the vitality, viability and attractiveness of the town centre.
 2. The appellants have assumed an unrealistically wide catchment area for the store, which overlaps with those of other foodstores and commitments. Therefore the appellants have over-estimated the expenditure available to support this proposal.
 3. The appellants have assumed an unrealistically low gross to net floorspace ratio for the proposed store. The retail floorspace would be much larger and the turnover of the store much greater.

4. In estimating the convenience goods turnover of commitments, the appellants have omitted the foodstore proposed for the Porth Bus Depot Site, although Porth is included within their catchment area.
5. The effect of existing stores and commitments on available expenditure has been under-estimated. As a result there would be much less available expenditure to support the proposed store.
6. The appellants have under-estimated the impact of the proposal on the existing town centre and stores. Consequently, planning permission should be refused.

10. CONDITIONS AND OBLIGATIONS

- 10.1. Lists of suggested conditions that might be applied in the event of planning permission being granted and agreements under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 were discussed with all parties during the inquiry.

Agreements/Undertakings by Morrison/Shoparama

- 10.2. The applicants have submitted signed agreements with Rhondda Cynon Taff CBC (Doc G3) and with the local bus company Shamrock Travel (Doc G5). Under the section 106 agreement of 22/12/05 with the Council, the developer would contribute to the Council towards the implementation of an environmental improvement scheme for the Glamorganshire Canal, to fund the ongoing maintenance of proposed traffic signal crossings and to fund a piece of public art to be located within Pontypridd. The developer also undertakes to use reasonable endeavours to obtain consent for and provide a footpath through Ynysangharad Park and to fund the ongoing maintenance of the new footpath. The agreement would also secure the diversion of the existing bus service Nos 10, 13, 15 and 19 to the site and the provision of a new bus service 1A through the site at the same frequency.
- 10.3. In a separate agreement with Shamrock Travel (Doc G5), the current bus services 10, 13, 15 and 19 would be diverted through the Brown Lenox site and a new bus service 1A would be provided from the town centre to the site connecting to the bus and railway stations. These services would be maintained for a minimum period of 3 years for an annual sum of £25,000.

Agreements/Undertakings by Morbaine Ltd

- 10.4. Under a section 106 unilateral undertaking to the Council, Pontypridd Rugby Football Club together with their Trustees and Morbaine Ltd agree to ensure that Shamrock Travel bus services 14 and 24 would be diverted through the Sardis Road site and that a new bus service 1A would be provided to connect the site to the town centre, bus station and railway station. The bus services would be operated for a minimum period of 3 years at the existing frequency and they would be reviewed annually with the Council to minimise any over-provision. In a separate agreement with Shamrock Travel, Morbaine Ltd and the bus company agree to the provision of bus services 1, 14 and 24 to the site for an annual sum for a minimum of 3 years.
- 10.5. An amended unilateral agreement of 16/02/06 has since been received from Morbaine Ltd (Doc G9). The new agreement binds the developer as well as the Rugby Club and its Trustees to provide the bus services and to contribute £50,000 towards a piece of public art in accordance with Policy en60 of the Rhondda Cynon Taff (Taff Ely) Local Plan, June 2003.

Conditions – Morrison/Brown Lenox Scheme

10.6. The list of 20 suggested conditions relating to the Morrison application (Doc G7) are agreed with the Council (subject to the slight amendments marked in blue ink). The standard conditions regarding time limits and the approval of reserved matters apply to this outline application. Additional conditions would control the size of net sales floor area, landscaping, levels of floors and access ways, drainage scheme, operational hours for building work, contamination, wheel cleansing of construction vehicles, schemes for the Brown Lenox and Bridge Street roundabout improvements and pedestrian crossings, parking layout, gates and barriers, car park management system, external signs and lighting, internal roads, turning areas and retaining walls, pedestrian barriers, sound attenuation and a Travel Plan.

10.7. Whilst these conditions are accepted in principle by Morrisons, they have reservations as follows: -

Condition 7 - construction operating times of 0700–1800 Monday to Friday and 0700–1300 on Saturdays would be preferred by the developers.

Condition 10 - it is not considered necessary to install 3 “puffin crossings” for the proposed scheme.

Condition 13 - is not considered to be necessary at all as there is no intention to install gates or barriers because it would be necessary to keep the road open as a through route across the site.

The Council would prefer to restrict construction times to an 0800 hrs start in this partly residential area, and they understood that Morrisons had agreed to provide the “puffin crossings”.

Morbaine Ltd consider that, as the Morrison development would add more traffic to Rhondda Road at the gyratory, they should contribute to improvements to that part of the road system.

Conditions – Morbaine/Sardis Road Scheme

10.8. A list of 23 conditions is submitted by the Council in respect of the Morbaine development (Doc G8). These cover standard outline conditions and similar matters to those above. There are additional requirements regarding the signalisation of slip roads at the Broadway and Bridge Street roundabouts, installation of replacement “puffin crossings” and MOVA controls and improvement of the riverside footpath adjacent to the development site. Draft conditions 17, 18 and 19 aim to protect trees and woodland areas and the control of Japanese Knotweed, and No 20 would require a habitat and species survey of the site. Condition 22 would require the submission of a scheme for the provision of alternative facilities for the playing of rugby football, which would be capable of beneficial occupation. In addition, the Council requires the appellants to enter into a Highways Agreement to secure the highway works set out in conditions 10 and 11, and to enter into section 106 to provide funds for the ongoing maintenance of new traffic light controlled junctions as part of the development.

10.9. The appellants agree the reserved matters conditions and others subject to the following comments:

Condition 10 – should read “Development shall not be brought into beneficial use until details...” rather than the wording submitted.

Condition 14 – this should only deal with lighting, as signage is under separate planning control.

Condition 16 – the words “...by a certified professional engineer” should be deleted.

Condition 20 – whilst there has been no evidence during the inquiry about habitats and species on the site, there is no objection to the requirement to carry out a survey.

Condition 22 – it is considered that this “condition precedent” would be enforceable and appropriate, and it would meet the policy requirement to safeguard existing recreational facilities. On the question of whether it is right to impose a Grampian condition where there is no prospect of fulfilling its requirements, the House of Lords judgement in *British Railways Board v SSE et al 1994[JPL]34* is referred to. It is considered that the condition can be fulfilled.

- 10.10. The Council agrees to the suggested amendment to condition 16, but prefers to retain the wording of conditions 10 and 14 because this is an outline application and there may be signs of a directional type needed as part of the development. With regard to condition 22, *British Railways Board v SSE* is the leading case on this point. However, where there is uncertainty about fulfilment of the condition and the reasonable prospect of achieving its aims, Welsh Assembly Government have turned them down in the past. The consideration is which of the two schemes has the better prospect of implementation. If Morbaine is approved, there could be an approval for a major foodstore hanging around beyond the five year time limit. The Morbaine proposal does not come close to fulfilling the condition or meeting the Local Plan policy.
- 10.11. In Morrison’s view, the *British Railways Board* judgement only decides that the local planning authority has the powers to use such a condition, but it is the clear policy of the Welsh Assembly Government not to impose such conditions in cases where there is no prospect of fulfilment. It could result in an unimplementable planning permission hanging around for more than 5 years, thus preventing progress in the area. Condition 22 fails to meet the requirements of Local Plan Policy r7 and it is not specific enough in terms of the actual requirements to provide a rugby field.
- 10.12. The appellants maintain that condition 22 requires the provision of a rugby ground that would have local planning authority approval. Accordingly, it would have to meet the policy requirements. The condition contains the protection that the Council has decided it needs in this case.

