



Mill Road Sipp Group

FORMER PETROL STATION, NORTH ROAD, KIRKBURTON

Retail Assessment



Mill Road Sipp Group

**FORMER PETROL STATION, NORTH ROAD,
KIRKBURTON**

Retail Assessment

TYPE OF DOCUMENT (VERSION) PUBLIC

PROJECT NO. 70121875

OUR REF. NO. 001

DATE: FEBRUARY 2024



CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
2	BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSALS	3
2.1	PLANNING HISTORY	3
2.2	PLANNING POLICY	3
	National Policy	3
	Local Planning Policy	4
2.3	KIRKLEES RETAIL CAPACITY STUDY UPDATED (2017)	4
3	THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	6
4	SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT	7
4.1	INTRODUCTION	7
4.2	NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY	7
4.3	RELEVANT CASE LAW	8
4.4	PARAMETERS OF THE SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT	10
4.5	ASSESSMENT OF SITES	11
	58 North Road, Kirkburton, Huddersfield	11
4.6	SUMMARY	11
5	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	12
5.1	BACKGROUND	12
5.2	IMPACT ON PLANNED AND COMMITTED INVESTMENT	12
5.3	IMPACT ON TOWN CENTRE VITALITY AND VIABILITY	12
5.4	SUMMARY	14
7	CONCLUSIONS	16

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1. This Retail Assessment has been prepared by WSP on behalf of Mill Road Sipp Group to support a planning application for the erection of single storey retail unit on North Road, Kirkburton (LPA ref. 2023/62/92200/E). There is currently no named operator for the proposed convenience store, albeit the applicant is in discussions with various retailers. The proposed store will extend to 460sqm GEA with a 223sqm net sales area.
- 1.1.2. The application site is located immediately adjacent to Kirkburton District Centre, within a mixed commercial and residential area. The accompanying Design and Access Statement prepared by Walters Architects sets out further details on the site and surrounding area.
- 1.1.3. Planning permission has previously been granted for 4 retail units on the site with residential above in February 2017 (Ref. 2016/62/93935) and more recently a Section 73 consent which varied a number of the conditions on the 2017 permission in December 2022 (Ref. 2020/70/90166/E). The Officer's Delegated Report for the Section 73 application confirmed that the principle of retail on the site is acceptable and recognised that the petrol station on the site had been demolished prior to the expiry of planning permission 2016/62/93935.
- 1.1.4. This retail permission is a material consideration in respect of the current application and retail policy considerations because officers recognise that the net floorspace of the current proposal is lower than the previous consented scheme.
- 1.1.5. However, as agreed with officers and to assist them in the determination of the application, a Retail Assessment proportionate to the scale and nature of the current proposal has been prepared. It includes a sequential assessment and a qualitative impact assessment. The scope of both of these assessments has been agreed with the policy officer.

2 BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSALS

2.1 PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.1.1. Planning permission (ref. 2015/62/91943) was originally granted on 3 December 2015 for the demolition of the existing petrol station and the erection of four retail and residential units. The retail units totalled 308sqm gross.
- 2.1.2. Planning permission was subsequently granted on 17 February 2017 (ref. 2016/62/93935) for a revised scheme totalling 245sqm of floorspace again within four retail units with residential above which the Council accept would have a higher net floorspace than the current proposal.
- 2.1.3. More recently, a Section 73 application (ref. 2020/70/90116/E) which varied condition 8-11 of permission 26/62/93935 relating to contamination was granted on 22 December 2022. Of note, the Officer's Delegated Report highlighted that:

“The application site is located within the defined local centre of Kirkburton and has been subject to a number of previous planning applications. The principle of the development of the site for the erection of 4 no. retail units and 4 no. residential units (modified proposal) was approved under permission 2016/93935. The impact of the development on visual amenity, residential amenity and highway safety were all assessed under the previously approved application. Although this permission was assessed under the Unitary Development Plan, the principle of the development is still considered to be acceptable under the newly adopted Local Plan.”

- 2.1.4. This consent is a material consideration for the current application.

