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## 1. Introduction

1.1 GVA has been instructed by Stroud District Council ('SDC') to prepare an update to its Town Centres \& Retailing Study (July 2010) ('the 2010 study'). This update study will supersede parts of the July 2010 study and will form part of the evidence base for the Stroud District Local Plan which is currently in preparation.
1.2 This update study concentrates upon three areas:

- A review of the changes in national retail and town centre policy since the completion of the 2010 study;
- An updated assessment of quantitative need for retail floorspace across the main settlements in Stroud District; and
- A review of the retail and town centre policies within the March/May 2013 policies consultation version of the Stroud District Local Plan.
1.3 As a consequence, parts of Sections 5, 6 and 7 of the 2010 study will be superseded by this study and the latter parts of this document explain which parts of the 2010 study are no longer relevant.
1.4 The remainder of this document is set out as follows:
- Section 2 summarises the change in national policy, from PPS4 to the National Planning Policy Framework ('the NPPF'), since the 2010 retail study;
- In Section 3, the updated assessment of quantitative need for new convenience and comparison goodsfloorspace is outlined; and
- In Section 4, we provide our review of the contents of retailing and town centre policies in the draft Local Plan and our recommendations for boundaries on the proposalsmaps.
1.5 All plans and statistical infomation can be found in appendices at the rear of this document.


## 2. Changes in Planning Policy Since 2010 Study

2.1 At the time of finalising the 2010 retail study, national planning policy on retailing and town centres was contained within Planning Policy Statement 4, published in December 2009. This PPS was supported by 'Practice Guidance on Need, Impact and the Sequential Approach', published at the same time.
2.2 In March 2012, the NPPF was published by the Department for Communities and Local Govemment and PPS4, amongst many other PPS's and PPG's, was superseded. However, the Practice Guidance rema ins extant and weight can be given to its contents insofar as they remain consistent with the NPPF.
2.3 The NPPF provides a slimmed-down version of national planning policy and in relation to retailing and town centres, the following is recommended in the context of plan-making:

- recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their viability and vita lity;
- define a network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes;
- define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, based on a clear definition of primary and secondary frontages in designated centres, and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations;
- promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer and which reflect the individuality of town centres;
- retain and enhance existing markets and, where appropriate, re-introduce or create new ones, ensuring that markets rema in attractive and competitive;
- allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres. It is importa nt that needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability. Local planning authorities should therefore undertake an assessment of the need to expand town centres to ensure a suffic ient supply of suitable sites;
- allocate appropriate edge of centre sites for main town centre uses that are well connected to the town centre where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available. If sufficient edge of centre sites cannot be identified, set policies for meeting the identified needs in other accessible locations that are well connected to the town centre;
- set policies for the consideration of proposals for main town centre uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres;
- recognise that residential development can play an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and set out policies to encourage residential development on appropriate sites; and
- where town centres are in decline, local planning authorities should plan positively for their future to encourage economic activity.
2.4 These requirements do not differ in a ny signific ant material extent to the contents of PPS4 and it remains national policy for development plans to assess the need for new retail development and if a need is identified then to identify sites in accordance with the sequential approach. An additional requirement in the NPPF is the need to meet retail needs in full. There also remains a need for local planning authorities to define town centre and primary shopping area boundaries, and also shopping frontages.
2.5 Therefore, the context in which the 2010 study was prepared has not materially altered.
2.6 In the context of development management, the NPPF retains the main retail policy tests of impact and the sequential approach and continues the approach of excluding 'need' as a stand-alone retail planning policy test. However, the test of impact has been slimmed down with the five criteria in Policy EC16 of PPS4 (impact on: investment, vitality and viability, scale, financial impact and impact on the delivery of allocated sites) being replaced by just two criteria: impact on town centre investment and impact on town centre vitality and viability. However, this change does not fundamentally alter the long-standing national policy objective of aiming to protect and enhance town centres and ensuring that town centre investment is not jeopardised by out of centre proposals.
2.7 Also, in line with the approach started by PPS4, the NPPF retains clear guidance for local planning authorities when determining retail development proposals which lie outside of town centres and which are not in accordance with an up to date development plan:
"Where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have signific ant adverse impact on one ormore of the above factors, it should be refused".


## 3. Updated Quantitative Need Assessment

3.1 This section, and supporting appendices, provide an update to (and supersede) part of section 5 of the 2010 study. In particular, we have caried out a new assessment of the quantitative need for new convenience and comparison goods floorspace within the ma in settlements in Stroud District.
3.2 This update assessment follows the same step by step methodology as the 2010 study ${ }^{1}$ and also adopts the same study area and constituent zones (see plan at Appendix A to this report). In order to estimate current shopping pattems, we have utilised the results of a household survey conducted in April 2013², and which provides a more up-to-date set of shopping pattems data than the household survey commissioned for the 2010 study. This survey uses the same zones and geographic area as the 2010 study.
3.3 In order to match the work being undertaken for the Stroud District Local Plan, five separate capacity scenarios have been tested, which are based upon five contrasting population growth and housing development options in the Local Plan. The housing development scenarios are:

[^0]| 9,500 dwellings in Stroud District |  |  |  | 11,500 dwellings in Stroud District |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C | Option A | Option B |
| Residual <br> requirement | 2400 | 2400 | 2400 | 4400 | 4400 |
| Hunts <br> Grove <br> extension |  | 500 | 500 | 750 | 0 |
| North East <br> Cam |  | 500 | 500 | 750 | 0 |
| Sharpness |  | 250 | 250 | 250 | 0 |
| Stroud <br> Valleys |  | 300 | 300 | 300 | 0 |
| West of <br> Stonehouse | 1550 | 0 | 750 | 1500 | 3550 |
| Council <br> house <br> programme | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |
| Windfall | 750 | 750 | 0 | 750 | 750 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{2 4 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 5 0}$ |

3.4 Like the 2010 study, population growth within those zones in the study area which fall within Stroud's administrative area has been calculated by apportioning the overall district-wide growth on the basis of: housing allocations, commitments and completions since 2011 (the date of the population base data, from the 2011 Census, for the study area zones). Therefore, the housing development options in the table above have then been added to completions and commitments since 2011 in order to estimate total growth in each zone.
3.5 In order to provide this updated quantitative need assessment, the following data sources and assumptions ha ve been used:

- Population. This a ssessment uses the results of the 2011 Census and projects these forward on the basis of the future district-wide growth rates advised by the Council's population advisor (Keith Woodhead). We are advised that Option B within the 9,500 dwellingsscena rio is the current preferred scenario.
- Current per capita expenditure, future growth rates and an allowance for special forms of trading. Base per capita expenditure data for 2011 has been sought from Experian and growth/change post-2011 has been calculated using the forecasts within Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 10.1 (October 2012).
- Market share information. As already noted, we have utilised the results of an April 2013 telephone survey of housing shopping pattems. This survey sought shopping pattems in relation to convenience and comparison goods.
- Commitments. Based upon data from SDC the only major unimplemented commitment for additional retail floorspace within Stroud District is an extension to the Tesco supermarket in Cam. This proposal will provide additional convenience and comparison goods floorspace. Other recent commitments such as the new Sainsburys in Dursley and the extension to the Sainsburys in Stroud have been implemented before the April 2013 survey.
- Special forms of trading. A reduction has been made in base 2011 expenditure levels to take into account the influence of special forms of trading (i.e. mail order and intemet shopping). In addition, the growth forecasts which have been used taken into account the influence of special forms of trading on the growth/change of spending in physic al stores.
- All monetary information is provided in 2011 prices.
3.6 All five floorspace capacity scenarios follow the same structure and therefore '9,500 dwellings Option $B^{\prime}$ is the only scenario provided with the full set of tables. See Appendix $B$ for this assessment. For the other scenarios, only the summary capacity tables are provided at a ppendices C-F.
3.7 The capacity forecasts for convenience goods floorspace for the main settlements in Stroud District are summarised below. All figures indicate forecast capacity for net additional sales area (in square metres), in addition to existing floorspace. Where there is no figure provided for a particular year, this indicates that there is no forecast capacity for additional floorspace.

