TO THE LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Objection to proposal 19/01670/FULL1 The Porcupine Inn and Lidl Great Britain Ltd (Lidl)

17 August 2020

This is an objection paper in respect of the re-submission of a request for planning permission from Lidl, to demolish the Porcupine Public House on Mottingham Road Bromley, and for a Lidl supermarket to be constructed on the site.

Administrative points

• A number of residents only received notice of the latest submission by Royal Mail post on Thursday 13 August. The letter from the “Planning Support Team” was dated 6 August, and gave 14 days’ notice for objections to be registered. As the letter only arrived on 13 August, a 14 day notice period would expire on 27 August. It is understood that the Planning Department have sent out a further letter, however I have not received this (this “further” letter alludes to further information on the Planning website, but I am advised that people who have received the latter are unable to locate the information on the planning website) Furthermore the Planning department failed to advise local residents of previous submissions of this planning application. Perhaps the planning team could provide the local Councillors with an explanation for this obvious oversight.

• Since 1 August there have been an additional 38 objections and 5 letters of support recorded on the Bromley Planning website. This represents nearly 8 objections to every letter of support on top of the previous massive number of objections to this planning proposal. There are an overwhelming number of objections to Lidl’s proposals, which have been totally ignored by the Planning Department. No doubt the Planning Department will deny this, but a detailed explanation to our elected Councillors would appear to be required.

• There is no narrative on the Bromley Planning website regarding the current submission. What are committee members and the general public expected to understand in respect of this resubmission.

Glanville Consultants (Glanville) Report dated 31 July 2020 & response by SCP.

Throughout the report Glanville refer to Mottingham as a Town Centre (e.g. 3.25, 4.43, 3.52, 5.4, 11.4.g) when according to the Bromley hierarchy (Bromley Plan 2.2.2) it is a Local Centre. This may simply be a misunderstanding on Glanville's part, but a Local Centre is significantly different, and smaller than a Town Centre (such as Bromley or Orpington) and the use of the term could lead to readers unfamiliar with the area thinking that Mottingham is a major shopping centre.

1.1 Comment.

Glanville were appointed by the London Borough of Bromley, to provide an independent review of the transport information provided in support of the planning application for the re-development of the former Porcupine Inn in Mottingham into a new Lidl food store. The site is located on the B266 Mottingham Road in Mottingham, within the London Borough (LB) of Bromley. Glanville’s 29 page report failed to address a number of issues, and SCP, on behalf of Lidl, have subsequently lodged with the Planning Department a 129 page (yes) response document, which obviously dilutes the independent nature of the Glanville Report. In the interests of impartiality it is recommended that the Glanville Report and the subsequent SCP report are removed from the application, and that a truly independent report be commissioned.

1.5-1.6 Comment.

Glanville are based at Hemel Hempstead, and they made a single site visit between 2pm and 6pm (4 hours) on Thursday 18 June. Additionally Glanville have acknowledged that the site visit took place during the COVID19 lockdown when traffic levels were insignificant compared to normal conditions. However, Glanville report, “this was discussed with LB Bromley and it was agreed that the site visit should continue in order for decision to be reached on the application and that we should assess the application based on unbiased past experience”. Glanville have no prior experience of Mottingham.

Bromley Planning Department’s behaviour in stating and allowing this is both out of order and unprofessional. It is surely not possible for an objective and independent traffic report to be undertaken during a lockdown, when people were not out on the streets by order of the Government. It follows, therefore, that these circumstances totally dilute the value of an independent report. This underlines the comments made in the previous paragraph. In paragraph 1.6 Glanville state “It should be noted, that at the time of the site visit, shops had re-opened, schools had re-opened for some pupils and workplaces were open for employees who were unable to work from home and therefore traffic was returning to typical levels.” This statement is incorrect; shops had not reopened, there were 3 very small grocery stores opened at restricted times, the rest of the shops were closed. Schools have severely restricted access for infants (all within walking distance), and it would be interesting to hear which workplaces were open and the hours that they were open. Traffic certainly was NOT returning to typical levels. As Glanville had only spent 4 hours in Mottingham, how on earth can they know what typical levels are?