2.2 PLANNING POLICY

National Policy

- 2.2.1. Since the previous application was granted, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was adopted in December 2023. The revised NPPF maintains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.
- 2.2.2. Paragraphs 91 to 95 of the NPPF set out the approach to the retail tests.
- 2.2.3. Paragraph 91 requires a sequential test to be carried out for main town centre uses not located in a town centre. Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses which are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an up-to-date plan. Main town centre uses should be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations.
- 2.2.4. Paragraph 94 requires all retail and leisure development outside town centres to be subject to a retail impact assessment if they are over 2,500sqm or a proportionate, locally set threshold. In this case, there is a lower locally-set threshold of 300sqm in Policy LP13 of the Kirklees Local Plan. However, the policy highlights that that the scope and content of any Impact Assessment shall be reflective of the scale, role and function of the proposal.

Local Planning Policy

2.2.5. The development plan for the site is the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies adopted 27 February 2019. It comprises the strategy and policies document, allocations and designations document and associated policies map.

2.2.6. The development plan identifies Kirkburton as a District Centre providing a range of shopping for everyday needs and serving specialist markets; and being locally focussed for basic financial services, food and drink, entertainment, leisure and tourist facilities, and health services.

2.2.7. As highlighted above Policy LP13 states that:

“Proposals which come forward for main town centre uses, which are located outside of the defined centre boundaries, will require the submission of a Sequential Test. For retail proposals the boundary shall form the Primary Shopping Area; for all other main town centre uses this shall be the extent of the centre boundary. Main town centre uses shall be first located in the defined centres, then edge of centre locations.”

2.2.8. Policy LP13 adds that:

“An Impact Assessment will be necessary for proposals (including the formation of mezzanine floors) for/or which include retail, leisure and office developments which are not located within a defined centre where:

- *the proposal provides a floorspace greater than 500 sq.m gross; or*
- *the proposal is located within 800 metres of the boundary of a Town Centre or District Centre and is greater than 300 sq.m gross;*
- *or the proposal is located within 800 metres of the boundary of a Local Centre and is greater than 200 sq.m gross.*

The scope and content of any Impact Assessment shall be agreed with the Council and shall be reflective of the scale, role and function of the proposal.

Proposals which would have an significant adverse impact on surrounding centres shall not be supported.”

2.3 KIRKLEES RETAIL CAPACITY STUDY UPDATED (2017)

2.3.1. The Retail Capacity Study was prepared by WYG Planning to assess the future need for additional retail floorspace in Kirklees.

2.3.2. The proposal falls within Zone 6 of the Retail Study which also included Skelmanthorpe and Denby Dale, with paragraph 5.49 of the Study highlighting that:

“In relation to Zone 6, no additional convenience goods floorspace has been consented in this zone since the 2014 Retail Study reported and therefore it remains the case that the existing provision in this zone is limited, requiring many shoppers to travel further afield in order to undertaken main food shopping. Accordingly, we maintain our view that there would be qualitative benefits from the provision of appropriate additional food retail provision within Denby Dale, Kirkburton or Skelmanthorpe.”

2.3.3. Of note, Table 4 of the Retail Study identified that the existing Co-Op and local shops in Kirkburton District Centre only had a convenience turnover of £2.31m. This means that only 3.2% of the total



convenience expenditure in Zone 6 was spent in Kirkburton. Despite this, Table 5 identified that the existing Co-Op was overtrading by £0.15m (9%).

3 THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1.1. The planning application proposes the redevelopment of a former petrol filling station site for a convenience store of 460sqm GEA (443sqm GIA) with a 223sqm net sales area. The store will be served by 11 car parking spaces and accessed off North Road. The details of the scheme are set out in further detail in the Design and Access Statement.
- 3.1.2. There is currently no named operator for the store, although the applicant is in discussions with a convenience retailer to occupy the store which will help to increase the food retail offer in Kirkburton and retain convenience good expenditure in the village, as well as helping to serve both existing and future residents within the surrounding area.
- 3.1.3. It will also provide a number of economic benefits, including bringing a vacant site back into beneficial use and it will result in new investment and employment opportunities for the local community.