[^1]
## Convenience goods floorspace capacity forec asts

| 9500 A | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 373 | 818 | 1083 | 1485 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 48 | 212 |
| Nailsworth | 292 | 369 | 429 | 505 |
| Wotton | 304 | 338 | 370 | 406 |
| Stonehouse |  | 41 | 71 | 142 |


| 9500 B | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 344 | 725 | 1013 | 1386 |
| Cam/Dursley |  | 2 | 124 | 320 |
| Na ilsworth | 292 | 366 | 429 | 504 |
| Wotton | 304 | 338 | 371 | 408 |
| Stonehouse |  |  |  | 26 |


| 9500 C | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 347 | 731 | 1020 | 1396 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 104 | 292 |
| Nailsworth | 289 | 359 | 422 | 494 |
| Wotton | 302 | 334 | 367 | 402 |
| Stonehouse |  |  | 22 | 72 |


| $\mathbf{1 1 5 0 0 ~ A ~}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 340 | 729 | 1211 | 1654 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 217 | 444 |
| Nailsworth | 287 | 357 | 444 | 524 |
| Wotton | 302 | 334 | 375 | 412 |
| Stonehouse |  | 10 | 90 | 165 |


| 11500 B | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 371 | 804 | 1337 | 1828 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 90 | 267 |
| Na ilsworth | 287 | 358 | 446 | 527 |
| Wotton | 302 | 334 | 373 | 410 |
| Stonehouse |  | 86 | 218 | 343 |

3.8 The figures presented in the tables above are based upon the continuation of curent market shares for convenience goods shopping into the future. When compared with the results of the 2010 study, which provided capacity forecasts up to 2026 , the latest results do vary although the scale of difference for each of the main settlements is not signific ant in our opinion.
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### 3.9 The 2010 study did go on to consider qualitative indicators and whether there was a need to plan for an altemate market share for each of the main settlements and we revisit that a ssessment below:

- Stroud. The 2010 study found a good level and quality of convenience goods floorspace and no need to allocate sites for additional floorspace. Based on upon the latest quantitative assessment and the changes which have taken place since 2010, we see no reason to alter this view. Whilst the ability to provide forchoice and compeition should be supported, there remains no urgency to provide for a new supermarket and any proposals which do come forward should be tested against their impact on nearby town centres and subject to the sequential approach.
- Stonehouse. The relatively low levels of forecast convenience goods floorspace capacity remain, due to the level of leakage of trips out of Stonehouse to Stroud and Gloucester. In line with the 2010 study, the level of retail floorspace which should be provided within Stonehouse will be dependant on the level of new housing which is allocated to the town. Opportunities to stem leakage of shopping trips from the town should be explored, including opportunities for new convenience goods floorspace within Stonehouse which allows local residents to meet more of their needs within the town without having to travel to Stroud and elsewhere.
- Dursley/Cam. In the short to medium term there is no need for additional convenience goods floorspace within Cam and Dursley, which is unsurprising given the impact of the new Sainsburys store and the committed extenstion to the Tesco store in Cam. As a consequence, we foresee no reason to allocate additional convenience goods floorspace in the Cam and Dursley area.
- Wotton-under-Edge. The latest quantitative assessment confirms the (collective) good trading performance of convenience goods stores in Wotton which occurs alongside the leakage of main food shopping expenditure to other settlements in Stroud District and South Gloucestershire. In principle, the ability to improve retention rates could be supported, but we repeat the findings of the 2010 study in terms of the availability of sites for retail development and the need to protect the high street.
- Nailsworth. The quantitative capacity for additional convenience goods floorspace in Nailsworth remains modest and there remains a reasonably good level of provision for local residents. Leakage of convenience goodsexpenditure doesoccur and the
main beneficiary of this is Stroud, although we do not consider that a higher retention level would warrant the allocation of a new large store for the town. Instead, modest improvements to the town centre and existing facilities are recommended.
3.10 The same capacity forecast scenarios have been undertaken for comparison goods shopping in the main settlements are the results are summarised below.

Comparison goods floorspace capacity forecasts

| 9500 A | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 371 | 1125 | 2215 | 3850 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 85 | 329 |
| Nailsworth | 39 | 115 | 268 | 472 |
| Wotton | 12 | 32 | 77 | 134 |
| Stonehouse |  |  |  |  |


| 9500 B | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 327 | 943 | 2075 | 3634 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 78 | 322 |
| Nailsworth | 41 | 119 | 275 | 482 |
| Wotton | 12 | 34 | 80 | 138 |
| Stonehouse | 25 | 72 | 153 | 267 |


| $\mathbf{9 5 0 0}$ C | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 333 | 959 | 2093 | 3662 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 80 | 324 |
| Na ilsworth | 38 | 108 | 263 | 464 |
| Wotton | 11 | 31 | 76 | 132 |
| Stonehouse | 36 | 104 | 188 | 320 |


| $\mathbf{1 1 5 0 0 ~ A ~}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 327 | 969 | 2553 | 4298 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 138 | 404 |
| Nailsworth | 36 | 106 | 299 | 512 |
| Wotton | 11 | 31 | 84 | 143 |
| Stonehouse | 40 | 121 | 278 | 448 |


| 11500 B | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Stroud | 363 | 1103 | 2807 | 4675 |
| Cam/Dursley |  |  | 146 | 411 |
| Na ilsworth | 34 | 100 | 288 | 497 |
| Wotton | 10 | 29 | 81 | 139 |
| Stonehouse | 65 | 201 | 427 | 668 |

3.11 In a similar manner to the convenience goods assessment, there are differences between the 2010 and 2013 floorspace capacity forecasts although the differences are not signific ant. Once again, Stroud is the focus for the highest quantitative capacity given its current market share. The other main settlements across the district attract much more modest levels.
3.12 There are opportunities to improve the quality of comparison goods floorspace provision within each of the main town centres in the District, although realism is required in relation to the ability for the main towns to signific antly improve their respective market shares. Stroud is the centre most likely to attract a noticeable level of new comparison goods floorspace and improve its market share, although actions to support this inc rease should only be supported where new provision can be placed within or as an extension to the town centre. In all cases, the level of net additional comparison goods floorspace capacity outlined above should be directed in the first instance to town centre locations, with edge and out of centre proposals tests against their impact on the health of nearby town centres.

## 4. Review of Retail and Town Centre Policies March/May Polic ies Consultation Document

### 4.1 As part of this update study, SDC has requested that we exa mine:

- the draft retail and town centre policies in the March 2013 version of the Stroud District Local Plan;
- the town centre boundaries and shopping frontages within each of the main towns; and
- provide advice on the implications of the recent changes to permitted development rights to town centres in Stroud District.


