

From: Richard Huteson [mailto:Richard.Huteson@rapleys.com]
Sent: 04 September 2018 19:31
To: Close, Roland <Roland.Close@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Paul Hebblethwaite <paul.hebblethwaite@lidl.co.uk>; Chris Jenkins <Christopher.Jenkins@lidl.co.uk>; Marcin Koszyczarek <marcin.k@rapleys.com>
Subject: Lidl, Ross on Wye - Minutes from the meeting on the 30th August 2018
Importance: High

Good Evening Roland

Firstly, thank you for organising the meeting last week which was well attended with representatives from the Council. I consider that it was beneficial to both sides and we have a number of clear actions to undertake that will address the comments that have been raised to date on our proposal. Some of these will have been addressed in the supplementary reports that were submitted to the Council on the 29th August 2018.

I have attached minutes of meeting for your information. I would be grateful if you can confirm that these are an accurate record of our discussion?

As you are aware, Rapleys held a conference call with JW Planning on Monday 3rd September 2018. Again, this was beneficially discussion as it was confirmed that the methodology had been accepted. Therefore, as requested, we shall provide further information/data on convenience and comparison sales densities and expand on the data in Table 6. We shall also provide a copy of Mintel data we have used to assist JW Planning in reviewing our Retail Assessment.

We have agreed that Rapleys will provide our retail addendum on or before Wednesday 12th September 2018. It was also agreed that we would hold another conference call with JW Planning before any formal response is submitted to the Council.

From the Council's prospective, we await the feedback from your colleagues in terms of what they consider an acceptable split for B1, B1a, B1b, B1c, B2 and B8 on the employment element of our proposal.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Kind regards

Richard Huteson

MA, Dip PS, MRTPI

Partner

Town Planning

07884 588935



RAPLEYS LLP

55 Spring Gardens Manchester M2 2BY

0370 777 6292 | www.rapleys.com

London | Birmingham | Bristol | Edinburgh | Huntingdon | Manchester



Rapeleys LLP is registered as a Limited Liability Partnership in England and Wales.

Registration No: OC308311

Registered Office at Falcon Road, Hinchingsbrooke Business Park, HUNTINGDON PE29 6FG

A full list of Members is available on our website or at any of our offices during normal business hours.
Regulated by RICS.

Rapleys LLP operates an Environmental Management System which complies with the requirements of ISO 14001:2004 Certificate No. EMS 525645

This email is not intended, nor shall it form part of any legally enforceable contract and any contract shall only be entered into by way of an exchange of correspondence by each party's solicitor. Where this Email message is sent in connection with a contentious issue, the contents are Without Prejudice.

This email has been scanned for email related threats and delivered safely by Mimecast.
For more information please visit <http://www.mimecast.com>

LIDL, WOLF BUSINESS PARK, GLOUCESTER ROAD, ROSS ON WYE

PLANNING APPLICATION REF: 182387

Thursday 30th August 2018

Location: Herefordshire Council, Plough Lane, Hereford, HR4 0LE

Attendees:

Herefordshire Council

Roland Close	Principal Planning Officer
Ed Thomas	Development Manager Majors Team
Kevin Singleton	Team Leader Strategic Planning
Stuart Powell	Planning Officer (Strategic Planning)
Jill Tookey-Williams	Area Engineer Development Control
Nick Webster	Economic Development Manager
Yvonne Coleman	Planning Obligations Manager
Olive Kaye	Tree Officer
Liz Duberley	Principal Natural Environment Officer

Lidl Development Team

Paul Hebblethwaite	Head of Property - Lidl
Chris Jenkins	Senior Acquisition Consultant - Lidl
Richard Huteson	Planning Partner - Rapleys
Marcin Koszyczarek	Senior Planner - Rapleys
Andrew Watson	Bourne Valley Associates
Matthew Anderson	Director - Corun
Jerry Ross	Jerry Ross Arboricultural Consultancy

	Action
1. Introductions	
2. Economic Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CJ explained that the existing employment site no longer meets operational requirements of many local businesses, is of poor quality, outdated and the Lidl development would be a catalyst to provide better quality employment accommodation. CJ reiterated that existing tenants have been offered preferential terms to relocate to the new premises. Existing premises are asbestos ridden and the most recent asbestos survey submitted to the LPA provides evidence for it. RC made a distinction between 'land' and site and advised that the 'Employment LAND' is of Good quality in terms of its location and accessibility. CJ agreed with the Officer that the site's location is good but the existing floorspace is not considered to be 'Good' as evidenced by vacancy rates and the fact that no businesses have wanted to move to the premises despite low rents being offered. RC asked to confirm timescales and build programme for new employment buildings. RC advised that Aldi on a different site/application has not brought forward employment land. RC asked for clarification on how the existing businesses, which are not relocating, will operate in the transitional period. RTH advised that there are alternative premises within Ross where the existing tenants could move into. RC expressed concerns over applicants' commitment to deliver the replacement employment floorspace. CJ re-emphasised the Wolf family commitment to bring forward new employment development, but this could not be delivered without capital receipt from Lidl. RTH advised that a special mechanism through S106 can be agreed on how to deliver the buildings by a certain date and sought agreement that draft wording could be submitted for 	<p>RC to provide Council's view on the potential split between B1,B1a,B1b, B1c, B2 and B8</p> <p>Rapleys/Lidl to provide information on how the existing tenants (to be displaced) will operate should the Lidl development be approved.</p>