11. CONCLUSIONS¹

Retail Need

- 11.1. Both national and local planning policy aims to protect existing town centres from large out of town retail development that is not justified in terms of quantitative or qualitative need and its location in terms of accessibility and linkages to the existing shopping centre^{3.1-3.4}. Large scale shopping development that does not meet these tests satisfactorily would be likely to have a harmful impact on the future economic viability and attractiveness of the town centre.
- 11.2. The guidelines and criteria for large scale retail developments are set out in Planning Policy Wales – March 2002, Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement 02/2005 - Planning for Retailing and Town Centres (November 2005), TAN 4, TAN 18, Structure Plan Policy (Doc CD8) and Local Plan Policy (Doc CD9). The policy position of the Government and the local planning authority is clearly set out in section 3 above, and does not need to be repeated here. In order to assess the acceptability of the proposed developments, I consider it necessary to examine the catchment area, the available retail capacity for additional convenience goods floorspace in that area and the likely impact on the town centre, which in this case are matters that would be virtually identical for both proposals. Where the Morrison and Morbaine proposals differ from each other with regard to existing land use, accessibility by various modes of transport, including cycling and walking, and their locations in a sequential analysis of sites, and I shall deal with those matters later on in my conclusions.

Catchment Area

- 11.3. The parties supporting the case for another foodstore, i.e. Morrison, Morbaine and RCTCBC, base their retail capacity assessments on a “primary catchment area” comprising Zones 1-3, which is a postcode based configuration^{4.6}. This area is also loosely based on a 10 minute drive time and it extends from the Treorchy/Treherbert area of the Rhondda Valley and Mountain Ash in the north to Taffs Well, Tongwynlais and the M4 near Radyr and Llanishen in the south. It also includes the new Tesco store at Upper Boat, which has a planned extension, and 3 other planned stores: Asda at Tonypandy, Tesco at Porth and Sainsbury’s at Pontypridd^{4.6(Doc WMS7 App CC1, Plans CC1 & CC2)}. The boundary of the primary catchment area includes populated areas and communities close to the larger settlements of Aberdare and Merthyr Tydfil in the north, which have major foodstores in place, Ystrad Mynach and Caerphilly in the east and the existing large stores at Llanishen, Thornhill and North Cardiff in the south.
- 11.4. The Council accepts that the southern boundary of the catchment zones ought to cross the A470 trunk road at a point somewhere between Tesco, Upper Boat and the existing North Cardiff stores. Such a revised area would exclude Taffs Well (pop. 3,500) and Tongwynlais (pop. 2,500) totalling £8.2m in annual expenditure^{4.56}. However, this would still leave Tesco, Upper Boat, and its planned extension within the catchment area of the proposed Pontypridd stores.
- 11.5. I note that an earlier assessment (August 2003) by the Council’s consultants Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners^{Doc CD12} defined a catchment area (study area) for retail assessment of

¹ The superscript numbers refer to previous paragraphs in the cases and documents containing source material

the whole borough with a southern boundary falling well short of the M4 and North Cardiff. This also identified a primary catchment area for Pontypridd (Zone 3) which had a population of 50,800 in 2003 and, with a 10% inflow from other zones based on a household survey, a total convenience goods expenditure of £86.69m (£111.15m at 2006). These figures contrast markedly with the Morrison assessment by Peacock & Smith^{Doc CD25}, which suggests a population for the catchment area of Zones 1-3 of 160,128 in 2001 declining to 154,154 in 2009, and revised assessments of £208.34m (Morrison), £208.40m (Morbaine) or £208.50m (RCT) total available convenience goods expenditure in the catchment at 2009^{4,8,4.38,4.63}.

- 11.6. The rationale behind the catchment area of Zones 1-3 is explained by the Council^{4.56} in terms of trade retention and claw-back. It is argued that a smaller catchment, as preferred by the Scarborough Development Group^{4.79, Doc SB6, Appendix 2}, would rely on the retention of all its available expenditure, with no account taken of trade draw or leakage across its theoretical boundaries, whereas Peacock & Smith and Barris Liptrott Associates on behalf of the main parties have looked at a more regional area which has retail development commitments and overlapping zones of influence. Whilst it is claimed that the primary catchment area has been defined having regard to the relative strength and location of established nearby shopping centres and other major food shopping facilities^{Doc CD34}, other spheres of influence do not appear to be accurately reflected in the boundaries of the area.
- 11.7. The identification of a reasonably accurate catchment is at the heart of the retail capacity assessment for the proposed stores. The use of too large a catchment would throw up excessive expenditure levels that could lead to an over-provision of retail floorspace outside the town centre, with consequent harm caused to existing centres, commitments and stores. In my view, it is unrealistic to anticipate that the primary catchment area of either of the proposed new foodstores outside Pontypridd would include populations in fairly close proximity to North Cardiff, Aberdare and Merthyr Tydfil and the natural catchments of Asda at Tonypany and Tesco at Porth.
- 11.8. The clear purpose of expanding the primary and secondary (includes Zones 4-7) catchment area for Pontypridd is to make an allowance in the calculations for trade claw-back from the surrounding areas, particularly where existing foodstores are trading beyond their benchmark turnover. This process assumes that a higher proportion than existing of expenditure in Zones 1-3 would be retained for the proposed store and that, based on the sample household survey, a significant percentage of convenience goods expenditure would be attracted from elsewhere in the region.
- 11.9. However, my view that the chosen primary catchment area is too large is confirmed by the Council and Morrison conceding that areas to the north and south of Pontypridd could be excluded from it. As already mentioned, it is accepted that the catchment should exclude the settlements closest to the M4 corridor, and Morrison accepts that the catchment area of Asda in Aberdare would in reality fall halfway between Asda and Pontypridd^{4.7}. It is clear to me therefore that Zone 1 extends too far north and south of Pontypridd, where the local populations of these areas would generate some £23m convenience goods expenditure that is currently attracted to stores in North Cardiff, Aberdare and Merthyr Tydfil.
- 11.10. To the west of Pontypridd, in Zone 2 of the primary catchment area, a new Tesco store is planned at Porth and trade gravitates to the existing stores at Talbot Green and Tonyrefail. Surveys show that very few shoppers go to Pontypridd now and it seems unlikely that they would drive past the existing and planned stores to visit Pontypridd in future. At present, only 1% of food shoppers from Zone 3 (Upper Rhondda) use Tesco at Upper Boat as they

are more attracted to Tonypany and Talbot Green. There is a new Asda planned at Tonypany and a Tesco at Porth, and shoppers would have to pass these to reach either of the proposed stores at Pontypridd. In view of these difficulties, I conclude that the assumed primary catchment area (Zones 1-3) for both proposals is unrealistic.