## The draft Stroud District Local Plan retail and town centre policies

4.2 With regards to Policy CP12 and its supporting text, we make the following recommendations:

- the supporting text to CP12 should indicate that primary and (where applicable) secondary shopping frontages have been defined and also how primary shopping areas (as per the NPPF definition) have been defined. Rather than repeating the generic definitions, reference can be made to the NPPF.
- With regards to criterion C in CP12, we recommend the addition of "...and not become destinations in their own right" to the final sentence.
- Criterion D should revised in order to explain the sequence of locations for the sequential approach and also include reference to the need to assess retail proposals against their impact on defined town centres.
- Within criterion $E(1)$, the definition of bulky goods should be defined.
- We recommend changing the phrase 'specialist shops' to 'specialist uses' in criterion $\mathrm{E}(2)$.
4.3 We note that Policy E17, which deals with primary shopping frontages, is a change from the adopted Local Plan Policy SH1 where qualitative criteria were applied to proposed changes of use from Class A1 (and the quantitative \% rule was used in the supporting text). Policy E17 now contains a quantita tive \% rule as the primary consideration and the qualitative criteria are removed. The 2010 retail study recommended keeping the status quo in SH1.
4.4 Whilst we understand that there are no objections to the \%-based approach in E17, we consider that a reasoned justific ation is required to support this intended approach.
4.5 We also note that Policy E17 allows for the potential of non-Class A uses within the primary retail frontages and therefore we recommend that non-A uses should be part of the $30 \%$ allowance and also the following criteria for assessing the impact on the vita lity and viability of the town centre:
- The location and prominence of the premises within the shopping frontage;
- The floorspace and length of frontage of the premises;
- The number, distribution and proximity to other non-Class A1 premises, or with planning permissions for such use, within the frontage in question and throughout the town centre;
- The particular nature and character of the use proposed, including the level of pedestrian activity assoc iated with it;
- The level of vacancies in ground floor properties; and
- Whether the proposed use would give rise to noise, smell or other environmental problems.
4.6 With regards to Policy E18, which deals with secondary retail frontages, we recommend a slightly revised wording asfollows:

Within Secondary Shopping Frontages, the change of use from retail (A1) at ground floor level to other uses within use classes A2 to A5, amusement centres/arcades, laundrettes, community use, healthcare, leisure and recreational uses will be acceptable in principle, subject to:
(1) the overall shopping character is not undemined;
(2) the proposed use contributes positively to the town centre as the focus of commercial orcommunity life of the town; and
(3) there is no detrimental effect on the visual or other special character and a menities of the surrounding area.
4.7 We consider that this wording provides greater clarify when assessing proposals within the secondary frontages.
4.8 We support the floorspace thresholds set out in draft Policy E19, although recommend that the penultimate paragraph is replaced with the following text:
"Exceptionally, a retail impact assessment may be required for smaller units where it is considered that the development either a lone or with other developments would harm nearby centres"
4.9 After which, the following text should be inserted:

The Council will expect Impact Assessments to conta in information on the following issues:
o the impact on existing, committed and planned public and private investment;
o the impact on town centre vitality and viability, with particular reference to choice and competition and town centre trade/tumover.
4.10 In a ny supporting text to Policy E19, we would also recommend that reference is made to the need to agree the scope of Retail Impact Assessments prior to the submission of planning applications.

## Shopping frontage and town centre boundaries

4.11 With regards to shopping frontages within the main settlements, we have re-visited the recommendations of the 2010 study and suggest the following:

- Stroud. No changes needed to the primary shopping frontages, although additional sec ondary frontages should be defined along: G louc ester Street, the Shambles, John Street, Union Street, George Street and the area which accommodates the regular farmers market. We also recommend that the Local Plan defines a primary shopping area boundary and this should encompass all of the defined primary and secondary retail frontages in this instance.
- Stonehouse. No change needed to the primary frontages although the town centre boundary should be extended north to include Elms Road.
- Nailsworth. Extend town centre boundary to include westem side of Bridge Street and eastem side of Bath Road (south of its junction with Founta in Street). No changes needed to the primary retail frontages.
- No changes are required to the boundaries in Wotton-under-Edge, Cam, Dursley, Painswick and Minchinha mpton.
- We also recommend that Cainscross in Stroud is defined as a centre and that it extends to include the Co-op store, whilst Kings Stanley and Whitminster should also have defined centres.

The implications of the recent changes to Permitted Development rights for retail development
4.12 In April 2013, changes to the Permitted Development regime were introduced. Amongst the changes was the ability for premises falling within use classes A1/2/3/4/5, B1, D1/2 to change to $A 1, A 2, A 3$ and $B 1$ for a limited period of up to two years.
4.13 Such changes will, in principle, have an impact upon how policies E17 and E18 within the draft Local Plan will operate. For example, with the inability to control changes of use within the primary and secondary shopping frontages, the Council will need to carefully
consider applications for permanent changes of use which will fall to be considered under E17 and E18.
4.14 For example, a simple review of the proportion/length of frontage of non-Class A1 uses at the time when an application for permanent change of use is made may give rise to misleading results, particularly where owners and occupiers of premises are taking advantage of the new PD rights.
4.15 Therefore, SDC officers will need to look beyond the situation 'on the ground' and examine the provisions of policies E17 and E18 in the context of the lawful uses of primary and secondary frontage premises. This will require, for example, the keeping of a database which records the lawful use of premises in the primary and secondary areas and records each instance of an owner or occupier making use of the new PD rights. This will be possible as anyone wishing to take advantage of the PD rights must notify the local planning authority of their intention to do so.

In this way, we see no need to alter policies E17 and E18 in the draft Local Plan, as their operation can be successful, subject of course to the preparation of the recommended database. This will also apply to the existing saved policies in the current Local Plan, such as Policy SH1.

Appendix A - stroud household survey area map
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Appendix B
Quantitative need assessment (9,500 dwellings- Option B)

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013
TABLE 1: POPULATION MTHIN STUDY AREA, BY ZONE

|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4 A}$ | $\mathbf{4 B}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6 O N E}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 31373 | 13953 | 7761 | 6627 | 3373 | 6366 | 15798 | 6328 | 11384 | 5863 | 53552 | 18139 |
| 2013 | 31569 | 14042 | 7777 | 6631 | 3394 | 6388 | 15798 | 6353 | 11384 | 5924 | 53954 | 18336 |
| 2021 | 31932 | 14207 | 7807 | 6640 | 3434 | 6430 | 15963 | 6401 | 11554 | 6038 | 54699 | 18703 |
| 2026 | 32618 | 14520 | 7865 | 6656 | 3510 | 6508 | 16235 | 6490 | 11812 | 6252 | 56108 | 19395 |
| 2031 | 32641 | 14530 | 7867 | 6656 | 3512 | 6511 | 16561 | 6493 | 12088 | 6260 | 56155 | 19418 |
|  | 33122 | 14749 | 7907 | 6667 | 3565 | 6566 | 16883 | 6556 | 12365 | 6410 | 57141 | 19903 |

Notes:
2011 population from 2011 Census results.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013
TABLE 2: PER CAPTIA CONVENIENCE GOODS EXPENDITURE, BY ZONE

|  |  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4 A}$ | $\mathbf{4 B}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
| 2013 | 2013 | 1961 | 2252 | 2125 | 1977 | 2015 | 2243 | 2091 | 2119 | 2078 | 1947 | 1998 |
| 2016 | 2019 | 1967 | 2258 | 2132 | 1983 | 2021 | 2249 | 2097 | 2125 | 2085 | 1953 | 2004 |
| 2021 | 2080 | 2027 | 2327 | 2196 | 2043 | 2082 | 2318 | 2161 | 2189 | 2148 | 2012 | 2065 |
| 2026 | 2163 | 2107 | 2419 | 2283 | 2124 | 2165 | 2410 | 2247 | 2276 | 2233 | 2092 | 2147 |
| 2031 | 2239 | 2182 | 2505 | 2364 | 2199 | 2242 | 2495 | 2326 | 2357 | 2312 | 2166 | 2223 |