4 SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT

4.1 INTRODUCTION

- 4.1.1. The NPPF confirms that local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up-to-date development plan.
- 4.1.2. The NPPF defines main town centre uses as retail development; leisure, entertainment and more intensive sport and recreational uses (including drive-thru restaurants); offices; and arts culture and tourism development.
- 4.1.3. Therefore, given the proposed development comprises a convenience store on the edge of Kirkburton District Centre, a sequential assessment has been undertaken in support of this application which has focused on the district centre as agreed with offices given the proposal will primarily serve a local catchment, albeit it will also attract customers from beyond the area.
- 4.1.4. The nature and scale of the proposal needs to be recognised when considering the suitability and availability of alternative sites. The assessment must consider the “real world” in which the Applicant and local planning authority must operate. The need for a “real world” approach is established in case law. It is, therefore, against this background that the sequential approach to site selection has been considered.
- 4.1.5. The purpose of this assessment is to demonstrate that there are no sequentially preferable sites located in town centres that are suitable, viable and available for the proposed development.
- 4.1.6. It is noteworthy that the Council did not request a sequential assessment for the previous applications at the site as they considered that the site was located in Kirkburton District Centre, and that the principle of retail on the site was acceptable.
- 4.1.7. Whilst officers have now requested a sequential assessment, it is noted that they consider that the proposed store is appropriate in scale for the role and function of Kirkburton District Centre as set out in Local Plan Policy LP13 Town centre uses Table 11. The centre generally serves a local catchment given its mix of uses and location.
- 4.1.8. Officers have also confirmed that they are not aware of any sequentially preferable sites within the district centre.

4.2 NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

- 4.2.1. Paragraphs 91-92 of the NPPF require the sequential approach to site selection to be applied to all development proposals for main town centre uses that are not in an identified centre and not in accordance with an up-to-date Development Plan. The NPPF states that applications for main town centre uses should be in town centres, then edge of centre locations, and only if suitable sites are not available within a reasonable period, should out-of-centre sites be considered. It also requires applicants and local planning authorities to demonstrate flexibility on issues like format and scale.
- 4.2.2. The following factors should be considered in such assessment:
- **Availability** - whether sites are available now or are likely to become available for development within a reasonable period of time;

- **Suitability** - whether a site could be developed for the proposal, having regard to the requirement to demonstrate flexibility and whether the site is suitable to accommodate the specific need or demand the proposal is intended to meet.
- **Viability** is also relevant to the suitability of a site. A site must meet all these criteria for it to be considered sequentially preferable i.e. it must be available, suitable and viable.

- 4.2.3. A site must meet **all** these criteria for it to be considered sequentially preferable i.e. it must be available, suitable and viable. These matters are explained in further detail in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) under “Town centres and retail”.
- 4.2.4. Paragraph 95 states that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test it should be refused. However, that paragraph does not create a presumption against granting planning permission. Conflict with NPPF paragraphs 91 and 95 can be outweighed by other factors, such as the environmental, economic and social benefits of the development.
- 4.2.5. In addition, the PPG on ‘Town Centres and Retail’ provides guidance on the application and interpretation of the sequential test. It is important to note that the sequential test is intended to implement the Government’s “town centre first” policy. This seeks to locate main town centre uses (including retail) in the most central sites possible. However, it is a “town centre first” policy, not a “town centre only” policy.
- 4.2.6. The PPG provides guidance on the sequential assessment and highlights at Reference ID: 2b-011-20190722 that:

“The application of the test will need to be proportionate and appropriate for the given proposal.”

- 4.2.7. The PPG also identifies at reference ID: 2b-013-20190722 that in terms of viability:

“The sequential test supports the Government’s ‘town centre first’ policy. However as promoting new development on town centre locations can be more expensive and complicated than building elsewhere, local planning authorities need to be realistic and flexible in applying the test.”

- 4.2.8. In addition, the PPG states that it is for the Applicant to demonstrate compliance with the sequential test (Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 2b-011-20190722). The PPG further those considerations (ref: 011 ID 2b-011-20190722) that should be taken into account when determining whether a proposal complies with the sequential test, based on the following:

- Has the suitability of more central sites to accommodate the proposals been considered, having regard to flexibility;
- Is there scope for flexibility in the format and/or scale of the proposal; and
- If there are no suitable sequentially preferable locations, the sequential test is passed.

- 4.2.9. In terms of local planning policy, Policy LP13 of the Kirklees Local Plan (2019) requires main town centre uses outside of defined centre to undertake a sequential assessment in line with national planning policy.

4.3 RELEVANT CASE LAW

- 4.3.1. In applying the sequential test, it is relevant to have regard to case law and precedent (including appeal decisions) which have helped to clarify the application of the sequential test as it is intended under the NPPF and PPG. Case law clarifies the interpretation of policy and suitability, availability,

and viability. The relevant case law and precedents are summarised below to provide a context to the application of the sequential test to the current proposals.