- 11.11. Consequently, I find that the assessments of retail capacity carried out for the two parties and RCT are flawed by the use of an over-ambitious catchment area. In view of the overlapping catchment areas and the strength of trade draw to surrounding shopping centres and major stores, I consider the primary catchment area defined by the parties for their respective proposals and endorsed by the Council to be unjustifiably large.

Quantitative Analysis

- 11.12. It can be seen that the main parties' retail assessments are highly vulnerable to any reduction in the size of the primary catchment area. Both of the food stores proposed by Morrisons and Morbaine are of identical floorspace and it is estimated that each would have a turnover of around £33m^{4.40,4.59,4.63} in 2009. Morrison estimates the retail capacity of the catchment in 2009, after deducting commitments, to be £20.6m^{4.15,4.16}, whilst Morbaine forecasts that it would be £18.4m^{4.41,4.42}. Reductions in the catchment area of the proposed stores of the order discussed above would more than eliminate the projected surplus retail capacity for 2009.
- 11.13. In the Council's analysis^{4.57-4.60} the net convenience goods floorspace of all the committed foodstore developments, including Sainsbury's at Angharad Walk, has been pared down from earlier estimates in order to reduce the total turnover in the catchment and therefore to increase the overall retail capacity. Even so, it is clear that there is insufficient capacity for the proposed Morrison store plus the existing planned commitments (totalling £119.6m)^{4.63}, as the surplus retail capacity expenditure is forecast to be only £108.5m in 2009.
- 11.14. Although an outflow of 10% is allowed for in the calculations^{WMS6, Table B}, it is difficult to agree with the Morrison prediction that 90% of convenience goods spending would be retained in Zones 1-3. It seems likely that the predicted levels of trade inflow would be more than matched by outflow in the catchment as defined, particularly having regard to the proximity of the North Cardiff stores and the likely levels of daily commuting taking place.
- 11.15. In addition, there is a discrepancy between the evidence of Council^{Doc RCT1a, App 4} and the objectors SDG^{Doc SB9} about the net floorspace of the existing and proposed extension of Tesco at Upper Boat. It was accepted by the applicants that the turnover of the Tesco store would increase by £2.5m, thereby leaving a total retail capacity of £18.1m by 2009^{Doc WMS38, para 3.07}, which has not been taken into account by the Council. If this additional floorspace is included, it would give a greater shortfall in the available turnover in the catchment area for either of the proposed stores.
- 11.16. The main parties express some doubt about the likelihood of the Sainsbury's store proceeding at Angharad Walk^{4.20, 4.48, 4.66}, but the development has planning approval and documentary evidence demonstrates Sainsbury's commitment through an agreement with the landowner^{Doc SB8}, the terms of which would only cease to apply in the event that either of the proposed superstores were to receive planning permission. Moreover, the approved development complies with the Pontypridd Town Centre Regeneration Strategy^{Doc CD11} and it is consistent with Policy s1 of the Rhondda Cynon Taff (Taff Ely Local Plan) 2003^{Doc}

CD⁹. Accordingly, the Angharad Walk development is a firm planned commitment, and as such it effectively soaks up any surplus retail capacity for this area.

- 11.17. Taking these factors into account, particularly the existing development commitments, I conclude that neither Morrison nor Morbaine has demonstrated that there would exist a quantitative retail need for the proposed developments, in terms of there being a sufficient quantity of surplus expenditure in the relevant catchment area.

Qualitative Need

- 11.18. As explained in MIPPS on Planning for Retailing and Town Centres December 2005, *where need is a consideration precedence should be accorded to establishing the quantitative need* for the proposed retail development, and the note goes on to say that *it will be for the decision-maker to determine and justify the weight to be given to any qualitative assessment*. This guidance is similar to the earlier Assembly Government clarification of Retailing and Town Centre Policy of December 2003 which stated that although need is both quantifiable and qualitative, *precedence should be accorded to establishing the quantitative need for both convenience and comparison floorspace, particularly as a basis for UDP allocations, before qualitative factors are brought into play*.
- 11.19. Both main parties and the Council express a qualitative need for another large foodstore in terms of providing for greater choice and convenience for bulk food shoppers in the Pontypridd area^{4.17,4.18,4.43,4.64,4.65}. Both developers and the Council claim that the proposed Sainsbury's store in Angharad Walk would not meet the quantified need fully^{4.21,4.49,4.65} and, as the approved foodstore would lack good access and parking^{4.20-21, 4.66}, there would still exist a qualitative need for one large store of the type proposed. However, it is an inevitable consequence of redevelopment in the town centre that the approved store will not have direct access from the A470T intersection and the location of the car parking access and layout will add more traffic to the existing congestion.
- 11.20. There is evidence that if either of the proposed stores were to proceed the Angharad Walk site would not be developed by Sainsbury's, who would pull out of their contract with Fountains Walk Ltd, and there is correspondence from Asda^{Doc SB15} to the effect that whilst they would also be interested in developing the site, it would not be viable if planning approval were granted for either of the proposed out of town foodstores. Unlike Asda, Sainsbury's have invested a considerable amount of money and effort to produce a workable scheme for the redevelopment of the Taff Vale Precinct, and they appear to be fully committed to its implementation.
- 11.21. With the new Sainsbury's store in place, and with easy car access to the enlarged Tesco at Upper Boat, Pontypridd would be well-served with facilities for bulk food shopping. The future implementation of the whole Angharad Walk Scheme, as envisaged in the development plan and the Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy, would provide strong pedestrian linkages with the rest of the town centre and public transport facilities. It would provide a major boost to the local economy and provide choice and variety of retail outlets. This, together with the new developments at Porth (Tesco 2743 sq m net sales), Tonypany (Asda 2787 sq m net sales) and Porth (Lidl 1000 sq m net sales), would improve the existing retail offer and meet the qualitative shopping needs of Pontypridd and the Rhondda Valley.
- 11.22. It is clear that the proposed developments would not meet the qualitative factors set out in paragraph 10.2.10 of PPW. The proposed further provision of retail stores at either site

would not be justified in terms of their accessibility by walking, cycling or public transport, over and above the existing town centre site; the proposed stores would not reduce the need to make car journeys, because they would be located too far from town centre facilities; and although the Morrison store would be close to the existing Brown Lenox Retail Park, it would not contribute to the co-location of facilities in the town centre. I conclude therefore that there is neither a quantitative nor a qualitative need for another large foodstore on the outskirts of the town.