Notes:
Expenditure data provided by Experian.
Projections between 2011 and 2031 based on forecasts provided by Appendix 3 of Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 10.1 (October 2012) which take into account changes in expenditure on special forms of trading.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013
TABLE 3a: PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE ON CLOTHES AND SHOES, BY ZONE

|  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4A | 4B | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|  | 722 | 709 | 830 | 871 | 661 | 728 | 842 | 789 | 847 | 727 | 767 | 737 |
| 2013 | 666 | 654 | 766 | 804 | 610 | 672 | 777 | 728 | 782 | 671 | 708 | 680 |
| 2016 | 707 | 694 | 813 | 853 | 647 | 713 | 825 | 773 | 830 | 712 | 751 | 722 |
| 2021 | 788 | 774 | 906 | 951 | 722 | 795 | 919 | 862 | 925 | 794 | 838 | 805 |
| 2026 | 907 | 891 | 1043 | 1094 | 830 | 914 | 1058 | 991 | 1064 | 913 | 963 | 926 |
| 2031 | 1046 | 1027 | 1203 | 1262 | 958 | 1055 | 1220 | 1143 | 1227 | 1053 | 1111 | 1068 |

Notes:
Expenditure data provided by Experian.
Projections between 2011 and 2031 based on forecasts provided by Appendix 3 of Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 10.1 (October 2012) which take into account changes in expenditure on special forms of trading

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013
TABLE 3b: PER CAPITA EXPENDTURE ON SMAL HOUSEHOLD TIEMS, BY ZONE

|  |  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4 A}$ | $\mathbf{4 B}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
|  | 1484 | 1443 | 1824 | 1824 | 1433 | 1564 | 1771 | 1610 | 1820 | 1626 | 1525 | 1511 |
| 2013 | 1369 | 1332 | 1683 | 1683 | 1322 | 1443 | 1635 | 1486 | 1679 | 1501 | 1407 | 1394 |
| 2016 | 1453 | 1413 | 1786 | 1786 | 1403 | 1532 | 1735 | 1577 | 1782 | 1592 | 1493 | 1480 |
| 2021 | 1620 | 1576 | 1991 | 1991 | 1565 | 1708 | 1934 | 1758 | 1987 | 1775 | 1665 | 1650 |
| 2026 | 1863 | 1813 | 2290 | 2291 | 1800 | 1965 | 2225 | 2022 | 2285 | 2042 | 1915 | 1898 |
| 2031 | 2150 | 2091 | 2642 | 2643 | 2076 | 2266 | 2566 | 2333 | 2637 | 2356 | 2209 | 2189 |

Notes:
Expenditure data provided by Experian.
Projections between 2011 and 2031 based on forecasts provided by Appendix 3 of Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 10.1 (October 2012) which take into account changes in expenditure on special forms of trading.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABLE 3C: PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE ON FURNITURE, BY ZONE


Notes:
Expenditure data provided by Experian.
Projections between 2011 and 2031 based on forecasts provided by Appendix 3 of Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 10.1 (October 2012) which take into account changes in expenditure on special forms of trading

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABLE 3d: PER CAPITA EXPENDIURE ON ELEC TRICALGOODS, BY ZONE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4 A}$ | $\mathbf{4 B}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
|  | 443 | 438 | 447 | 482 | 413 | 436 | 489 | 478 | 465 | 473 | 449 | 439 |
| 2013 | 408 | 404 | 413 | 445 | 381 | 402 | 451 | 441 | 429 | 437 | 415 | 405 |
| 2016 | 433 | 429 | 438 | 472 | 405 | 427 | 479 | 468 | 455 | 463 | 440 | 430 |
| 2021 | 483 | 478 | 489 | 527 | 451 | 476 | 534 | 522 | 507 | 517 | 491 | 480 |
| 2026 | 556 | 550 | 562 | 606 | 519 | 548 | 614 | 600 | 583 | 594 | 564 | 552 |
| 2031 | 641 | 634 | 648 | 699 | 599 | 632 | 708 | 692 | 673 | 686 | 651 | 636 |

Notes:
Expenditure data provided by Experian.
Projections between 2011 and 2031 based on forecasts provided by Appendix 3 of Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 10.1 (October 2012) which take into account changes in expenditure on special forms of trading

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABLE 3e: PER CAPTA EXPENDIURE ON DIY GOODS, BY ZONE

|  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4 A}$ | $\mathbf{4 B}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
|  | 285 | 283 | 422 | 363 | 312 | 319 | 364 | 334 | 362 | 332 | 281 | 291 |
| 2013 | 263 | 261 | 390 | 335 | 288 | 294 | 336 | 308 | 334 | 306 | 260 | 269 |
| 2021 | 279 | 277 | 413 | 356 | 306 | 312 | 356 | 327 | 354 | 325 | 275 | 285 |
| 2026 | 311 | 309 | 461 | 396 | 341 | 348 | 397 | 365 | 395 | 363 | 307 | 318 |
| 2031 | 358 | 355 | 530 | 456 | 392 | 401 | 457 | 419 | 454 | 417 | 353 | 366 |
|  | 413 | 410 | 612 | 526 | 452 | 462 | 527 | 484 | 524 | 481 | 408 | 422 |

Notes:
Expenditure data provided by Experian.
Projections between 2011 and 2031 based on forecasts provided by Appendix 3 of Experian Retail Planner Briefing Note 10.1 (October 2012) which take into account changes in expenditure on special forms of trading

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABLE 4: TOTALCONVENIENCE GOODS EXPENDITURE, BY ZONE

|  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4A | 4B | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  |
| 2013 | £63.5 | £27.5 | £17.5 | £14.1 | £6.7 | £12.9 | £35.4 | £13.3 | £24.1 | £12.3 | £105.1 | £36.6 | £369.1 |
| 2016 | £64.5 | £27.9 | £17.6 | £14.2 | £6.8 | £13.0 | £35.9 | £13.4 | £24.6 | £12.6 | £106.8 | £37.5 | £374.8 |
| 2021 | £67.9 | £29.4 | £18.3 | £14.6 | £7.2 | £13.6 | £37.6 | £14.0 | £25.9 | £13.4 | £112.9 | £40.1 | £394.8 |
| 2026 | £70.6 | £30.6 | £19.0 | £15.2 | £7.5 | £14.1 | £39.9 | £14.6 | £27.5 | £14.0 | £117.5 | £41.7 | £412.1 |
| 2031 | £74.2 | £32.2 | £19.8 | £15.8 | £7.8 | £14.7 | £42.1 | £15.3 | £29.1 | £14.8 | £123.8 | £44.2 | £433.9 |

Notes:
Total expenditure calculated by multiplying population with per capita retail expenditure, by zone.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013
table 5a: Total expendiure on clothes And shoes, by zone

|  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4A | 4B | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  |
| 2013 | £21.0 | £9.2 | £6.0 | £5.3 | £2.1 | £4.3 | £12.3 | £4.6 | £8.9 | £4.0 | £38.2 | £12.5 | £128.3 |
| 2016 | £22.6 | £9.9 | £6.3 | $£ 5.7$ | £2.2 | £4.6 | £13.2 | £4.9 | $£ 9.6$ | $£ 4.3$ | £41.1 | £13.5 | £137.8 |
| 2021 | £25.7 | £11.2 | £7.1 | £6.3 | £2.5 | £5.2 | £14.9 | £5.6 | £10.9 | £5.0 | £47.0 | £15.6 | £157.1 |
| 2026 | £29.6 | £12.9 | £8.2 | £7.3 | £2.9 | £6.0 | £17.5 | £6.4 | £12.9 | $£ 5.7$ | £54.1 | £18.0 | £181.5 |
| 2031 | £34.7 | £15.2 | £9.5 | £8.4 | £3.4 | £6.9 | £20.6 | £7.5 | £15.2 | £6.8 | £63.5 | £21.3 | £212.9 |

