

## Sainsbury's Mill Road 11/0710/FUL: Vague claims and flawed arguments in the applicant's documents

20/Jun/2011 11\_0710\_FUL-TRANSPORT\_STATEMENT-614142.pdf

### 1. Delivery within 15 minutes

The applicant claims that the main delivery will be a 11m rigid vehicle "on site for approximately 15 minutes". No evidence has been provided for this. Tesco's proposals for on-street deliveries proposed deliveries of 41 minutes each. We feel it is unlikely that Sainsbury's delivery could be almost one-third the period of the nation's leading supermarket retailer.

One of our Committee members previously worked as a supermarket delivery driver. In discussion, he stated that

*"any suggestion of daily depot deliveries taking any less than 45 minutes is completely unrealistic. The driver would need to be assisted by a number of on site staff and be familiar with the site to achieve even that, and 60+ minutes is probably more likely in practice - meaning that the deliveries would still be taking place right as the morning peak period commences, even if the delivery starts on time.*

*"It actually takes longer to deliver to front of store, as there isn't a secure loading dock to hold the deliveries on - each cage needs to be taken into the store as it is unloaded, which takes at least twice as long.*

*"It seems to me that whoever came up with that 15 minute figure cannot have ever even watched a delivery, much less made one! To do it in 15 minutes would need a guaranteed vacant level unloading dock with ramp (so you don't lose time waiting to get in or using a tail-lift) and a dedicated staff to take the goods from the driver as fast as he could get them off the truck. Even then it would be tight."*

The Highway Authority later said "Further information is requested to verify the applicant's estimate of time of stay of their own servicing vehicles.". We can see no evidence that this has been provided.

### 2. Lack of servicing restrictions

The applicant says

*"It is suggested that if an existing problem regarding deliveries was known servicing restrictions would have been modified to control and prevent on-street serving from being permitted"*

There are no premises at present along this side of Mill Road in this stretch that would require the level of servicing that would be required for a store of this nature. Accordingly, there would be no reason to implement such a restriction.

In practice there are problems caused by existing deliveries, but we assume that the Highway Authority's clear backlog of other work has meant that this issue has not risen to the top of its agenda yet.

### **3. Applicant believes narrowness of Mill Road has no effect on high collision rate**

The applicant claims, with respect to the high collision rate here:

*“Retail use has little if any bearing on the number of accidents or occurrence”*

*“No trend that could be identified with regards an issue relating to actual highway infrastructure”*

Any reasonable person would find it perfectly obvious that the narrow and very busy nature of the road creates an environment where more conflict between users is created. It is obvious that, with a high number of cyclists and pedestrians, that if there was more space, there would be fewer collisions.

Mill Road is an accident cluster site. The applicant’s suggestion that the narrow highway and that existing delivery practices have no effect on the high level of collisions cannot explain the unusually high level of collisions.

### **4. Applicant’s view of lack of congestion relies on illegal pavement parking**

The applicant states in section 2.38 that “limited if any congestion is caused” by existing deliveries to traders. We strongly disagree – the existing deliveries do cause safety dangers and delays, as any reasonable person observing Mill Road would be aware of.

In making this assertion, the applicant shows photos in Appendix 2. However, the picture clearly shows vehicles breaking the law by having driven on the pavement. In this way, these vehicles have lowered delays to other road users but created pedestrian danger.

#### **Mill Road Kerbside Survey Screenshots: Thursday 12/05/11**



09:54 OGV1 South Delivery



11:04 LGV South Delivery



15:03 LGV South Delivery

12/Oct/2011 11\_0710\_FUL-RESPONSE\_TO\_HIGHWAYS\_COMMENTS-711591.pdf

**5. Applicant claims that servicing is no different to the Pool club**

*“the servicing proposals are no different to the existing Snooker/Pool Club use”*

We would submit that the nature of a Pool Club is very different to that of a supermarket. The delivery intensity of the latter is considerably greater. In fact, the Officer agrees:

*“8.29 [...] I share the highway authority’s view that the greater intensity of servicing required by the proposed A1 use represents a significant worsening of the situation”*

**6. Sainsbury’s delivery is shown breaking the law on St Andrew’s Street**

The St Andrew’s Street branch is mentioned, with the applicant stating:

*“vehicles stop on-street and do not cause any congestion”*

The screenshot given for 26<sup>th</sup> July clearly shows a van having driven on the pavement, which is illegal.