Sequential Assessment of Sites

- 11.23. In the main parties' sequential analysis of available sites for large scale retail development^{Doc WMS19(p.80), 4.45,4.67} the inevitable comparison is made between the out of centre Morrison and Morbaine sites and the town centre Angharad Walk site. The Statement of Common Ground between the main parties and the Council^{Doc CD56} sets out the agreed position that there are no other town centre sites capable of accommodating a modern foodstore with a net sales floorspace in excess of 2,500 sq m. No alternative sites to Angharad Walk in the town centre are put forward by any party and there do not appear to be any suitable sites on the edge of the town centre.
- 11.24. As PPW states (para 10.2.10), if there is no need for further development for retail uses (as in this case), there will be no need to identify additional sites. The sequential test is set out in MIPPS 2005 and paragraph 10.2.11 of PPW. The first preference is for town centre locations where sites or buildings are available, followed by edge of centre sites, then by district and local centres, and only then by out-of-centre sites that are accessible by a choice of means of transport. As the onus is on intending developers to show that all town centre options have been thoroughly assessed (10.3.2) and that an innovative and flexible approach has been taken format scale and design of the development to fit the local circumstances (10.3.3), it is unacceptable to dismiss the Angharad Walk site simply because it is more difficult to develop than a large out-of-centre site.
- 11.25. Clearly however, the Taff Vale Precinct site (Angharad Walk) is an available site for a large foodstore, which meets all the criteria for sequential selection, being a preferred town centre site. As I have already concluded that there is not a proven need for additional large scale convenience goods floorspace, and the committed Sainsbury's scheme already meets the identified surplus retail capacity for the Pontypridd catchment area, it follows that in my opinion the Morrison and Morbaine proposals do not meet the sequential test for site selection.
- 11.26. The evidence indicates that the Angharad Walk site would not be developed as approved if either of the proposed developments is allowed to proceed. The main parties claim that, for various reasons, the Angharad Walk site is not ideal for a large bulk foodstore and it should be discounted in the sequential analysis. However, in my view this remains a town centre opportunity to meet the retail requirements of Pontypridd. The approved siting of the multi-storey car park across the river from the shop units places it closer to the main road system and the Bridge Street interchange for easier access on the edge of the town centre. Whilst there may be some delays due to land assembly, this is conjecture by the main parties promoting their own sites rather than specific matters to be considered at this stage. In this regard therefore, I take the view that the promoters of the additional retail sites have failed to carry out a proper sequential test.

Retail Impact

- 11.27. The likely impact of the proposed developments on existing town centres also depends heavily on the retail capacity assessment for the catchment area. Clearly, the provision of a large superstore on the outskirts of the town centre in a situation where there is little or no proven quantitative need for the floorspace would have a greater impact in terms of trade diversion.
- 11.28. Although those promoting the developments claim that the main trade diversion to a new store would be in the form of claw back from other large stores outside town centres^{4.31-32, 4.52, 4.72-74}, it is also accepted that they would divert trade from the town centre of Pontypridd^{4.27-29} with a 21.35% impact on convenience goods retailing there and a 20.49% impact on the planned Sainsbury's store. It is also claimed by Morbaine that the largest impact would be on the new foodstore in Angharad Walk which would feel a fall in trade from £30.3m to £24.7m and there would be reductions in trade for other convenience stores from £21.6m to £19.7m in total^{4.53-55}. The impact on out of centre stores in Pontypridd catchment area is estimated to be a 25% reduction in turnover from £37.4m to £28.1m, which is considered to be a positive effect because the viability of such stores is not a material consideration.
- 11.29. These levels of trade diversion are calculated on the basis of there being a larger trade surplus in the catchment area than would actually exist if a more realistic, smaller catchment area boundary were adopted. In those circumstances the impact of the proposed out-of-centre foodstores would be somewhat greater on the existing town centre.
- 11.30. Whilst the vacancy rate for retail units in Pontypridd is currently below the national average, the town clearly has a relatively poor economic image in terms of investment yields^{4.90} and retail rents, which have declined and stagnated since 1990^{4.91}. The figures on trade diversion indicate that either of the proposed developments would undermine the trading conditions in the town centre and, in quantitative terms, convenience trade in the town would be significantly weakened. Bearing in mind that there are some serious reservations about the convenience spending capacity of the recently defined catchment area of Pontypridd, I conclude that the impact of another large food shopping development outside the town could have serious implications for the future economic well-being of the town, particularly if one of the consequences was to render the Sainsbury's development unviable in the town centre.
- 11.31. I conclude therefore that contrary to the guidance in PPW and the Structure Plan and Local Plan policies, the developments proposed outside the town centre would have a harmful impact upon the shopping vitality and viability of the Pontypridd town centre.

Accessibility

- 11.32. As existing, access to both sites would be largely by private car, or alternatively by cycle and foot. There are no convenient bus services to either site at present, and both the bus and railway stations are too far away for people to walk to the proposed store entrances. There is no doubt that foodstores attract large numbers of car trips wherever they are located. Bearing in mind that the development of a new superstore does not significantly increase overall traffic volumes on the highway network, it is assumed that 95% of trips to a new store are trips that are already on the network, but in a different location^{5.7-5.8}. Both proposed developments, of the same net sales area, would generate similar levels of traffic, but the locations are quite different.
- 11.33. Whereas the highway network in the vicinity of the proposed Morrison store on the Brown Lenox site would be capable of accommodating the likely volume of traffic generated by

the proposed development^{5.10, Doc CD61}, the Morbaine development is totally dependent on the Sardis Road gyratory for access to the site. As claimed by objectors^{5.11,8.2,8.3,8.10}, this would add considerably to existing congestion, which will be made worse when the Angharad Walk development takes place.

- 11.34. Although mitigation measures would be undertaken as part of the development^{5.19-5.21} to improve the traffic flows on all sides of the gyratory, the fact that all the traffic would need to enter and leave the system via Sardis Road would be bound to lead to some queuing and congestion at peak times on other parts of the network, if not on Rhondda Road. Consequently, I consider that the Morbaine site is less appropriately located than the Morrison scheme for the proposed development in terms of the traffic difficulties likely to be generated.
- 11.35. Compared to the approved town centre redevelopment at Angharad Walk, both proposals would have poor access by modes of transport other than the car^{5.36-5.40} and walking distances from both sites to the primary shopping streets of Pontypridd are considerable in distance. Whilst bus services would be extended and provided through agreements with the local bus company^{5.5,5.25, Docs G5, G6}, the success of these routes in the long term is unknown. Surveys by Morrison show that over 3000 people walked between the Brown Lenox Retail Park and the town centre over a 7 day period in July 2005^{5.3}. However, compared to the Angharad Walk scheme, there would be far less likelihood of those visiting the proposed stores making linked trips to Pontypridd town centre by modes of transport other than the private car.
- 11.36. There is a distinct risk in my view that the sites would have rather poor accessibility by a realistic choice of means of transport within the catchment area they seek to serve. Apart from the artificial boost of subsidised bus services to both sites, there is a danger that either one of these developments could seriously harm convenience goods retailing in the town centre, where accessibility by all forms of transport is very good. Mitigation measures to improve pedestrian routes and bus services are not as certain as the benefits of a town centre location. Consequently, I conclude that the proposals would have poor pedestrian linkages with the town centre and they would be likely to lead to an increase in overall car use within the catchment area.