4.3.2. The established case law includes the Supreme Court Judgement *Tesco Stores Ltd v. Dundee City Council* (dated 21st March 2012), which has been regularly and comprehensively cited in terms of its clarity on the application of the sequential approach. The Judgement concluded that in order for a site to be considered 'suitable', conclusions should be based on a 'real' world assessment, and whether an alternative site is suitable for the development proposed, not whether the proposed development can be altered or reduced to fit alternative sites, making allowance for a reasonable degree of flexibility in terms of the format and scale of the proposed development.

4.3.3. This position is highlighted in the *Rushden Lakes* appeal decision (ref: APP/G2815/V/12/2190175) relating to a new retail park, which provide clarity on the issue of disaggregation in terms of national policy requirements. At paragraph 8.47 of the *Rushden Lakes* Inspectors' decision, it states:

"The last sentence of NPPF [24] states that: "Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale." This contrasts strikingly with what was said previously in PPS4 in policy EC15.1 at (d) (iv) and 15.2 which contained an explicit requirement for disaggregation. There is no longer any such requirement stated in the NPPF. It is no answer to this to refer to the words "such as" in the last sentence of NPPF [24]. These words cannot be read so as to imply that a major, and extremely controversial, part of previously stated national policy lives on by implication in the NPPF. Had the Government intended to retain disaggregation as a requirement it would and should have explicitly stated this in the NPPF. If it had been intended to carry on with the requirement then all that would have been required is the addition of the word "disaggregation" at the end of NPPF [24]"

4.3.4. The Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector's view that there is not any requirement to consider if proposals can be disaggregated.

4.3.5. Similarly, in the *Scotch Corner* decision from December 2016 (Ref. APP/V2723/V/15/3132873 and APP/V2723/V/16/3143678), the Inspector found that the sequential test does not require the applicant to disaggregate schemes and stated at paragraph 11.7 of the decision that the "*sequential test seeks to see if the application, i.e. what is proposed, can be accommodated on a town site.*" The SoS agreed with the Inspector's conclusions.

4.3.6. The SoS's decision in October 2018 in relation to *The Mall at Cribbs Causeway* (ref: APP/P0119/V/17/310627) confirms again that disaggregation is not required. The Inspector noted at IR 567 that while past retail policy and guidance had included the requirement for disaggregation, he reiterated the conclusions of previous decisions that the need for disaggregation is not embodied in either the NPPF or the PPG.

4.3.7. In terms of availability, paragraph 91 of the NPPF requires the availability of sites to be considered. This is a point considered by several appeal decisions and Secretary of State decisions, including in an appeal by the *Tollgate Partnership Ltd* (Ref. APP/A1530/W/16/3/147039) regarding a proposal for a mixed-use development comprising leisure and retail uses at *Tollgate Village* in Colchester.

4.3.8. Paragraph 12.3.18 of the appeal decision, states:

"in terms of availability [the 2012 version of the] NPPF paragraph 24 asks whether town centre or edge of centre sites 'are ... available'. That is at the date of the assessment. This

was the approach of the SoS in Rushden Lakes and accords with the language and context of the sequential test.”

- 4.3.9. In these terms, and for a sequentially preferable site to be deemed “available”, it must be available now, rather than at some undetermined period in the future. In this case, the application site is available now.
- 4.3.10. The Supreme Court Case involving Tesco and Dundee Council also previously considered the definition of ‘suitability’ and the degree to which an application should demonstrate flexibility. The decision concluded that:
- “...the Council were correct to proceed on the basis that ‘suitable’ meant ‘suitable for the development proposed by the applicant’. It stated: “The natural reading of each policy is that the word “suitable”, in the first criterion, refers to the suitability of sites for the proposed development: it is the proposed development which will only be acceptable if no suitable site is available more centrally” [Paragraph 25].*
- “...To refuse an out-of-centre planning consent on the ground that an admittedly smaller site is available within the town centre may be to take an entirely inappropriate business decision on behalf of the developer” [Paragraph 28].*
- 4.3.11. Furthermore, an appeal in January 2019 for a foodstore in Gillingham, Dorset, the Inspector was clear that in applying the sequential approach at paragraph 29 that:
- “The question is whether any suggested alternative site is suitable and available for the broad type of development currently proposed. In terms of size, type and range of goods, incorporating the requirement for flexibility.”*
- 4.3.12. In summary, whilst national policy requires a degree of flexibility in relation to format and/or scale in the sequential test, it is clear from the above decisions and case law that disaggregation is not a requirement of the sequential test.
- 4.3.13. Therefore, to be an appropriate alternative site, it must be able to accommodate a 443sqm (GIA) retail unit albeit allowing for flexibility in terms of scale and format. We go on below to consider the parameters for our site search in more detail.