**St Andrews, Cambridge – 26<sup>th</sup> July Screenshots**



12/Oct/2011 11\_0710\_FUL-VECTOS\_-\_RESPONSE\_TO\_HIGHWAYS\_COMMENTS-711619.pdf

**7. Applicant’s believes St Andrew’s Street store is comparable**

The applicant claims that:

*“St Andrew’s store ... is considered a very close comparison site”*

Mill Road is a busy district road with lots of through car traffic, and cyclists (as the counts show), whereas St Andrew’s Street is not. St Andrew’s Street is subject to bollard-based

control, and so the only vehicles going there would be buses, authorised taxis, cycles and vehicles emerging from the Lion Yard car park. At 7-8am it is very unlikely that many vehicles would be leaving a car park.

**8. Little servicing claimed – but there are no other shops**

*“on the northern kerbside adjacent the proposed Sainsbury’s site very little servicing takes place”*

But at present, there are no shops requiring heavy servicing, so this is hardly surprising.

**9. Applicant believes driving on the pavement is legal**

*“existing vehicles therefore stop on Mill Road’s carriageway or on part of the footway which while entirely permitted under existing regulations is not deemed acceptable by Cambridgeshire County Council”*

Driving on the pavement is in fact a clear offence in the Highway Code. Whilst the police are poor at enforcing this due to a poor legislative framework, it surely cannot be permissible to allow new developments to rely on illegal behaviour.

Delivery vehicles also damage the pavement, imposing costs on the Highway Authority, as pavements are not reinforced to the same extent as roads.

**10. Applicant claims that the pavement is being narrowed 'very modestly'**

*“in line with Sainsbury’s best intentions and community responsibilities they propose that a half lay-by be constructed adjacent 103 Mill Road”*

*“To provide such a facility it is proposed to very modestly narrow the adjacent above average width footway close to 103 Mill Road”*

The latest proposal, total removal of the pavement is not “Very modestly” narrowing it.

We do not feel “community responsibilities” are compliant with creation of inconvenience and danger for pedestrians and cyclists.

**11. Two cars passing a lorry partly on the road does not leave ample width**

The applicant presents a diagram showing that their half-width bay:

*“allows two large cars (based on a Bentley chassis) to pass each other on Mill Road with ample width.”*

This does not accord with reality, as any reasonable person observing Mill Road would know.

**12. Applicant admits that on-road loading would be problematic**

The applicant claims:

*“Without Sainsbury’s proactive stance there would be no catalyst to create such a loading facility and therefore provide a more acceptable manner in which servicing can take place”*

We take this as an admission that the applicant’s initial proposal to deliver on-street would be problematic. Given this, why did they propose it in the first place?

#### **12/Oct/2011 11\_0710\_FUL-RESPONSE\_POLICY\_ISSUES-711604.pdf**

##### **13. Local Plan claimed to be less relevant than a document which is not yet passed parliament**

This document quotes the draft National Planning Policy Framework and infers that this makes the Local Plan document out of date.

The Local Plan is in fact was instituted only 5 years ago, and the NPPF is only in draft, is currently in consultation, and has not been passed by parliament.

#### **13/Oct/2011 11\_0710\_FUL-RE\_DELIVERIES-711562.pdf**

##### **14. Applicant implies that the Manual For Streets 2 would agree to a diverted pavement**

*9. “This loading bay has been designed and embedded within the footway and directly accords with guidance from Manual for Streets 2 (CIHT, London, 2010) an excerpt of which is included at Appendix 2 for ease of reference.”*

This selective quoting fails to make clear that the Manual For Streets 2 would regard a pavement with a gap in it as unacceptable. In fact, the applicant (perhaps carelessly) includes a quotation from Manual For Streets 2 which makes clear that the applicant’s proposals would create problems:

*MfS2, para 11.1.7: “On-street servicing bays [...] Where they are designed as lay-bys, they can be difficult to keep clear of parked cars and take space away from pedestrians”*

This is exactly the problem that the applicant will create.

##### **15. ‘Equivalent’ Goodge Street bay has cars parking in the loading bay and shows a lorry that does not fit**

*“11. In addition to the MfS2 guidance, photographs of a similar bay at Goodge Street, central London, which itself has an extremely high pedestrian footfall, are also included at Appendix 2.”*

The illustration given appears to show a non-delivery vehicle parked in a delivery bay, a problem we expressly raise above.

The bay concerned can be viewed on Google Street View. Note how the lorry does not fit, a problem which we also explicitly raise in our objection.

The pictured bay is also of a different nature to what is proposed on Mill Road. Note that there is a straight pavement which contains an additional delivery bay. On Mill Road, the applicant proposes removing the pavement and diverting pedestrians around it onto their land, which is a different arrangement.