2.5 Glanville state “The appeal hearing was undertaken in 2014 by an Inspector from the Planning Inspectorate. It was rejected on highway safety grounds, amongst other non-highway reasons. The specific highway reasons for dismissal were as follows:

- During deliveries some parking spaces would need to be coned off preventing customers from using them;

- Insufficient visibility was proposed at the site access which would create a safety issue as the attention of drivers on Mottingham Road would be focussed on the adjacent War Memorial roundabout; and

- The alternative access options suggested were not considered to be suitable.

Comment.

However since the start of COVID19 pandemic the government has introduced further proposals regarding the size, width and nature of pavements (footways), which impact on Lidl’s proposals.

2.6 Glanville state “The Inspector confirmed that he was happy with the proposed parking provision of 35 spaces and that large delivery vehicles would take both sides of the carriageway when turning in and out of the site.”

Comment.

Within the Appeal decision of 16 December 2014, the Inspector did not confirm that he was happy. In paragraph 19 of his report he states (re parking noise) “Nevertheless, it would be an advantage to those living nearby that the proposed retail use of the site would permit customers only to be admitted to the premises up to 2100 hours on Mondays to Saturdays and up to 1700 hours on Sundays.” Paragraph 46 states “The substantially larger retail unit proposed in the appeal scheme, along with 35 car parking spaces compared to the number of existing spaces, would be likely in my judgement to result in considerably greater traffic generation than would be likely from the fall-back scheme.20 The existing arrangements are not ideal, some car parking spaces are substandard, entering the northern access would raise safety considerations, and the visibility of both access points is restricted to some degree” These statements by the Inspector do not indicate that he was “happy”.

3.2 Comment.

Doesn’t acquaint the reader of the direction that Lidl’s HGV’s will approach the site. Elsewhere it is noted that vehicles will approach from Court Road (part of LB of Greenwich) which has restrictions on HGV’s. Lidl HGV’s approaching via West Park will have to navigate the roundabout at the junction of West Park and Mottingham Road. Recent speed control measures on West Park will mean that the HGV’s will generate more noise to annoy local residents.

3.3 Seeks information, which is provided by SCP on page 3 of their 129 page report. Of interest SCP state “It is expected that the store will be open during the following hours:

• Monday to Saturday: 7am – 10pm

• Sunday: 10am – 4pm”.

Comment.

However the Inspector in his decision report states at paragraph 19 “People getting in and out of cars in the car park, moving shopping trolleys and loading car boots would also make some noise. This could be annoying at times for neighbouring residents, particularly the occupiers of the rooms in the elevation of No.26 that faces towards the appeal site. Windows in this elevation would be close to the proposed parking spaces in the north-western corner of the proposed development. However, I have taken into account that noise and disturbance at night time might result from activities in the rear garden of the public house up to closing time. There are reports of anti-social behaviour at times when the Porcupine Inn was operational. I accept that such activities and behaviour might not be a feature of all public houses. Nevertheless, it would be an advantage to those living nearby that the proposed retail use of the site would permit customers only to be admitted to the premises up to 2100 hours on Mondays to Saturdays and up to 1700 hours on Sundays” Clearly, the Inspectors comments have been ignored.

3.4 Glanville seeks further information, which SCP provide.

3.5 Glanville state

“The previous application was rejected due to a conflict with Policies T6, T7 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan. In 2019, the UDP was superseded by the LB Bromley Local Plan and therefore Glanville has undertaken a review to identify if the proposed development accords with the transport policies within the Local Plan. The following policies are considered relevant to the application and which the proposed development accords with.

• Policy 31 – Relieving Congestion

 This policy requires developments to be located in areas accessible by sustainable modes of travel, encouraging walking and cycling, incorporating improvements to the highway network and supporting the planning applications with a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.

• Policy 32 – Road Safety

 The potential impact of any development on road safety will be considered by the Council to ensure that it is not significantly adversely affected.

• Policy 33 – Access for All

 The council will ensure that development proposals are designed for people with disabilities including crossing provision and that the impact on public transport is assessed.

• Policy 34 – Highway Infrastructure Provision

 New developments should be designed to ensure ease of access for people with disabilities or mobility impairments. New accesses should be considered subject to road safety requirements.

Comment.