Employment Land

- 11.37. As the Council points out^{6.13}, the Brown Lenox site is not allocated for employment uses under Local Plan Policy e1, but it is included in Policy e4 as an existing employment site. It should be borne in mind that at the time the Local Plan was in preparation the application site was still in industrial use by Brown Lenox, and therefore was not included in the 240 ha land bank supply of employment sites to meet Structure Plan requirements. In the circumstances, it is axiomatic to state that the loss this site would not affect the supply of allocated employment land. Local Plan Policy e4 simply lists existing employment sites, including the Brown Lenox site, and allows improvements, redevelopments, extensions, conversions and infill development within Classes B1 and B2.
- 11.38. The prominent position of the Brown Lenox site on the A470T is acknowledged by the Council^{6.14}, also referring to its level surface and proximity to the town that makes it suitable for a range of employment uses, including offices. There is a vast amount of Policy e1 land – business and industrial land allocations, but no indication as to the suitability, availability, quality or prestigious nature of the listed sites.

- 11.39. Although unemployment levels have declined in the period up to 2005^{6.12} and there is now less need for the retention of employment land, it seems to me that the Brown Lenox site has qualities of good access from the A470T close to the M4 corridor, a prominent location and attractive surroundings that may not be attributes of many of the sites in the industrial land bank. The applicants claim that it would not attract a manufacturing, distribution or office use in this sector of South Wales^{6.2-6.7}, but this conclusion has not been tested by offering the property for sale on the open market^{6.3}.
- 11.40. It is clear that the site was marketed only for retail development in 2000 and not for industrial or other employment uses. The applicants point out that there is a 34 year supply of available land for employment development in Rhondda Cynon Taff at the current rate of take up^{6.9}, but I consider that this site would be likely to prove to be one of the most attractive for more prestigious employment uses. As it has not been tested at all in the market, I do not accept what can only be described as conjecture that there is no demand for this particular site. Consequently, for the reasons already given above, I do not accept the Council's view^{6.15} that there is a demonstrable need for additional retail land that overrides the need for employment land, because there is an over-supply of employment land in the borough. Therefore, in my view the current supply of available employment land in the area does not of itself justify the release of the Brown Lenox site for retail development.

Leisure/Sports Use of Rugby Club Site

- 11.41. The Sardis Road site is not allocated for retail use. On the contrary, the development plan position is that new development that would replace an existing leisure facility is only allowed under Policy L4 of the Structure Plan and Local Plan Policy r7 where an alternative facility can be provided that would enhance the provision of the same facility in the same neighbourhood and the proposals for the future use of the existing site are also acceptable^{7.1}.
- 11.42. Therefore, there is a policy presumption against the proposed retail use of the site unless an alternative site is found for the Pontypridd Rugby Club. In order to satisfy the policy requirements, the replacement pitch would have to provide enhanced facilities for the club and spectators in the same vicinity. Whilst the developers have actively sought new premises for the Rugby Club^{7.2, Docs MOR10+11}, there are no firm proposals and the Council does not consider the alternative locations to be acceptable^{7.7-7.8} for various reasons.
- 11.43. The current problems of the Rugby Club are recognised by the Council in the Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy Final Report^{Doc CD11}, which identifies the site as a "key regeneration site" in the town centre. This envisages the Rugby Club's relocation to Ynysangharad Park, described as an "appropriate home" for the club, and the redevelopment of the site for leisure and housing uses^{7.3,CD11}. Sketch plan 6051/10 for a new stadium in the park has been submitted to the Inquiry^{Doc MOR7, Appendix B}, but the Council is concerned about the loss of existing football pitch facilities^{7.7}.
- 11.44. I consider that it is important to the cultural and sporting heritage of the town that an acceptable alternative site for the Pontypridd Rugby Club should be made available before redevelopment of the Sardis Road site could be allowed to proceed in any form. In my view this means that the relocated site should be somewhere within the town; it should be genuinely available and capable of accommodating all the necessary elements of the Rugby Club without displacing other existing sporting facilities or pitches; and its development should have the agreement of the landowners and planning permission from

the Council. I do not consider that a “Grampian” type of condition, as suggested in this instance^{10.8-10.11}, would be sufficient to ensure that these requirements could be met.

- 11.45. As the Council is already promoting leisure and residential development on the site, the proposed large scale retail development on land situated between housing areas and the riverside is not considered to be acceptable in the terms of Policy r7. As freeholder of the Rugby ground, which is most of the appeal site, the Council is in a position to ensure that the preferred uses in the Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy are implemented and that the future of the Rugby Club is safeguarded. Apart from match days, this site is a tranquil area in a predominantly residential part of the town, surrounded by well treed banks and the riverside footpath. This section of Sardis Road appears to be a fairly quiet backwater to the town centre, and the proposed development would introduce significant levels of traffic and disturbance to the surrounding area.
- 11.46. Accordingly, as the future relocation of the Rugby Club is not yet secured or agreed, and the proposed large foodstore use is not compatible with the proposed uses for this site in the regeneration strategy for the town centre, I conclude that the development would be unacceptable in land use terms.

Signed Agreements

- 11.47. I have considered the submitted section 106 agreements and draft planning conditions set out in Documents G3-G8, relative to each proposal. The agreements would be essential in securing off-site highway works and extended bus services to each site.
- 11.48. Morrison’s signed section 106 agreement with the Council (Doc G3) binds the developer to contributing to a future canal restoration scheme. Whilst this is not directly related to the proposed retail development, the site currently impinges directly onto the former canal and its towpath, and its upgrading would provide an amenity area for the town and improved access for pedestrians and cyclists into the Morrison food store site. The provision of a piece of public art as part of a major development is required under Local Plan Policy EN60^{3.4}.
- 11.49. However, there is far less certainty that the agreement would deliver a new footpath from the Morrison site through Ynysangharad Park to the town centre. The link from the Park to the Brown Lenox site would require new ramped access due to the change in levels, and the whole route depends on consent from the Park Trustees. As this route would be the most direct link from the site to the primary shopping area of the town centre, failure to implement it would adversely affect the accessibility of the proposed development in terms of pedestrian linkages with the town centre.

Morrison Scheme Conditions

- 11.50. Should the Assembly Government be minded to determine in favour of either development, I consider that the conditions set out, as discussed in section 10, are appropriate and necessary to secure and control the details of these outline proposals. Where the Council and the applicants disagree over certain conditions, I recommend as follows:

Condition 7 – although this is partly a residential area on the north side of the canal, the site is a large industrial complex which would have good access from the A470, and therefore the earlier start for construction operating time of 0700hrs from Monday to Saturday should be included in the condition.