Notes:
Total expenditure calculated by multiplying population with per capita retail expenditure, by zone.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABLE 5b: TOTALEXPENDITURE ON SMAL HOUSEHOLD ITEMS, BY ZONE

|  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4A | 4B | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  |
| 2013 | £43.2 | £18.7 | £13.1 | £11.2 | £4.5 | £9.2 | £25.8 | £9.4 | £19.1 | £8.9 | £75.9 | £25.6 | £264.6 |
| 2016 | £46.4 | £20.1 | £13.9 | £11.9 | £4.8 | £9.8 | £27.7 | £10.1 | £20.6 | £9.6 | £81.7 | £27.7 | £284.3 |
| 2021 | £52.8 | £22.9 | £15.7 | £13.3 | £5.5 | £11.1 | £31.4 | £11.4 | £23.5 | £11.1 | £93.4 | £32.0 | £324.0 |
| 2026 | £60.8 | £26.3 | £18.0 | £15.2 | £6.3 | £12.8 | £36.8 | £13.1 | £27.6 | £12.8 | £107.5 | £36.8 | £ 374.3 |
| 2031 | £71.2 | £30.8 | £20.9 | £17.6 | £7.4 | £14.9 | £43.3 | £15.3 | £32.6 | £15.1 | £126.2 | £43.6 | £439.0 |

Notes:
Total expenditure calculated by multiplying population with per capita retail expenditure, by zone.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABIE 5c: TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON FURNITURE, BY ZONE


Notes:
Total expenditure calculated by multiplying population with per capita retail expenditure, by zone.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABLE 5d: TOTALEXPENDIURE ON EIEC TRICALGOODS, BY ZONE

|  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4A | 4B | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  |
| 2013 | £12.9 | £5.7 | £3.2 | £3.0 | £1.3 | £2.6 | £7.1 | £2.8 | $£ 4.9$ | £2.6 | £22.4 | £7.4 | f75.8 |
| 2016 | £13.8 | £6.1 | £3.4 | £3.1 | £1.4 | £2.7 | £7.6 | £3.0 | $£ 5.3$ | £2.8 | £24.1 | £8.0 | £81.4 |
| 2021 | £15.8 | £6.9 | £3.8 | £3.5 | £1.6 | £3.1 | £8.7 | £3.4 | £6.0 | £3.2 | £27.5 | £9.3 | £92.8 |
| 2026 | £18.1 | £8.0 | £4.4 | £4.0 | £1.8 | £3.6 | £10.2 | £3.9 | £7.1 | £3.7 | £31.7 | £10.7 | £107.2 |
| 2031 | £21.2 | £9.4 | £5.1 | £4.7 | £2.1 | £4.1 | £12.0 | $£ 4.5$ | £8.3 | £4.4 | £37.2 | £12.7 | £125.7 |

Notes:
Total expenditure calculated by multiplying population with per capita retail expenditure, by zone.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABLE 5e: TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON DIY GOODS, BY ZONE

|  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4A | 4B | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  |
| 2013 | £8.3 | £3.7 | £3.0 | £2.2 | £1.0 | £1.9 | £5.3 | £2.0 | £3.8 | £1.8 | £14.0 | £4.9 | £51.9 |
| 2016 | £8.9 | £3.9 | £3.2 | £2.4 | £1.0 | £2.0 | £5.7 | £2.1 | $£ 4.1$ | £2.0 | £15.1 | £5.3 | £55.7 |
| 2021 | £10.2 | £4.5 | £3.6 | £2.6 | £1.2 | £2.3 | £6.4 | £2.4 | $£ 4.7$ | £2.3 | £17.2 | £6.2 | £63.5 |
| 2026 | £11.7 | £5.2 | £4.2 | £3.0 | £1.4 | £2.6 | £7.6 | £2.7 | £5.5 | £2.6 | £19.8 | £7.1 | £73.4 |
| 2031 | £13.7 | £6.0 | $£ 4.8$ | £3.5 | £1.6 | £3.0 | £8.9 | £3.2 | £6.5 | £3.1 | £23.3 | £8.4 | £86.0 |

Notes:
Total expenditure calculated by multiplying population with per capita retail expenditure, by zone.

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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TABLE 5f: TOTALCOMPARISON GOODS EXPENDITURE, BY ZONE

|  | ZONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4A | 4B | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  |
| 2013 | £91.8 | £40.0 | £27.3 | £23.3 | £9.5 | £19.3 | £54.4 | £20.3 | £39.6 | £18.5 | £161.4 | £54.1 | £559.6 |
| 2016 | £98.5 | £43.0 | £29.1 | £24.8 | £10.2 | £20.7 | £58.3 | £21.7 | £42.6 | £20.1 | £173.6 | £58.6 | £601.2 |
| 2021 | £112.2 | £48.9 | £32.7 | £27.7 | £11.7 | £23.3 | £66.2 | £24.5 | £48.6 | £23.2 | £198.6 | £67.7 | £685.2 |
| 2026 | £129.1 | £56.3 | £37.6 | £31.9 | £13.4 | £26.8 | £77.6 | £28.2 | £57.2 | £26.7 | £228.6 | £78.0 | f791.5 |
| 2031 | £151.2 | £66.0 | £43.6 | £36.8 | £15.7 | £31.2 | £91.3 | £32.9 | £67.5 | £31.5 | £268.4 | £92.2 | £928.3 |

Notes:
Total expenditure calculated by multiplying population with per capita retail expenditure, by zone.

TABLE 6: MARKETSHARE OF CONVENIENCE GOODS SHOPPING FACILTIES



## TABLE 7a: TURNOVER OF CONVENIENCE GOODS SHOPPING FACILTIES, 2013




## TABLE 7b: TURNOVER OF CONVENIENCE GOODS SHOPPING FACILTIES, 2016



TABLE 7c: TURNOVER OF CONVENIENCE GOODS SHOPPING FACILIIES, 2021



## TABLE 7d: TURNOVER OF CONVENIENCE GOODS SHOPPING FACILTIES, 2026



TABLE 7e: TURNOVER OF CONVENIENCE GOODS SHOPPING FACILTIES, 2031


## TABEE 8: COMPARISON GOODS MARKETSHARES, 2013



TABLE 9a: COMPARISON GOODS TURNOVER, 2013


TABLE 9b: COMPARISON GOODS TURNOVER, 2016


TABLE 9C: COMPARISON GOODS TURNOVER, 2021


TABLE Yd: COMPARISON GOODS TURNOVER, 2026
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## TABLE 10: CONVENIENCE ROORSPACE IN THE MAIN SEITLEMENIS IN STROUD DISIRICT