Policy 33 is ignored in Lidl’s submission. Appendix B of Transport for London’s Pedestrian Comfort Guidance states that for areas with low flow <600pph “The recommended minimum footway width (total width) for a site with low flows is 2.9m This is enough space for comfortable movement and a large piece of street furniture such as a guard rail, cycle parking (parallel with the road) a bus flag for a low activity bus stop, or a busy pedestrian crossing”. Lidl’s proposal however proposes a pedestrian crossing and a footway width of 2.02m to 2.2m on the footway opposite their proposed development. (ie c 30% narrower than the TfL recommendation. It is accepted that the figures are recommended widths, but for the Planning Dept. to brush aside these recommendations (in the interests of Lidl) would be totally out of order.

Additionally, SCP Schedule1, Item 18, Appendix 3 and Plan SCP/18246/0000/002 includes a proposal to shave off part of the flower bed in front of the library, the property of a third party, to increase the pavement width there from the 2.20m of the previous application to 2.5m, but still a significant reduction from the current 3.19m width. This reduction in pavement width remains unacceptable, particularly in view of the Coronavirus pandemic, when every other nearby local authority is working on providing extra footway space rather than reducing it. In the Statutory Guidance to the Traffic Management Act 2004, updated 23-5-20, the introduction notes:

The government therefore expects local authorities to make significant changes to their road layouts to give more space to cyclists and pedestrians. Such changes will help embed altered behaviours and demonstrate the positive effects of active travel. I’m pleased to see that many authorities have already begun to do this, and I urge you all to consider how you can begin to make use of the tools in this guidance, to make sure you do what is necessary to ensure transport networks support recovery from the COVID-19 emergency and provide a lasting legacy of greener, safer transport.

This should be a real opportunity for Bromley to reconsider road layouts, speed limits and parking so that the needs of pedestrians and cyclists are promoted instead of doing all in their power to accommodate Lidl.

3.6 Glanville state “it is considered unlikely that shoppers would walk such distances (>2km) with heavy shopping”.

Comment.

Lidl were relying on the expectation that people would walk to the store rather than take a bus or drive given the poor bus service. Glanville appear to disagree.

3.7 Conclusion is speculative.

3.10 - 3.12 Glanville deal with accidents in 3.10-12 and state that there were no highway defects associated with the accidents recorded and SCP consider the accidents in more detail in their Schedule 1, Item 3 and in Appendix 1.

Comment.

SCP extracted the accident figures for Junction 1 (Grove Park Road/Mottingham Lane/Court Farm Road), Junction 2 (West Park and Mottingham Road) and Junctions 3-4 (Mottingham Road/Court Road/Portland Road) from the Crashmap website. At Junction 1, four out of seven accidents involved cars colliding with cycles or motorcycles; at Junction 2, the only recorded accident was between a car and a motorcycle; and at Junctions 3-4, four out of six accidents involved cars colliding with cycles, motorcycles or a pedestrian (one of which resulted in a serious injury). Nine out of the total 14 accidents involved cycles, motorcycles or pedestrians; these categories of road user are more likely to suffer an injury in an accident with a car.

SCP's analysis for all three junctions suggests that there is no pattern to the accidents and therefore no safety problems associated with the junctions. However, there IS a pattern: it is noticeable that the clusters of accidents shown on Crashmap are all at these busy junctions, with few elsewhere and so there is an inherent additional risk for cyclists, motorcyclists and pedestrians. Traffic speeds, parked cars, drivers making U turns (a factor in two of the accidents) all contribute to those errors of judgement which are the most common factor in accidents. The accidents on Crashmap are just those which have been reported and, according to RoSPA "many cyclist casualties are not reported to the police, even when the cyclist is injured badly enough to be taken to hospital" (RoSPA). As well as the reported accidents there are near misses witnessed by residents most days at these junctions.

3.13- 3.19 Comment.

In Schedule 1, Items 4, 7 and 9, SCP provide several unsatisfactory solutions to questions about deliveries raised by Glanville. SCP confirm that the preferred option is for two deliveries a day via Court Road using the larger HGV between 8am and 9pm with Sunday deliveries, if Lidl were to obtain a permit to override the restriction on Court Road. Even two deliveries a day is inappropriate and unsafe for a site this restricted despite all the swept path analyses. The proposed site and access from Court Road are unsuitable for HGV deliveries, especially as traffic builds up at the Court Road/Mottingham Road junction at certain times of day and can come to a standstill when there are other delivery lorries for the flower shop in Court Road and/or Nisa in Mottingham Road. There is also a good reason for Sunday restrictions: to give everyone a break from heavy lorries.