Condition 10 – Morrison had agreed to provide the “puffin crossings” as part of their proposals in the Traffic Assessment, and they are considered essential to provide for safe and convenient access to the town centre.

Condition 13 – although the applicants do not intend to close the access road with gates or barriers, the condition as written would safeguard the future use of the through road, regardless of land ownership, and as such it should be retained.

Morbaine Conditions

11.51. The Council’s list of 23 conditions relevant to the Morbaine outline planning application (Doc G8) is largely agreed and I consider them to be necessary to control the details of the scheme. Where these are disputed by the appellants, I find as follows:

Condition 10 – the wording of the draft condition is appropriate for an outline application and should be retained.

Condition 14 – it is reasonable and necessary for the local planning authority to retain control over the type and form of signs as well as lighting throughout the development site. Although separate consent would be required for advertisements, there would be many directional signs throughout the development. Therefore the original wording should be retained.

Condition 16 – the Council agrees that it is not necessary to require the works to be “certified by a professional engineer”, and accordingly the condition should be amended.

Condition 20 – This is not objected to by the parties, but there is no evidence that particular species or habitats exist, or may possibly exist on the application site. Therefore this condition is not considered to be either necessary or relevant to the proposals.

Condition 22 – as mentioned above in paragraph 11.44, the suggested “Grampian style” condition would not meet the requirements of the Local Plan Policy r7, that planning permission should not be granted before a suitable alternative site for a replacement sports facility has been found and secured. The policy is worded in a way that means that the alternative facilities have to be readily available as part of the proposed scheme. The suggested condition would not achieve this, although it would prevent the development proceeding until a replacement facility has been secured. However, meeting the policy requirement is crucial to the success or failure of the Morbaine development

11.52. Subject to the amendments above, I consider that the lists of conditions are appropriate, reasonable and necessary for the proposed developments. However, the agreements and the suggested conditions do not overcome my objections to the additional retail development of gross floor area of 6,921 sq m, with a net sales area of 3,354 sq m on either or both the Brown Lenox or Sardis Road sites.

Summary of Conclusions

11.53. My final conclusions are that there is no proven quantitative or qualitative need for the proposed additional retail floorspace in Pontypridd. The evidence indicates that the primary catchment area for the town, as defined by the main parties, is too large and in reality it should be limited by the zones of influence of adjoining shopping centres and large stores. The retail capacity of the chosen catchment is not sufficient to prove the need for another large store, and a reduced catchment would not produce the surplus convenience goods expenditure necessary to justify either of the proposals. Consequently,

there simply is no pressing need to release more land for convenience retailing, over and above that which is already approved for the Angharad Walk scheme. With the Angharad Walk development in place and other store commitments in surrounding areas, the qualitative retail offer in Pontypridd would meet the needs of the area in terms of choice and variety.

- 11.54. The Angharad Walk scheme has planning approval in the town centre and it meets the development plan policies for future retail provision in the sub-regional centre, particularly Structure Plan Policy R1 and Local Plan Policy S1. In contrast, both proposals would fail to satisfy the criteria regarding out of centre retail development set out in Policies R4 and S11.
- 11.55. In the absence of a quantitative need for an additional foodstore in either of the out-of-centre locations, I consider that these developments would be likely to harm the viability and vitality of Pontypridd town centre. Further weakening of the trading position of the town, which already has low investment indicators, would be disastrous, especially if it was to lead to the withdrawal of the approved Sainsbury's store in the Angharad Walk Scheme.
- 11.56. Neither of the proposed developments would meet the sequential test, as there is already land available to meet the need for additional convenience shopping floorspace in the town centre, which would have an immediate regenerative effect on the shopping centre. This town centre development has already been approved in accordance with the Local Plan and Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy. Nor would the proposed sites, particularly the Brown Lenox location, enable good pedestrian linkages with the town centre shopping area and residential areas of Pontypridd. In land-use terms, nothing in the development plan policies lends support to either of the developments. The Brown Lenox site is noted as comprising an existing employment use and Sardis Road is earmarked for other uses in the Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy.
- 11.57. I conclude finally that neither of the proposed developments would meet national policies as set out in Planning Policy Wales (March 2002) particularly those relating to retail development, Technical Advice Note (TAN) 4 – Retailing and Town Centres and the recent MIPPS 02/2005; or the policies in the Mid Glamorgan (Rhondda Cynnon Taff County Borough) Replacement Structure Plan and the Rhondda Cynon Taff (Taff Ely) Local Plan relating to retail development, employment and leisure uses.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.1. In view of my conclusions I make the following recommendations: -

Ref: APP/L6940/X/05/514688 – Wm Morrison & Shoparama Ltd Application

- (1) that planning permission be refused for a foodstore and associated car parking on the former Brown Lenox site, Pontypridd.

Ref: APP/L6940/A/05/1179257 – Morbaine Ltd Appeal

- (2) that the appeal be dismissed and planning permission refused for a Class A1 foodstore, car parking, and associated services and facilities at the Pontypridd Rugby Club, Sardis Road, Pontypridd.
- (3) in the event that the Assembly Government decides to grant planning permission for the Wm Morrison/Shoparama Ltd development at the former Brown Lenox site

and/or allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the Morbaine Ltd development at Sardis Road, I recommend that the conditions set out in Documents G7 and G8 respectively be attached, subject to my suggested amendments set out in paragraphs 11.50 and 11.51 above.

C. I. Coomane .

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

- Anthony Porten QC - instructed by Mr P Lucas LLB, Solicitor, Director of Legal and Democratic Services, Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council
- He called:
- Jonathan S Langham BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI FRSA - Associate Director, FDP Savills
- Dean Mears HTech - Transportation Planner, Glamorgan Engineering Consultancy
- Souren Zeinali BSc MSc CEng MIHT - Senior Engineer, Projects & Development Control, Rhondda Cynon Taff CBC
- Martin Sullivan LCGI - Parks and Amenities Officer, Rhondda Cynon Taff CBC

FOR THE APPLICANTS – Wm MORRISON SUPERMARKETS & SHOPARAMA Ltd:

- Vincent Fraser QC - instructed by Hammonds, Solicitors, 2 Park Lane, Leeds LS3 1AB
- He called:
- Justin Fletcher BSc(Hons) MRICS - Development Manager, Wm Morrison Supermarkets
- Chris Creighton MTP MRTPI - Associate, Peacock & Smith
- James Banks FRICS - Senior Partner, Rapleys
- David Pearson BEng CEng MICE - Bryan G Hall
- Simon Lloyd MRICS - Atisreal
- Peter Wood DipTP MRTPI - Senior Partner, Peacock & Smith

FOR THE APPELLANTS – MORBAINE LTD:

- Anthony Dinkin QC - instructed by Morbaine Ltd, The Finlan Centre, Hale Road, Widnes, Cheshire WA8 8PU
- He called:
- John Whittaker MA DipTP MRTPI - White Young & Green
- John Lowe CEng BSc(Hons) MSc - Turner Lowe Assocs, Traffic Engineering Consultants