| STORE/ LOCATION | FOORSPACE (sq m net) |  | CONV GOODS SALES DENSTTY ( $£$ /sq m) | TOTALCONVENIENCEGOODS TURNOVER$(\mathrm{Em})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Net Sales | Convenience Goods Sales |  |  |
| STROUD |  |  |  |  |
| Tesco, Stroud | 3,367 | 2,357 | 11,126 | 26.2 |
| Sainsbury's Stroud | 3,812 | 2,859 | 12,537 | 35.8 |
| Waitrose, Stroud | 2,401 | 2,041 | 11,818 | 24.1 |
| Iceland, Stroud | 483 | 459 | 7,265 | 3.3 |
| Co-op, Cashes Green, Stroud | 1,068 | 962 | 7,496 | 7.2 |
| Co-op, Slad Road, Stroud | 148 | 133 | 7,496 | 1.0 |
| Other |  | 1,480 | 5,000 | 7.4 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 105.1 |
| CAM |  |  |  |  |
| Tesco, Cam | 1,538 | 1,307 | 11,126 | 14.5 |
| DURSEY |  |  |  |  |
| Iceland, Parsonage Street, Dursley | 500 | 450 | 7,265 | 3.3 |
| Co-op, Rosebery Road, Dursley | 141 | 134 | 7,496 | 1.0 |
| Lid, Kingshill Road, Dursley | 643 | 546 | 3,949 | 2.2 |
| Sainsburys, Dursley |  | 1,486 | 12,537 | 18.6 |
| Other | 481 | 433 | 4,500 | 1.9 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 27.0 |
| WOTTON |  |  |  |  |
| Co-op | 429 | 386 | 7,496 | 2.9 |
| Tesco Express | 150 | 143 | 11,126 | 1.6 |
| Other | 438 | 438 | 4,500 | 2.0 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 6.5 |
| NAILSWORTH |  |  |  |  |
| Morisons, Nailsworth | 1159 | 1,043 | 12,431 | 13.0 |
| Tesco Express, Nailsworth | 151 | 143 | 11,126 | 1.6 |
| Co-op | 232 | 209 | 7,496 | 1.6 |
| Other |  | 550 | 4,500 | 2.5 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 18.6 |
| Stonehouse |  |  |  |  |
| Co-op, High Street, Stonehouse | 1076 | 968 | 7,496 | 7.3 |
| Co-op, Eastington | 141 | 134 | 7,496 | 1.0 |
| Co-op, Elm Road, Stonehouse | 100 | 95 | 7,496 | 0.7 |
| Co-op, Kings Stanley | 136 | 129 | 7,496 | 1.0 |
| Other | 254 | 241 | 4,500 | 1.1 |
| BERKEIFY | 401 | 381 | 4,500 | 1.7 |
| MINCHINHAMPTON | 150 | 143 | 4,500 | 0.6 |

TABLE 11: COMMITMENTS IN STROUD DISIRIC1

|  | ROORSPACE <br> (sq m net) | SALES DENSTY <br> ( $\mathbf{f} / \mathbf{s q} \mathbf{~ m})$ | BENCHMARK <br> TURNOVER ( $\mathbf{f m}$ ) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tesco extension, Cam <br> convenience <br> comparison | 432 |  |  |

Notes:
floorspace data from Stroud District Council, GVA and IGD data
sales densities for large stores derived from Mintel and Verdict research and sales densities for other town centre floorspace based on GVA assumptions

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013

## TABLE 12a: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | £412.1 | $£ 433.9$ |
| Tumover from study area | £101.1 | £102.4 | £107.4 | $£ 111.8$ | $£ 117.3$ |
| Ma rket share | 27.4\% | 27.3\% | 27.2\% | 27.1\% | 27.0\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £7.1 | £7.2 | £7.5 | £7.8 | £8.2 |
| Total tumover potential | £108.2 | £109.6 | £115.0 | £119.6 | £125.5 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £105.1 | £105.44 | £106.18 | £107.25 | £108.32 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.1 | £4.1 | £8.8 | £12.4 | £17.1 |
| Indic ative sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 256 | 344 | 725 | 1013 | 1386 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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## TABLE 12b: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | £412.1 | £433.9 |
| Tumover from study area | £40.4 | £41.3 | $£ 44.0$ | $£ 45.8$ | £48.6 |
| Market share | 11.0\% | 11.0\% | 11.1\% | 11.1\% | 11.2\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £2.6 | £2.7 | £2.9 | £3.0 | £3.2 |
| Total tumover potential | £43.1 | £44.0 | $£ 46.9$ | $£ 48.8$ | £51.7 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £46.4 | £46.5 | $£ 46.8$ | £47.3 | £47.8 |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.3 | -£2.5 | £0.0 | £1.5 | £4.0 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace ( $£ / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic ative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -276 | -209 | 2 | 124 | 320 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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## TABLE 12c: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | $£ 412.1$ | $£ 433.9$ |
| Tumover from study area | £20.6 | £20.8 | £21.8 | £22.7 | £23.8 |
| Market share | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £1.3 | £1.4 | £1.4 | £1.5 | £1.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £21.9 | £22.2 | £23.2 | £24.2 | £25.4 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £18.6 | £18.6 | £18.8 | £19.0 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.3 | £3.5 | £4.4 | £5.2 | £6.2 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 275 | 292 | 366 | 429 | 504 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
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## TABLE 12d: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | $£ 412.1$ | £433.9 |
| Tumover from study area | £9.2 | £9.3 | £9.7 | £10.2 | £10.7 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.8 | £0.9 | £0.9 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.0 | £10.1 | £10.6 | £11.1 | £11.7 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.6 | £6.6 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.5 | £3.7 | £4.1 | £4.5 | £5.0 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 295 | 304 | 338 | 371 | 408 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013

## TABLE 12e: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | $£ 412.1$ | £433.9 |
| Tumover from study area | £9.2 | $£ 9.3$ | £9.8 | £10.2 | £10.7 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.8 | £0.9 | £0.9 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.0 | £10.1 | £10.7 | £11.1 | $£ 11.7$ |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | $£ 11.0$ | £11.1 | £11.1 | £11.2 | £11.4 |
| Residual expenditure | -£1.0 | -£0.9 | -£0.4 | -£0.1 | £0.3 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -85 | -75 | -37 | -10 | 26 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013

## TABLE 13a: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expenditure | £559.6 | £601.2 | £685.2 | £791.5 | £928.3 |
| Tumover from study area | £96.8 | £103.8 | £117.9 | £135.8 | £158.7 |
| Market share | 17.3\% | 17.3\% | 17.2\% | 17.2\% | 17.1\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £5.8 | £6.2 | £7.1 | £8.1 | £9.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £102.6 | £110.0 | £124.9 | £143.9 | £168.2 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £102.6 | £108.3 | £119.4 | £130.7 | £142.9 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £1.7 | £5.5 | £13.2 | £25.3 |
| Indic ative sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indica tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 327 | 943 | 2075 | 3634 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013

## TABLE 13b: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expenditure | £559.6 | £601.2 | £685.2 | £791.5 | £928.3 |
| Tumover from study area | £12.9 | £15.63 | £17.82 | £20.58 | £24.13 |
| Ma rket share | 2.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.4 | £16.3 | £18.5 | £21.4 | £25.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £16.4 | £17.3 | £19.1 | £20.9 | £22.9 |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.0 | -£1.1 | -£0.6 | £0.5 | £2.2 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace ( $£$ /sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -595 | -202 | -99 | 78 | 322 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013

## TABLE 13c: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.2 | £685.2 | £791.5 | £928.3 |
| Tumover from study area | £13.3 | £14.2 | £16.1 | £18.6 | £21.7 |
| Market share | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.9 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.8 | £14.8 | £16.8 | £19.3 | £22.6 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £13.8 | £14.6 | £16.1 | £17.6 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.2 | £0.7 | £1.7 | £3.4 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace ( $£ / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | $£ 5,818$ | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 41 | 119 | 275 | 482 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013

## TABLE 13d: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £559.6 | £601.2 | £685.2 | £791.5 | £928.3 |
| Tumover from study area | £3.5 | £3.7 | £4.2 | $£ 4.9$ | $£ 5.7$ |
| Ma rket share | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.4 | £0.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £3.7 | $£ 4.0$ | $£ 4.5$ | $£ 5.3$ | £6.2 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £3.7 | £3.9 | $£ 4.3$ | $£ 4.8$ | $£ 5.2$ |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.1 | £0.2 | £0.5 | £1.0 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 12 | 34 | 80 | 138 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013

## TABLE 13e: COMPARISON G OODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.2 | £685.2 | £791.5 | £928.3 |
| Tumover from study area | £6.8 | £7.3 | £8.3 | £9.6 | £11.2 |
| Market share | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £0.9 |
| Total tumover potential | £7.3 | £7.9 | £9.0 | £10.3 | £12.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £7.3 | £7.8 | £8.6 | £9.4 | £10.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.1 | £0.4 | £1.0 | £1.9 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 25 | 72 | 153 | 267 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