As an alternative, SCP propose three or four deliveries a day using a smaller lorry via Mottingham Lane, which is incredible and insulting to local residents, given the thirteen road humps and narrowness of the road. It would also be hazardous for pedestrians particularly at the Winn Road end where there is a narrow pavement on one side only. The additional journeys would create further noise, and pollution.

Glanville note in 3.14 a. that delivery vehicles need to use both sides of the road to turn in and out of the site. SCP have not commented on this, but this must present an extra hazard for other road users.

In their sections 3.16 and 3.17, Glanville discuss the movement of HGVs into and within the car park and state that "delivery drivers are highly trained and regularly make deliveries within operational car parks and are therefore experienced at manoeuvring within confined areas among pedestrians." However, most supermarkets do not mix deliveries and customers like this, so do they really have the experience? No other Lidl, or other supermarket, mixes delivery vehicles with other users in this way. This is a further demonstration of the unsuitability of this site as a supermarket and car park. SCP do not comment on this.

3.21 Comment.

Glanville's section 3.21 questions whether an articulated HGV could negotiate the War Memorial roundabout; SCP state that the swept path analysis confirms that they could, but that it would be an unlikely route. However a driver might turn left out of the proposed Lidl entrance, go round the roundabout and come back along Mottingham Road towards Court Road if the easier right turn was blocked by a badly parked vehicle - cars often stop outside the takeaways (i.e. outside designated parking), outside the permitted hours, and vehicles often stop there in permitted hours as well, which clashes with a lot of Lidl’s proposed delivery times. SCP do not address this. It is not possible for a 40 tonne HGV to circumnavigate the roundabout safely and without reversing.

3.22 -3.29 Parking. Parking is considered in Glanville's Section 3.27-3.29 and SCP respond in Schedule 1, Item 13 and Plan SCP/18047/SK17 within their Appendix 3.

Comment.

SCP admit that demand for parking spaces in the car park will exceed capacity at peak times and have shown available parking in the surrounding streets in the plan - basically any street without parking restrictions, suitable or not. This plan includes the designated 30 minute parking spaces outside the shops in Mottingham Road which are usually at capacity, explaining why some drivers park in the non-designated section, outside the permitted hour which are before 9.30 and after 6.30 on Monday to Saturday.

Also included is Highcombe Road, which does have a good number of parking spaces, but it is also a cul de sac and a quiet residential road. Lidl shoppers would be turning in the road or in the drives of houses when they needed to leave, an unsatisfactory solution and likely to prove hazardous to passers-by. Additionally, this road also suffers already with parking by commuters from Mottingham Station, which would have been picked up by Glanville had they made their site visit at a normal time, rather than during a lockdown.

Other unlikely and unsuitable parking spaces are shown in: Mottingham Lane, where the road bends, near the junction; Grove Park Road, where the spaces on either side of the road appear to be at the dropped kerb at the crossing place and also just before the start of a cycle lane going towards Grove Park; Court Farm Road, which is part of the London Cycleway. The Plan SCP/18047/SK17 specifically refers to Sundays only, and that is the only time the free parking in West Hallowes is available. Other parking in West Park is only available outside the CPZ times of 1.30-3pm.

For a supermarket to draw up a handy guide to parking in the local streets suggests that there is something fundamentally wrong with the application: there is not going to be enough parking available and that is because the site is not suitable for a supermarket.

3.29 Glanville state “It is important to note, however, that no information has been provided for parking requirements, parking accumulation or parking duration during the peak periods for example Christmas and therefore the potential impact at these times is unknown. It is acknowledged, however, that at these busy times there will be staff on hand to ensure that vehicles do not queue out of the car park resulting in Mottingham Road being blocked.”

SCP respond “Based on ANPR data gathered from two local stores (New Addington and Locksbottom), average trip rates per 100sqm RFA have been estimated for the week leading up to Christmas. The ANPR data is provided within Appendix 4.

During the peak period (Christmas), the peak demand derived by applying these trip rates to the Mottingham store is approximately 80 vehicles in and 80 out in a single hour. That equates to each of the 33 spaces turning over 2.4 times per hour which gives an average dwell time of 25 minutes.

