

COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT

- This comparative assessment has been prepared for Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) by Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA). This considers the current application for retail-led development on land at Maylands Avenue (4/01132/15/MOA) and the appeal that is currently live on Jarman Fields (APP/A1910/W/15/3132774) following the refusal of a planning application in June 2015 on retail impact grounds (4/00424/15/MOA).
- 2 This assessment should be read alongside the following reports prepared by PBA for DBC:
 - Retail Review (May 2015) Proposed Retail Development Jarman Park
 - Retail Review (September 2015) Land at Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead
 - Further Retail Review (November 2015) Land at Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead
- This assessment considers retail planning matters only, focusing on the tests as set out at paragraphs 24, 26 and 27 of the NPPF. It draws together advice provided on the two schemes to assist DBC's decision making process. It does not come to a view on the degree of weight that should be afforded to each element but instead compares one scheme against the other.

	Issue	Aviva	Jarman Fields (appeal)
Context	Scale	12,503 sqm GIA A1 retail floorspace 9,262 sqm net sales area (7,848 sqm comparison and 1,414 sqm convenience) 650 sqm A3	10,305 sqm GIA A1 retail floorspace 8,812 sqm net sales area (8,000 sqm comparison and 812 sqm convenience)
	Range of goods/suggested restrictions	1,350 sqm fashion (in a single unit), 825 sqm sports clothing (in a single unit) and 3% clothing, footwear and health and beauty cap in other units i.e. c. 30% floorspace cap	10% cap on fashion floorspace i.e. 800 sqm net
	Turnover in 2020 (£M)	£56.21	£43.68
	Sequential status	Out of centre	Out of centre
Sequential (NPPF paragraph 24)	Analysis	Both sites are out of centre and neither is within easy walking distance would promote linked trips with the town centre. Both have established links with the town centre and surrounding residential areas. The Aviva site is located c.200m from the nearest part of the permitted neighbourhood shops that is currently under construction at the Heart of Maylands but, for the purposes of the NPPF sequential test, it is not an existing centre and therefore is not relevant in determining the status of Aviva site. In any event, taking into account local factors, including the sof the approved local centre and the nature of linkage between it and an development that might come forward on the Aviva site, it is considered be out of centre even to Heart of Maylands local centre. Both sites are considered to be sequentially equal.	
Impact	Impact on Hemel Hempstead Convenience Comparison Total diversion Impact	£1.6m £14.7m £16.3m 5.6%	£0.9m £13.4m £14.3m 4.9%



Issue	Aviva	Jarman Fields (appeal)	
Commentary	Diversion and impact, whilst adverse, deemed to be within the bounds of acceptability, provided appropriate conditions are imposed to reduce the prospect of town centre occupiers relocating to the site.	Diversion and impact, whilst adverse, deemed to be within the bounds of acceptability, provided appropriate conditions are imposed to reduce the prospect of town centre occupiers relocating to the site.	
Analysis The overall impact is lower in the case of the Jarman Fields; have quantitative impact needs to be balanced against other factors			
	Notably this includes the existence of significant retail and leisure provision at Jarman Fields which is already in the process of being enhanced. Both developments are presented as being 'complementary' to the town centre; however, the already well-established nature of Jarman Park as a retail and leisure destination together with any new retail development at Jarman Fields risks creating a competing destination. Although controls are suggested, the Jarman Fields development together with the existing Jarman Park offer would create a greater critical mass of main town centre uses in an out-of-centre location than through the Aviva scheme.		
Impact on local centres			
Convenience	£1.0m	£0.6m	
Comparison Total diversion	£0.2m £1.2m	£0.2m £0.7m	
Impact	2.0%	1.2%	
P			
Commentary	Greatest diversion (£1m) forecast from Woodhall Farm (Sainsbury's store). Overall diversion and impact on other local centres limited.	Greatest diversion (£0.6m) forecast from Woodhall Farm (Sainsbury's store). Overall diversion and impact on other local centres limited.	
Analysis	The Aviva scheme will result in a greater level of impact on the local centres than the Jarman Fields scheme.		
Impact on planned investment in town centres	Heart of Maylands local centre located 200m from the nearest part of the application site. Objection submitted on behalf of the Heart of Maylands developer; however, no evidence to suggest that development will not proceed or prejudice to occupiers.	Potential impact on longer-term development aspirations at Market Square.	
	Potential impact on longer-term development aspirations at the Market Square in Hemel Hempstead town centre.		
Analysis	Both schemes may result in a potential impact on future investment in He Hempstead town centre. However, no explicit concerns have been expressed by town centre stakeholders to suggest that there are any firm plans that either development might impact upon.		
	The Aviva scheme presents a greater degree of risk than the Jarman Fields scheme because of the proximity to the new local centre at the Heart of Maylands. Whilst there is nothing to indicate that in solus terms the Aviva scheme would result in a significant adverse impact on the delivery of that planned investment, it is inevitable that there will be a greater degree of diversion in the future from the local shops in the Heart of Maylands centre simply because of the proximity of the Aviva site to Heart of Maylands.		
Diversion from other centres			
Berkhamsted	£0.8m	£0.6m	



Issue	Aviva	Jarman Fields (appeal)	
St Albans Watford	£1.4m £5.1m	£1.2m £4.1m	
Analysis	A greater level of diversion will result from the Aviva scheme. Again, neither scheme is anticipated to result in diversion of such a scale as to result in a significant adverse impact on any of these centres.		
Impact on town centres	In solus terms, neither scheme will result in impacts on existing centres of a scale that would raise the likelihood of a significant adverse impact.		
	The Aviva scheme will result in a greater degree of diversion and therefore impact on other centres; however, the Jarman Fields scheme risks creating a retail destination in an out-of-centre location that could create the critical mass that could compound impact on particularly Hemel Hempstead town centre.		