Appendix C
Qua ntita tive need assessment (9,500 dwellings - Option A)

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12a: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £395.1 | £412.1 | £433.8 |
| Tumover from study area | £101.2 | £102.7 | $£ 108.5$ | £112.6 | £118.4 |
| Ma rket share | 27.4\% | 27.4\% | 27.5\% | 27.3\% | 27.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £7.1 | £7.2 | £7.6 | £7.9 | £8.3 |
| Total tumover potential | £108.3 | £109.9 | £116.1 | £120.5 | £126.7 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £105.1 | £105.44 | £106.18 | £107.25 | £108.32 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.2 | £4.5 | £9.9 | £13.3 | £18.4 |
| Indic ative sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 266 | 373 | 818 | 1083 | 1485 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12b: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £395.1 | £412.1 | $£ 433.8$ |
| Tumover from study area | $£ 40.3$ | £40.9 | £43.2 | £45.0 | £47.3 |
| Market share | 10.9\% | 10.9\% | 10.9\% | 10.9\% | 10.9\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £2.6 | £2.7 | £2.8 | £2.9 | £3.1 |
| Total tumover potential | £42.9 | £43.6 | £46.0 | £47.9 | £50.4 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | $£ 46.4$ | £46.5 | £46.8 | £47.3 | $£ 47.8$ |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.4 | -£2.9 | -£0.9 | £0.6 | £2.6 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -287 | -242 | -70 | 48 | 212 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12c: CONVENIENCE G OODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £395.1 | $£ 412.1$ | $£ 433.8$ |
| Tumover from study area | £20.6 | £20.8 | £21.8 | £22.7 | £23.9 |
| Market share | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £1.3 | £1.4 | £1.4 | £1.5 | £1.6 |
| Total tumover potential | £21.9 | £22.2 | £23.3 | £24.2 | £25.4 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £18.6 | £18.6 | £18.8 | £19.0 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.3 | £3.5 | £4.5 | £5.3 | £6.2 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 275 | 292 | 369 | 429 | 505 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12d: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £395.1 | £412.1 | £433.8 |
| Tumover from study area | £9.2 | £9.3 | £9.7 | £10.2 | £10.7 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.8 | £0.9 | £0.9 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.0 | £10.1 | £10.6 | £11.1 | £11.7 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.6 | £6.6 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.5 | £3.7 | £4.1 | £4.5 | £5.0 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace ( $£ /$ sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 295 | 304 | 338 | 370 | 406 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12e: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £395.1 | $£ 412.1$ | £433.8 |
| Tumover from study area | £9.3 | $£ 9.7$ | £10.7 | £11.1 | £12.0 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.6\% | 2.7\% | 2.7\% | 2.8\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.9 | £1.0 | £1.0 | £1.1 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.1 | £10.6 | £11.6 | £12.1 | £13.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £11.0 | £11.1 | £11.1 | £11.2 | £11.4 |
| Residual expenditure | -£0.9 | -£0.5 | £0.5 | £0.9 | £1.8 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -73 | -41 | 41 | 71 | 142 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expend iture taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13a: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.0 | £685.6 | £791.3 | £927.9 |
| Tumover from study area | £97.0 | £104.1 | £119.0 | £136.8 | £160.3 |
| Market share | 17.3\% | 17.3\% | 17.4\% | 17.3\% | 17.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | $£ 5.8$ | £6.2 | £7.1 | £8.2 | £9.6 |
| Total tumover potential | £102.8 | £110.4 | £126.1 | £145.0 | £169.9 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £102.8 | £108.4 | £119.6 | £130.9 | £143.1 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £2.0 | £6.5 | £14.1 | £26.8 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 371 | 1125 | 2215 | 3850 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13b: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £559.6 | £601.0 | £685.6 | £791.3 | £927.9 |
| Tumover from study area | £12.9 | £15.63 | £17.82 | £20.57 | £24.12 |
| Market share | 2.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.4 | £16.3 | £18.5 | £21.4 | £25.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £16.4 | £17.3 | £19.1 | £20.9 | £22.8 |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.0 | -£1.0 | -£0.5 | £0.5 | £2.3 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | $£ 5,818$ | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -595 | -194 | -89 | 85 | 329 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13c: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.0 | £685.6 | £791.3 | £927.9 |
| Tumover from study area | £13.3 | £14.2 | £16.1 | £18.6 | £21.6 |
| Market share | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.9 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.8 | £14.8 | £16.7 | £19.3 | £22.5 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £13.8 | £14.6 | £16.1 | £17.6 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.2 | £0.7 | £1.7 | £3.3 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace ( $£ / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) | £5,000 | £5,275 | $£ 5,818$ | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 39 | 115 | 268 | 472 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13d: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.0 | £685.6 | £791.3 | £927.9 |
| Tumover from study area | £3.5 | £3.7 | $£ 4.2$ | $£ 4.9$ | $£ 5.7$ |
| Market share | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.4 | £0.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £3.7 | £4.0 | £4.5 | £5.2 | £6.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £3.7 | £3.9 | £4.3 | £4.8 | £5.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.1 | £0.2 | £0.5 | £0.9 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 12 | 32 | 77 | 134 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13e: COMPARISON G OODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.0 | £685.6 | £791.3 | £927.9 |
| Tumover from study area | £6.9 | £7.5 | £8.8 | £10.2 | £12.2 |
| Market share | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £7.4 | £8.1 | £9.5 | £11.0 | £13.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £7.4 | £7.8 | £8.6 | £9.5 | £10.3 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.3 | £0.9 | £1.5 | £2.8 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | $£ 5,818$ | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 53 | 156 | 242 | 404 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 12a: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | $£ 412.1$ | $£ 433.8$ |
| Tumover from study area | £101.1 | £102.4 | £107.5 | £111.9 | £117.4 |
| Ma rket share | 27.4\% | 27.3\% | 27.2\% | 27.2\% | 27.1\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £7.1 | £7.2 | £7.5 | £7.8 | £8.2 |
| Total tumover potential | £108.2 | £109.6 | £115.0 | £119.7 | £125.6 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £105.1 | £105.44 | £106.18 | £107.25 | £108.32 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.1 | £4.2 | £8.9 | £12.5 | £17.3 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 257 | 347 | 731 | 1020 | 1396 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 12b: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | $£ 412.1$ | $£ 433.8$ |
| Tumover from study area | £40.4 | £41.2 | £43.8 | £45.6 | £48.2 |
| Market share | 10.9\% | 11.0\% | 11.1\% | 11.1\% | 11.1\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £2.6 | $£ 2.7$ | £2.8 | £3.0 | £3.1 |
| Total tumover potential | £43.0 | £43.9 | £46.6 | £48.6 | £51.4 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £46.4 | £46.5 | £46.8 | £47.3 | £47.8 |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.3 | -£2.6 | -£0.2 | £1.3 | £3.6 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -278 | -218 | -16 | 104 | 292 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 12c: CONVENIENCE G OODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | $£ 412.1$ | £433.8 |
| Tumover from study area | £20.5 | £20.8 | £21.7 | £22.7 | £23.7 |
| Market share | 5.6\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £1.3 | £1.4 | £1.4 | £1.5 | £1.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £21.9 | £22.1 | £23.1 | £24.1 | £25.3 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £18.6 | £18.6 | £18.8 | £19.0 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.3 | £3.5 | £4.3 | £5.2 | £6.1 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace ( $£ / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 274 | 289 | 359 | 422 | 494 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 12d: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | $£ 412.1$ | £433.8 |
| Tumover from study area | £9.2 | £9.3 | £9.7 | £10.2 | £10.7 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.8 | £0.9 | £0.9 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.0 | £10.1 | £10.6 | £11.1 | £11.6 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.6 | £6.6 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.5 | £3.6 | £4.1 | £4.5 | £5.0 |
| Indic ative sales density for new convenience goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 295 | 302 | 334 | 367 | 402 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 a nd 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 12e: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.1 | £374.8 | £394.8 | $£ 412.1$ | £433.8 |
| Tumover from study area | £9.2 | $£ 9.5$ | £10.1 | £10.6 | £11.2 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.9 | £0.9 | £1.0 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.1 | £10.3 | $£ 11.1$ | £11.5 | £12.3 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £11.0 | £11.1 | £11.1 | £11.2 | £11.4 |
| Residual expenditure | -£1.0 | -£0.7 | -£0.1 | £0.3 | £0.9 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -80 | -62 | -6 | 22 | 72 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 13a: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.1 | £685.1 | £791.4 | £928.1 |
| Tumover from study area | £96.9 | £103.8 | £118.0 | £135.9 | £158.9 |
| Market share | 17.3\% | 17.3\% | 17.2\% | 17.2\% | 17.1\% |
| Expenditure inflow | $£ 5.8$ | £6.2 | £7.1 | £8.2 | £9.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £102.7 | £110.1 | £125.0 | £144.1 | £168.4 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £102.7 | £108.3 | £119.5 | £130.7 | £142.9 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £1.8 | £5.6 | £13.3 | £25.5 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 333 | 959 | 2093 | 3662 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 13b: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.1 | £685.1 | £791.4 | £928.1 |
| Tumover from study a rea | £12.9 | £15.63 | $£ 17.81$ | $£ 20.58$ | £24.13 |
| Market share | 2.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.4 | £16.3 | £18.5 | £21.4 | £25.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £16.4 | £17.3 | £19.1 | £20.9 | £22.8 |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.0 | -£1.1 | -£0.6 | £0.5 | £2.3 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace ( $£ / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | $£ 5,818$ | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -595 | -200 | -97 | 80 | 324 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 13c: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.1 | £685.1 | £791.4 | £928.1 |
| Tumover from study area | £13.3 | £14.2 | £16.1 | £18.5 | £21.6 |
| Market share | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.9 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.8 | £14.8 | £16.7 | £19.3 | £22.5 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £13.8 | £14.6 | £16.1 | £17.6 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.2 | £0.6 | £1.7 | £3.2 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace ( $£ / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) | £5,000 | £5,275 | $£ 5,818$ | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 38 | 108 | 263 | 464 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 13d: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £559.6 | £601.1 | £685.1 | £791.4 | £928.1 |
| Tumover from study area | £3.5 | £3.7 | £4.2 | £4.9 | £5.7 |
| Market share | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.4 | £0.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £3.7 | $£ 4.0$ | $£ 4.5$ | £5.2 | £6.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £3.7 | £3.9 | $£ 4.3$ | $£ 4.8$ | £5.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.1 | £0.2 | £0.5 | £0.9 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace ( $£ /$ sq m) | $£ 5,000$ | $£ 5,275$ | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 11 | 31 | 76 | 132 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-9500 OPTION C