As shown in Item 11, the parking duration for peak periods (Christmas) is approximately 30 minutes, therefore there are some instances during peak demand where a customer may have to wait a few minutes for a space to become free.

Comment.

At least 3 spaces will be used by staff and should not be included in these turnover figures. Thus 80 vehicles would indicate a turnover of 2.7 vehicles per hour i.e. a dwell time of 22 Minutes. Therefore we challenge SCP’s calculations.

SCP go on to say.Based on the estimated generated trips, a parking accumulation exercise has been undertaken for the peak period (Christmas), the resulting graphs are provided in Appendix 4. It is important to note that the accumulations are based on all vehicles entering and exiting the site as it could not be distinguished when deliveries were taking place.

The accumulation shows that for a peak weekday, the peak forecast parking demand is 36 at 11:00-12:00, which exceeds the parking provision by 3 spaces, Comment. If you ignore the spaces used by staff.

The accumulation shows that for a peak Saturday, the peak forecast parking demand is 36 at 11:00-12:00 and 13:00-14:00 which exceeds the parking provision by 3 spaces.

The accumulation shows that for a peak Sunday, the peak forecast parking demand is 40 at 11:00-12:00 which exceeds the parking provision by 7 spaces. Comment. This would be 10 spaces if you discount spaces used by staff.

Whilst some customers may choose to wait a short period of time for a space to become free, TN02 shows that there is sufficient off-site parking provision available within a 200m walk Comment Glanville use 100m as the walking distance for car drivers. SCP have ignored this.

for the site to accommodate the surplus: 41 spaces are free on a Thursday and 49 spaces free on a Saturday. SCP have prepared an additional plan, see SCP/18047/SK17 within Appendix 3, which shows there are 97 available onstreet parking spaces within a 200m walk from the site which could be utilised by customers if available on a Sunday. It is expected that the baseline demand for parking on-street on a Sunday would be similar if not lower than that which was observed on the Saturday, particularly along Mottingham Road.

Therefore there will be sufficient off-site parking to accommodate any potential surplus from the development during peak periods.”

Comment.

SCP are saying at peak periods (they cite Christmas, but a peak period could be at any other time), trip rates to the Mottingham store is approximately 80 vehicles in and 80 out in a single hour. That equates to just under 3 vehicles a minute (see Appendix 4). This makes a total mockery of Lidl’s traffic plan. Additionally SCP fail to include the fact that 3 spaces will be taken up by staff. Having a vehicle movement in/out of the site every 20 seconds is completely unsustainable on a road such as Mottingham Road. The comments made by SCP regarding street parking (they call it off-site parking) indicate that Lidl and SCP are advocating that cars that are unable to access the parking spaces at the proposed Lidl site should just park their cars wherever they think fit. This is totally unsatisfactory. Car parking spaces in the vicinity are often taken up by students from Eltham College during daytime and on some Saturdays. There certainly will not be sufficient off-site parking available.

3.34 Glanville state “3.34 - It should be noted that these surveys are relatively old and Glanville would typically recommend that newer surveys are undertaken.”

SCP responds “A new speed survey was undertaken on Mottingham Road, just to the north of the Devonshire Road / Mottingham Road priority junction, between Friday 17th July and Monday 20th July, the data is provided in Appendix 5. The data shows 85th percentile speeds of 27.01mph for north westbound traffic and 28.91mph for south eastbound traffic. This confirms that 43m visibility splays are still appropriate for the site.

Comment.

Between Friday 17th July and Monday 20th July, the country was in partial lockdown. The data therefore only applies to the time when the UK was in partial lockdown when the nature of traffic movements changed, and does not in any way reflect typical speeds in view of the lesser volumes of traffic. This survey should therefore be ignored as having no value in normal traffic conditions.

3.35 – 3.36 No mention is made of TfL Pedestrian Comfort Guidance. See comments above in 3.5, Policy 33.

3.38 SCP state “In accordance with Manual for Streets, these visibility splays are adequate for vehicles travelling at speeds of 27mphsouthbound and 30mph northbound.

Southbound vehicles, having just exited the War Memorial roundabout, are expected to be travelling at speeds lower than the 30mph speed limit, this was confirmed by speed surveys which were undertaken in 2014 and recorded an 85thpercentile speed of 26.4mph for southbound vehicles. The same speed surveys recorded an 85th percentile speed of

29.6mph for northbound vehicles, a more recent survey has been undertaken on Mottingham Road, just to the north of the

Devonshire Road / Mottingham Road priority junction, between Friday 17th July and Monday 20th July, the data is provided in Appendix5 .