4.4 PARAMETERS OF THE SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT

- 4.4.1. This application seeks permission for a new retail unit (460sqm GEA and 443sqm GIA) and associated parking. The site area is approximately 0.2ha.
- 4.4.2. In accordance with guidance, we must show flexibility in terms of format and scale, assessing whether the proposals can be accommodated at a sequentially preferable site. Therefore, we will apply a degree of flexibility by assessing sites with a flexibility range of +/- 20% of the total site area.
- 4.4.3. It is recognised that the requirements for a sequentially preferred site are as follows:
- A site with an area between 0.16ha to 0.24ha to facilitate the proposed development;
 - A vacant unit which can accommodate 368sqm to 552sqm GEA;
 - The floorspace should be at a single level on a single floor;
 - It will require good servicing arrangements;
 - It will require associated car park, with a minimum of eleven parking spaces; and
 - Free parking.

4.4.4. A site within the district centre, therefore, must meet all these requirements in order to provide a sequentially preferable alternative that meets the operator's requirements and business model.

4.5 ASSESSMENT OF SITES

4.5.1. As highlighted above, any sequentially preferable site must be capable of accommodating the proposal. WSP has focused on sites / vacant units within Kirkburton District Centre only as agreed with the Council in their email on 9 February 2024.

4.5.2. In searching for sequentially preferable sites, we have used the following resources:

- Adopted Development Plan and proposals map;
- Council's Brownfield Land Register; and
- Vacant sites / units identified using Google / Rightmove / Zoopla / EGi / Local Agents websites.

4.5.3. According to the Council's Development Plan, there are no allocated sites within Kirkburton District Centre boundary. There are three sites subject to allocations in Kirkburton, however, these relate to residential development (ref. HS196) and safeguarded land for housing (refs. SLS23 and SLS27). Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to these site allocations and as such, these sites have been discounted.

4.5.4. The Council's Brownfield Land Register does not identify any sites within Kirkburton.

4.5.5. We have reviewed vacant sites and units within the District Centre from various estate agents' websites to identify whether there were any potential available and suitable sites and vacant units within the District Centre.

4.5.6. We have identified one site in the District Centre, and we set out its details below. There do not appear to be any other available or vacant sites in the District Centre.

58 North Road, Kirkburton, Huddersfield

4.5.7. The site comprises a part-one, part-two storey building, which is unallocated within the Development Plan. The site does fall within Kirkburton District Centre. Two rooms within the property are vacant within an existing hair and beauty salon, comprising 19sqm. Therefore, whilst the site can be considered as available, it does not include sufficient floorspace to accommodate the proposed development. Therefore, the site is **unsuitable** and on this basis does not represent a sequentially preferable site.

4.6 SUMMARY

4.6.1. Since there are no sequentially preferable sites or vacant units, the sequential test is satisfied.

4.6.2. The application site remains the most appropriate and suitable site to meet the need for additional food shopping in Kirkburton because it is located on the edge of the district centre within walking distance of the other shops and services, as well as nearby homes. The site is the closest available site to the District Centre, and is immediately available and suitable site for the proposed development. It also includes car parking which can be used by shoppers undertaking a linked trip between the store and other shops and facilities in the district centre.

5 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 BACKGROUND

- 5.1.1. The proposed convenience store is significantly smaller than the threshold for requiring retail impact assessments in the NPPF, and the site has previously been granted permission for retail units which is a material consideration. However, given the Council's lower threshold (300sqm) for requiring a retail impact assessment, the policy officer has agreed that whilst:

“the proposal will draw trade from the Co-op, however, given its location immediately adjacent to the district centre boundary, that the Co-op appears to be overtrading and there is a qualitative need for further food shopping provision in Kirkburton albeit on a larger scale, it is accepted that a qualitative assessment is proportionate in this case.”

- 5.1.2. The NPPF requires that out-of-centre retail proposals are assessed against the following criteria:

- The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and
- The impact on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider catchment area.

5.2 IMPACT ON PLANNED AND COMMITTED INVESTMENT

- 5.2.1. Firstly, we are not aware of any other commitments in Kirkburton District Centre which would be impacted upon by the proposal.