<p>agreement between Lidl and the Council. RT considered that the outline employment part of the application should specify a split of B1, B1a, B1b, B1c, B2 and B8 uses in the first instance. Once this split was defined then discussions could be held on the S106 wording. RT agreed to secure the Council's preference in terms of such an employment split and to provide this to the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CJ emphasised the importance of the opportunity presented by the current scheme before the Council and its ability to invigorate a run down employment site that would likely continue to fail without the capital investment that could be provided by the Lidl proposals. 	
<p>3. Highways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MW briefly went through his Rebuttal to highway comments received and advised that a Road Safety Audit will be provided. RC queried whether the TA covered only the Lidl store. MW responded that as the employment element is a relocation of existing Business Park, the existing traffic is already contained within the traffic surveys in the base scenario. RC asked if the applicants considered to incorporate two mini-roundabouts (as per refused Tesco proposal) to which MW stated that they are not necessary as other committed developments which have a greater impact on the area were not required to model a double mini-roundabout option. RC asked if it was possible to provide additional information on traffic impact once the potential B1, B1a, B1b, B2 and B8 split is available to which MW responded that it can be done. JT-W advised that she will review the Rebuttal and feedback to RC. 	<p>JT-W to provide feedback on Rebuttal to RC.</p> <p>MW to forward Road Safety Audit once it has completed.</p>
<p>4. Landscape and Trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC confirmed that tree assessment is robust and quoted a small print within Arboricultural report stating that RPAs should pre-determine the layout. RC asked JR whether he was approached from the start to which JR stated that layout was already given to him. OK, RC and LD queried if the layout can be changed to show the new employment units to the north of the site and Lidl store to the south, and therefore retaining better quality trees which are currently to be lost due to the car park layout. PH and CJ advised that the layout cannot be changed to reflect such a situation as the site was affected by numerous constraints including access, underground services and utilities and levels as determined by Lidl's topographic survey of the site. The layout before the Council was the result of accounting for all site constraints, including trees. CJ also reiterated that it would only be the north part of the site that Lidl would secure a legal interest in. CJ also queried how provision of employment units on the northern half of the site would reconcile with the Council's stance that the frontage on to the main road was a key consideration for such a key vantage point. CJ felt that the Lidl proposals now tabled reflected such an aspiration whilst also taking account of all site constraints (including trees). CJ agreed to try to retain some more trees within the car park and to examine this in more detail with JR. OK queried if retaining wall could be rejigged to allow for more retention of trees in the woodland strip to the east. CJ stated that he would discuss with the architect to see if an alternative solution could be achieved in terms of the depth of retaining wall and subsequent tree loss. JR stated that existing layout could be redesigned to retain some better trees at the frontage, however the officers insisted on moving the store to the south of the site. CJ queried the reasoning for this as there only appeared to be minor tree loss of individual trees as opposed to substantive 'tree belts' being removed as referenced by officers. 	<p>CJ and JR to review potential for retaining trees along northern boundary of car parking.</p>
<p>5. Retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RTH summarised the sequential comments from JW Planning and advised that a rebuttal will 	<p>Applicant to provide</p>

<p>be submitted in due course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC went through three alternative sites. CJ provided further information why two of the three sites can be dismissed. RTH advised that rebuttal on the third site will be submitted shortly to the Council along with formal rebuttal of the other two sites • RC queried why Lidl / CJ had not engaged officers when looking for stores in Ross on Wye as the Council would have put forward such sites. CJ reminded officers that the Council had not provided any information on any such sites that it might consider more suitable as part of its pre-application response letter of 20th April 2018 which would have been the opportune moment to make such sites known to Rapleys/Lidl had they been known to RC / officers. • In terms of impact RC confirmed that the retail impact and sequential aspect will have to be addressed first to give the Council comfort that the principle of retail in this location can be accepted. Concerns on loss of employment/trees/layout/highways will then follow after. • RTH confirmed that retail elements will be submitted within two weeks and that RTH will discuss matters directly with JW Planning as agreed by RC. 	<p>rebuttal on sequential and retail impact within two weeks.</p>
<p>6. Timescales for Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTH confirmed that current determination deadline is 3rd October and asked if the Council would be willing to extend the determination timescales. • RC advised that he would be willing to extend the determination period whilst matters are still being considered by all parties. CJ / Lidl agreed that such an extension of timescale would be welcomed and agreed by Lidl to resolve matters. 	<p>As above</p>
<p>7. Any Other Business</p>	