Comment.

Another survey undertaken during partial lockdown. In the interests of accuracy this should be ignored as it is likely to be meaningless in normal times. SCP conclude here saying “The more recent speed survey shows that the achievable visibility at this access and indeed the site access is appropriate for the current speed limit of the road and therefore there is no need to consider reducing the speed limit of Mottingham road to 20mph.” This cannot be so as the survey is blemished in view of the COVID19 partial lockdown. Glanville recognise this in the preamble to their report.

3.43 – 3.44 Appears to contradict each other.

5.6 SCP state “Store hours are likely to be Mon-Sat 7am-10pm or 8am-10pmand Sun 10am-4pm.

The car park gate will be locked by the employee who leaves the site last on an evening, this is expected to be just after 11pm. Appropriate signage will be provided.”

Comment.

See 3.3 re comments made by the Inspector.

7.17 Granville state “7.17 - it is considered that the roundabout should still have been validated based on 2018 traffic levels and queueing.”

SCP state “The Inspector confirmed that the ARCADY model validated well based on queue surveys undertaken in 2014. As demonstrated within CG/18047/TN01/01, the 2018 surveys provide a good comparison with the 2014 flows. This is further supported by Glanville’s statistical assessment (paragraphs 6.5-6.7 of HH4200317/DK/003 Issue 3) which concludes there is a good correlation between the 2014 and 2018 traffic.”

Comment.

Validating on queue surveys undertaken in 2014 & 2018 would not reflect traffic conditions in 2021. Additionally the roundabout geometry has recently changed, which would not be reflected in the 2018 results.

Traffic speed is discussed in SCP's Schedule 1, Item 15 and Appendix 5. Although the speeds are within the legal limit for the road, they are high for an area near roundabouts, with parked cars and pedestrian crossings. Cars travelling south east (28.91 mph) will have come from the long, straight stretch of Grove Park Road, where it is commonplace for vehicles to exceed the 30mph limit, and will not have slowed down to any great extent at the roundabouts. These speeds are high for a B road in a residential area with small shops. The additional traffic generated by a Lidl will only exacerbate this.

SCP Conclusion states:

“As a result of the information provided in this Technical Note, we have concluded that the issues highlighted within Glanville’s review have been adequately addressed, and therefore the proposals are acceptable from a traffic and transport perspective and there should be no reasons to resist the grant of planning permission on these grounds.”

**Conclusion**

The issues highlighted in Granville’s review have not been adequately addressed. SCP state that “the proposals are acceptable from a traffic and transport perspective” We disagree and this submission details reasons why. Additionally people have not been mentioned in the SCP conclusion. The needs of the residents in the area must be considered. They have not been, either by Granville, SCP or Bromley Planning Department.

This re-application must therefore be declined. Traffic movements and levels have not been satisfactorily defined, nor have pedestrian movements. Furthermore the apparent conflict whereby Granville are relying on Lidl’s agents (SCP), invalidate their report, as it cannot possibly be construed as being independent. It is also noted that Glanville have not responded to the SCP report which was undertaken for Lidl. Additionally the final outcome of traffic implications following the COVID19 pandemic have not been announced by the government.

Additionally it should be pointed out that the former Porcupine Inn was on the Council’s Asset of Community Value list for a period of 5 years between July 2013 and July 2018. A six month moratorium period and the procedures set out under Section 88 (2) of the Localism Act 2011 were followed. Lidl liaised with the Porcupine Inn Development Committee directly and showed no interest in selling the site to the community group. A member of the Porcupine Development Committee had a face to face meeting with a Mr Young-Wootton at Lidl’s Merton office, where Mr Young Wootten advised that Lidl were looking to recover their total outlay on the site, if they chose to sell, which is considerably in excess of the open market value of the site, thus making an acquisition by the community impossible as it would be impossible to fund. Furthermore there are reports that there is an interested party, who have been in contact with Lidl with a view to purchasing the site for housing and possibly a micro pub. Bromley Council were supportive of the community group, however the failure for this initiative to acquire the Porcupine failed as Lidl would not accept an open market value for the site.