5.3 IMPACT ON TOWN CENTRE VITALITY AND VIABILITY

Healthcheck of Kirkburton District Centre

- 5.3.1. In order to assess the impact of the proposal, we have undertaken a health check of Kirkburton District Centre. Kirkburton District Centre is a small centre located along North Road, comprising buildings ranging from one to three storeys in height, in a mixture of architectural styles. Typically, the retail/commercial units are located on the ground floor with residential above.
- 5.3.2. The comparison goods offer in the Centre is strong and it benefits from a number of comparison stores including a hardware store, clothing stores, a charity store, and a florist. The comparison goods stores are independently owned. In terms of the convenience offer, there is a butchers' and a bakery (both interpedently owned) and a Co-Op store. The Centre's financial and business services comprise a number of estate agents and a travel agent. Retail services includes barbers, hairdressers and beauty salons. It also includes a number of bars and restaurants including the Secret Garden bar and Joys coffee house.
- 5.3.3. Therefore, Kirkburton offers a good range of shops and services proportionate to the size of the Centre and its catchment.
- 5.3.4. There is few vacancies within Kirkburton District Centre, and the level of vacancy does not detract from the Centre's vitality.
- 5.3.5. The Centre is easily accessible by public and private vehicles. There are no car parks within the Centre, although parking is available outside of the Centre. With regards to access for mobility

impaired visitors, the Centre's pavements and pathways appear accessible. Some of the shops have stepped accessed which would not be accessible to those with impaired mobility.

- 5.3.6. The Centre provides a pleasant environment for residents and visitors. The Centre's heritage value adds to the interest of the environment for visitors.
- 5.3.7. In summary, Kirkburton District Centre is an attractive and safe environment which serves the local community. The Centre appears vital and viable.

Impact

- 5.3.8. As previously highlighted, the net sales area of the previous consented is a material consideration in respect of the impact of the store given the net floorspace of the current proposal is lower.
- 5.3.9. Existing convenience provision in Kirkburton does not adequately meet food shopping needs. The population of Kirkburton has increased from 3,399 in 2001 to 4,033 in 2021, an increase of 634 new residents or 18.7%. In addition, a further 666 dwellings are also forecasted to be built in Lepton by 2031 on sites within circa 2km from the application site. Assuming 2.4 persons per household, this could increase the population by a further 1,598 people and assuming per capita expenditure of £2,043 (based on Table 1 of the Kirklees Retail Study), this equates to an additional £3.26m of convenience expenditure which will support the turnover of the store.
- 5.3.10. Despite this increase in population there has been no additional convenience retail provision to meet the additional demand from this housing growth. This is recognised by officers. There is only limited convenience provision in Kirkburton which comprises a small Co-Op, a butchers and a bakery in the District Centre plus the out-of-centre Highburton Villages Store. As such a number of residents undertake their food shopping outside the village as evidenced by the Council's Retail Study which also highlights a qualitative need for additional food retail provision in Kirkburton.
- 5.3.11. The proposed store would, therefore, help to fill the current gap in convenience retail provision in Kirkburton and meet the needs of new residents. It will provide a greater range and choice of local shopping and competition within the area. It will also claw back expenditure spent outside the local area. The proposed store would help to reduce the length and time some local residents travel for their food shopping.
- 5.3.12. However, the range of offer and product lines within the store will still be relatively limited. For example, it will not include a meat counter or bakery. It would, therefore, not compete directly with the existing butchers and bakery in the District Centre which provide a specialist retail offer and will have a loyal customer base. Shoppers are still likely to visit these shops given their specialist nature as the proposed convenience store will provide a different retail offer. It will complement existing convenience shops in Kirkburton, which would continue to perform their specialised roles.
- 5.3.13. Whilst some limited trade will be drawn from the existing Co-Op which extends to 317sqm gross and 221sqm net, this store appears to be overtrading based on the Council's Retail Study. As such, it will be able to withstand any limited trade draw and any trade draw will have a negligible impact on it and the District Centre. There is certainly no prospect of the Co-op closing as a result of the competition.
- 5.3.14. Therefore, the proposal will only draw a limited amount of trade from Kirkburton District Centre, which appears to be healthy with limited vacancy, and as such, this will not result in the closure of any shops or a significant adverse impact on it.