GENERAL DOCUMENTS

- G1 Lists of persons present at the inquiry
- G2 Letter of notification and addresses
- G3 Section 106 Agreement between Morrison/Shoparama and RCT
- G4 Section 106 Unilateral Agreement by Pontypridd Rugby Club and Morbaine Ltd, dated 03/01/06
- G5 Agreement between Morrison/Shoparama and Bus Company
- G6 Agreement between Morbaine Ltd and Bus Company (as amended and resubmitted 16/02/06)
- G7 List of suggested conditions for Morrison application
- G8 List of suggested conditions for Morbaine proposal

CORE DOCUMENTS

- CD1 Planning Policy Wales – March 2002
- CD2 Technical Advice Note 4: Retailing & Town Centres (November 1996) and Draft Policy Clarification (December 2003)
- CD3 Technical Advice Note 12: Design (1997)
- CD4 Technical Advice Note 16: Sport & Recreation (1998)
- CD5 Technical Advice Note 18: Transport (1998)
- CD6 PPS 6: Planning for Town Centres (2005)
- CD7 PPG 13: Transport (March 2001)
- CD8 Mid Glamorgan (Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough) Replacement Structure Plan (Adopted January 1996)
- CD9 Rhondda Cynon Taff (Taff Ely Local Plan) including Waste Policies (Adopted June 2003)
- CD10 Rhondda Cynon Taff Local Development Plan Draft Interim Policy Statement (April 2005)
- CD11 Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy Final Report – RPS (July 2005)
- CD12 Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Retail Capacity Assessment Final Report – Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (August 2003)
- CD13 Morrison Committee Report & Minutes – 16 February 2005

- CD14 Morrison Committee Report & Minutes – 14 December 2004
- CD15 Local Plans Consultation Response – 04/09/05
- CD16 Rhondda Cynon Taff Screening Opinion – 03/625 Former Brown Lenox (23/05/03) and 05/282 Pontypridd Rugby Club (21/03/05)
- CD17 Planning Application Forms – former Brown Lenox Site
- CD18 Morrison’s Application Drawing PO1 – Site Location
- CD19 Morrison’s Application Drawing PO2 – Site Layout
- CD20 Morrison’s Application Drawing PO3 – Proposed Elevation 2
- CD21 Morrison’s Application Drawing PO4 – Proposed Elevation 1
- CD22 Morrison’s Application Drawing PO5 – Proposed Building Layout
- CD23 Morrison’s Application Drawing PO6 – Site Boundaries & Section
- CD24 Wm Morrison Superstore Brown Lenox Site, Pontypridd Retail Assessment – Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (August 2003) and correspondence of 22/01/04 and 19/11/04
- CD25 Brown Lenox Site, Pontypridd Retail Statement on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc prepared by Peacock & Smith (March 2003)
- CD26 Analysis of land and buildings in Rhondda Cynon Taff – Hirons Morgan & Yapp (November 2003)
- CD27 Bryan G Hall - Travel Plan, Transport Assessment and Revised Transport Assessment Appendices (April 2004)
- CD28 Correspondence from NAW (10/03/05) and from PINS (26/04/05)
- CD29 Planning Application for Morbaine Ltd at Pontypridd Rugby Club Ref: 05/0282/13
- CD30 Morbaine Application Drawing 5928/34/D – Revised Layout
- CD31 Morbaine Application Drawing 5928/18/B – Red Line Site
- CD32 Committee Report on Morbaine Application & Minutes (09/06/05)
- CD33 Retail Assessment (Pontypridd Rugby Club) – Barris Liptrot & Associates (February 2005)
- CD34 Supplementary Retail Assessment (Pontypridd Rugby Club) – Barris Liptrot & Associates
- CD35 Traffic & Highways Report – Turner & Lowe (January 2005)
- CD36 Map Info Explanatory Volume 2001 Expenditure
- CD37 Appeal Decision Ref: APP/L6940/A/04/11670235 – Millfield Depot Rhondda Road Pontypridd (13/01/05)

- CD38 Map Info Information Brief 99/02
- CD39 Map Info Information Brief 05/02
- CD40 Planning Application C/98/4318/16 – Proposed Retail Store and Petrol Filling Station, Tirfounder Fields, Asda, Aberdare
- CD41 Planning Application 05/0312 Tesco Superstore, Ynys Field, Trealaw, Tonypandy, and Retail Statement
- CD42 Planning Application 05/210 for Retail Store, Porth Bus Station, Porth for Tesco, and Retail Statement
- CD43 Planning Application 04/738 and Committee Report for A1 Retail Store, Hutchinson Garage, Tonypandy (31/03/05)
- CD44 Planning Decision Notice 02/0919/10 for Angharad Walk (02/12/04)
- CD45 Angharad Walk Application Drawings (4.0 plan proposals)
- CD46 Notes of Pre-Inquiry Meeting (28/06/05)
- CD47 Parking Guidelines Revised Edition (1993) Standing Conference of Policy in South Wales
- CD48 Rule 6 Statement - Rhondda Cynon Taff (Morrisons) (June 2005)
- CD49 Rule 6 Statement - Rhondda Cynon Taff (Morbaine) (June 2005)
- CD50 Rule 6 Statement – Wm Morrison – Hammonds (June 2005)
- CD51 Rule 6 Statement – Morbaine Ltd (June 2005)
- CD52 Rule 6 Statement – Scarborough Development Group (RPS) (June 2005)
- CD53 Written Statement by Roger Tym & Partners on behalf of Somerfield Stores Ltd (June 2005)
- CD54 Letters from Environment Agency re. Morbaine (11/04/05 & 05/08/05)
- CD55 Letters from Environment Agency re. Morrisons (07/05/05 & 04/08/05)
- CD56 Statement of Common Ground (October 2005)
- CD57 Committee Report on former Brown Lenox Site 56/86/1000 & 56/88/0120
- CD58 Letter from Savills to J Sainsburys (08/09/05)
- CD59 Letter from J Sainsburys to Savills (29/09/05)
- CD60 Record of Executive Officer Decision (RPS Report - Pontypridd Regeneration Strategy)
- CD61 Highways Statement of Common Ground – October 2005
- CD62 Appendices to Highways Statement of Common Ground – October 2005

RHONDDA CYNON TAFF COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL DOCUMENTS

- RCT1 Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Langham re: Morrison's Application
- RCT1A Appendices to Mr Langham's Proof of Evidence
- RCT2 Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Langham re: Morbaine Appeal
- RCT3 Proof of Evidence of Souren Zeinali re: Morbaine Appeal
- RCT4 Proof of Evidence of Dean Mears re: Morrison's Application
- RCT5 Proof of Evidence of Martin Sullivan re: Morbaine Appeal
- RCT6 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Dean Mears re: Morrison
- RCT7 Supplementary Proof of Evidence of Jonathan Langham re: Tesco Extension
- RCT8 Food Store Map
- RCT9 Bundle of Correspondence re: Pontypridd Rugby Football Club
- RCT10 First Supplementary Proof of Evidence of Souren Zeinali re: Morbaine
- RCT11 Second Supplementary Proof of Evidence of Souren Zeinali re: Morbaine
- RCT12 Extract of the Pontypridd Observer Newspaper – 17/11/05

Wm MORRISON SUPERMARKETS DOCUMENTS

- WMS1 Summary Proof of Evidence of Justin Fletcher
- WMS2 Proof of Evidence of Justin Fletcher
- WMS3 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Justin Fletcher
- WMS4 Proof of Evidence of Justin Fletcher re; Morbaine Appeal
- WMS5 Summary Proof of Evidence of Chris Creighton
- WMS6 Proof of Evidence of Chris Creighton
- WMS7 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Chris Creighton
- WMS8 Summary Proof of Evidence of James Banks
- WMS9 Proof of Evidence of James Banks
- WMS10 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of James Banks
- WMS11 Summary Proof of Evidence of David Pearson

- WMS12 Proof of Evidence of David Pearson
- WMS13 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of David Pearson
- WMS14 Proof of Evidence of David Pearson re: Morbaine Appeal
- WMS15 Summary Proof of Evidence of Simon Lloyd
- WMS16 Proof of Evidence of Simon Lloyd
- WMS17 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Simon Lloyd
- WMS18 Summary Proof of Evidence of Peter Wood
- WMS19 Proof of Evidence of Peter Wood
- WMS20 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Peter Wood
- WMS21 Proof of Evidence of Peter Wood re: Morbaine Appeal
- WMS22 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Peter Wood re: Morbaine Appeal
- WMS23 Revised Site Layout Drawing MO2238 PO2E
- WMS24 Supplementary Note on Catchment Areas – Chris Creighton
- WMS25 Note on Sainsbury Stores
- WMS26 Letter from Debenhams to Morrisons dated 02/11/05
- WMS27 E-mail from Welsh Development Agency to Mr Carter 03/05/03
- WMS28 Correspondence between Shamrock Travel and Bryan G Hall
- WMS29 Summary of Pedestrian Surveys
- WMS30 Extract from Bryan G Hall Transport Assessment of Pedestrian Surveys
- WMS31 Extract from Angharad Walk Transport Assessment
- WMS32 Note by Justin Fletcher of Morrison's interests in Angharad Walk and Brown Lenox Sites
- WMS33 Further Supplementary Proof of Evidence of David Pearson re: Morbaine
- WMS34 Jackson Criss Letter (undated)
- WMS35 Letter from Riddell tps to Morrisons – 16/11/05
- WMS36 Note Regarding Bus Services and Agreement with Bus Operator
- WMS37 Note Regarding Pedestrians
- WMS38 Response by Chris Creighton re: Ministerial Interim Planning Policy Statement on Retailing and Town Centres of 05/12/05
- WMS39 Agreement to Provide Bus Services dated 19/12/05 (see Doc G5)
- WMS40 N/A (see Doc G5)

- WMS41 Minute of Ynysangharad War Memorial Park Committee of 29/11/05
- WMS42 Revised Table Showing Traffic Flow at the Sardis Road Gyratory
- WMS43 Revised Table Showing Traffic Flow at the Sardis Road Gyratory, including Retail Park Traffic

MORBAINES LTD DOCUMENTS

- MOR1 Proof of Evidence of John Whittaker
- MOR2 Proof of Evidence of John Lowe
- MOR3 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of John Whittaker
- MOR4 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of John Lowe
- MOR5 Summary of Proof of Evidence of John Whittaker
- MOR6 First Supplementary Proof of Evidence of John Whittaker re: Morrison's Application
- MOR7 Second Supplementary Proof of Evidence of John Whittaker re: Morbaine Appeal
- MOR8 Supplementary Proof of Evidence of John Lowe re: Morrison's Application
- MOR9 Design of Pedestrian Crossings – Local Transport Note 2/95 DoT, Welsh Office
- MOR10 Letter from Pontypridd Rugby Club – 07/11/05
- MOR11 Letter from Pontypridd Rugby Club – 21/12/05

SCARBOROUGH DEVELOPMENT GROUP DOCUMENTS

- SB1 Statement by Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd
- SB2 Proof of Evidence of Stephen McBride
- SB3 Summary Proof of Evidence of Ian Metcalfe
- SB4 Proof of Evidence of Ian Metcalfe
- SB5 Extract from 2005 Institute of Grocers Database – sales areas of local superstores
- SB6 Proof of Evidence of Derek Ball
- SB7 Proof of Evidence of Roy Goddard, including map of bus routes
- SB8 Summary of Key Terms of the Agreement for the Lease between Fountains Walk Ltd Partnership and Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd
- SB9 Letter of 09/11/05 from DPP to Derek Ball RPS re: Tesco, Upper Boat, Pontypridd

- SB10 Letter of 10/11/05 from Tesco Stores Ltd to Derek Ball RPS
- SB11 Preliminary Report on Transportation Issues re: Morrison's Application by WSP
- SB12 Derek Ball's re-working of Chris Creighton's Table B (Theoretical Capacity) and Table 8, Appendices p 12 (Turnover of Proposals/Commitments)
- SB13 Re-Working of Jonathan Langham's Tables 6.4 and 6.6 with Correct Input Figures
- SB14 Section 106 Agreement of 09/12/04 between Fountains Walk Ltd and Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council
- SB15 Letter of 07/11/05 from ASDA Stores Ltd
- SB16 Letter of 04/11/05 from Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd re: Angharad Walk Scheme

INTERESTED PARTIES' DOCUMENTS

- IP1 Statement by Mr J S Coduri
- IP2 Statement by Mr B Talbot
- IP3 Letters from Mr A Carter, Secretary Y Celtaiddwr, including newspaper cuttings, Restoration Feasibility Report for Glamorganshire Canal (W S Atkins) – The Wildlife Trust of South Wales, Visual Projections of Canal Restoration/Environmental Improvements, & bundle of petitions
- IP4 Statement by Mr M Duxbury
- IP5 Statement by Mr B Watts, Chairman of Ponty Pride
- IP6 Submission by Mr L Jones
- IP7 Statement by Mrs M Davies, including bundle of photographs of flooding in Ynysangharad Park

PLANS

- Plans A Morrisons' Application Drawings:
 - M02238 PO1 Site Location Plan
 - M02238 PO2/E Proposed Site Layout
 - M02238 PO3 Proposed Elevations 1
 - M02238 PO4 Proposed Elevations 2
 - M02238 PO5 Proposed Building Layout
 - M02238 PO6 Site Boundary Sections (East)
 - unnumbered Perspective Drawing

- Plans B Morbaine Ltd Application Drawings
 - 5928/34/D Revised Layout (for illustrative purposes)
 - 5928/18/B Site Plan (Red Line)
 - 5928/19 Site Plan Layout for Illustrative Purposes