- 5.3.15. Moreover, given the location of the site off North Road, a number of those visiting the shop are also likely to be passing the site this could be as much as a third of the trade. These shoppers will include people living further afield who are visiting Kirkburton or driving through it. As such, any trade diverted to the proposal will be diluted across a number of shops including the existing Highburton Village Store on Moor Lane in Kirkburton and the McColl's/Morrisons in Shelley,
- 5.3.16. Given the close proximity of the site to the district centre, it is also likely to result in linked shopping trips with existing shops and businesses on North Road. The car park will allow shoppers at the store to visit other facilities in the village.

5.4 SUMMARY

- 5.4.1. The proposal will enhance local consumer choice to the benefit of local residents given the limited convenience retail provision in the area, particularly since the population has grown significantly and will continue to grow. It will also assist in retaining a greater proportion of expenditure in Kirkburton and reduce the amount of leakage outside the area. The store will complement existing shops in the village. It will not have a significant adverse impact on Kirkburton District Centre as a whole. It will also result in a number of positive economic impacts as highlighted in the next Section. In short, the proposals satisfy the NPPF impact test and local retail policy.

6 ECONOMIC BENEFITS

- 6.1.1. The proposal will result in a number of economic benefits for the local community which are a material consideration in respect of the proposal as follows:
- The investment into the construction of the Proposed Development would support approximately **5 full-time equivalent (FTE) on-site jobs** over the one-year construction phase.
 - After allowing for displacement, leakage and multiplier effects in the supply chain, the Proposed Development could support approximately **4 FTE net additional jobs** in the construction sector and its supply chains, of which 3 FTE jobs are likely to be taken up by those residing in the local authority area of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The construction phase could generate approximately **£440,000 in Gross Value Added (GVA)**, a measure of economic productivity, that could support economic growth across the wider regional economy of Yorkshire and the Humber, of which £300,000 GVA could support local economic growth in Kirklees.
 - On-site employees during the construction period are likely to spend approximately **£4,500 in local shops**, supporting businesses in the retail and leisure sectors.
 - **Once fully built out and operational**, the Proposed Development will generate the following socio-economic impacts over the lifetime of the new store.
 - The new store will offer employment opportunities at a range of levels, including management and shop-floor positions. The Proposed Development will support approximately **20 on-site jobs**. As these jobs will be flexible depending on the number of hours worked, the new employment opportunities will be a mix of part-time and full-time.
 - After allowing for displacement, leakage and multiplier effects in the supply chain, it is estimated that the Proposed Development could support up to **15 FTE net additional jobs in the regional economy, of which approximately 12 FTE jobs could be taken up by residents in the local authority area of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council**.
 - The Proposed Development could generate approximately **£1.0 million annually in GVA** for the Yorkshire and the Humber regional economy.
 - The new on-site employees and jobs supported in the local area could generate approximately **£15,000 in annual additional expenditure** for local businesses in the retail and leisure sectors.
 - Business Rates of approximately £28,000 per annum, of which **£14,000 retained by Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council per annum**.
 - Fiscal benefits of **£70,000 per annum**, comprising Income Tax and National Insurance, to the Exchequer.

7 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1.1. This Retail Assessment has considered the proposal against the adopted Development Plan and the NPPF. It concludes the following:
- Retail proposals have previously been considered acceptable by the Council at the application site through the granting of the previously planning permissions at the site. It must also be the case that the current proposal is acceptable in principle.
 - The Council's Retail Study identified a qualitative need for more food retail provisions in Kirkburton. The proposed store will help to serve the shopping needs of existing and future residents within the surrounding area.
 - It will also improve local retail provision, thereby helping to retain a greater proportion of expenditure within the Kirkburton catchment area.
 - It has been demonstrated that there are no suitable or available sites within Kirkburton District Centre which could accommodate the proposal, thereby satisfying the sequential test as set out in the NPPF and Local Plan. The application site represents the most appropriate and suitable location for the proposals.
 - The impact on local convenience stores will not be significantly adverse, and
 - The proposal will have a positive economic impact, including introducing new investments to Kirkburton and creating new jobs for local residents, which is particularly vital given the current economic climate.
- 7.1.2. In summary, this Retail Assessment has demonstrated that the proposal has satisfied the sequential and impact tests, and that there are strong planning grounds for supporting the proposal. The NPPF makes it clear that proposals for sustainable development should be supported by local planning authorities.



4th Floor
6 Devonshire Square
London
EC2M 4YE

wsp.com

PUBLIC