## TABLE 13e: COMPARISON G OODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.6 | £601.1 | £685.1 | £791.4 | £928.1 |
| Tumover from study area | £6.8 | £7.4 | £8.5 | £9.8 | £11.6 |
| Market share | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £0.9 |
| Total tumover potential | £7.4 | £8.0 | £9.2 | £10.6 | £12.5 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £7.4 | £7.8 | £8.6 | £9.4 | £10.3 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.2 | £0.6 | £1.2 | £2.2 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 36 | 104 | 188 | 320 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and $0.2 \%$ pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

Appendix E
Quantitative need assessment (11,500 dwellings - Option A)

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12a: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £367.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | £419.3 | $£ 443.5$ |
| Tumover from study area | £101.1 | £102.4 | $£ 107.5$ | £114.1 | £120.3 |
| Ma rket share | 27.5\% | 27.4\% | 27.3\% | 27.2\% | 27.1\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £7.1 | £7.2 | £7.5 | £8.0 | £8.4 |
| Total tumover potential | £108.2 | £109.5 | £115.0 | £122.1 | £128.8 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £105.1 | £105.44 | £106.18 | £107.25 | £108.32 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.0 | £4.1 | £8.8 | £14.8 | £20.4 |
| Indic ative sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 252 | 340 | 729 | 1211 | 1654 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTIO N A

## TABLE 12b: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £367.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | £419.3 | £443.5 |
| Tumover from study area | $£ 40.4$ | £41.1 | £43.7 | £46.9 | £50.0 |
| Market share | 11.0\% | 11.0\% | 11.1\% | 11.2\% | 11.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £2.6 | £2.7 | £2.8 | £3.0 | £3.3 |
| Total tumover potential | £43.0 | £43.8 | £46.5 | £50.0 | £53.3 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | $£ 46.4$ | £46.5 | £46.8 | £47.3 | $£ 47.8$ |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.4 | -£2.7 | -£0.3 | £2.7 | £5.5 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -280 | -226 | -26 | 217 | 444 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12c: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £367.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | $£ 419.3$ | $£ 443.5$ |
| Tumover from study area | £20.5 | £20.8 | £21.7 | £22.9 | £24.1 |
| Market share | 5.6\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.4\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £1.3 | £1.3 | £1.4 | £1.5 | £1.6 |
| Total tumover potential | £21.9 | £22.1 | £23.1 | £24.4 | £25.6 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £18.6 | £18.6 | £18.8 | £19.0 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.3 | £3.5 | £4.3 | £5.4 | £6.5 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 273 | 287 | 357 | 444 | 524 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12d: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £367.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | $£ 419.3$ | £443.5 |
| Tumover from study a rea | £9.2 | £9.3 | £9.7 | £10.2 | $£ 10.8$ |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.4\% | 2.4\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.8 | £0.9 | £0.9 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.0 | £10.1 | £10.6 | £11.2 | $£ 11.7$ |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.6 | £6.6 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.5 | £3.6 | £4.1 | £4.6 | £5.1 |
| Indic ative sales density for new convenience goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 295 | 302 | 334 | 375 | 412 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study a rea taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 12e: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £367.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | $£ 419.3$ | $£ 443.5$ |
| Tumover from study area | £9.3 | $£ 9.5$ | £10.3 | £11.3 | £12.3 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.6\% | 2.7\% | 2.8\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.9 | £0.9 | £1.0 | £1.1 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.1 | £10.4 | £11.3 | £12.4 | £13.4 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | $£ 11.0$ | £11.1 | £11.1 | £11.2 | £11.4 |
| Residual expenditure | -£0.9 | -£0.7 | £0.1 | £1.1 | £2.0 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -78 | -57 | 10 | 90 | 165 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13a: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £556.4 | £600.1 | £683.6 | £804.8 | £948.4 |
| Tumover from study area | £96.8 | £103.8 | £118.0 | £138.6 | £163.0 |
| Market share | 17.4\% | 17.3\% | 17.3\% | 17.2\% | 17.2\% |
| Expenditure inflow | $£ 5.8$ | £6.2 | £7.1 | £8.3 | £9.8 |
| Total tumover potential | £102.6 | £110.0 | £125.1 | £146.9 | £172.8 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £102.6 | £108.3 | £119.4 | £130.7 | £142.9 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £1.7 | £5.6 | £16.3 | £29.9 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 327 | 969 | 2553 | 4298 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13b: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £556.4 | £600.1 | £683.6 | £804.8 | £948.4 |
| Tumover from study area | £12.9 | £15.60 | $£ 17.77$ | £20.93 | £24.66 |
| Market share | 2.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.4 | £16.2 | £18.5 | £21.8 | £25.6 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £16.4 | £17.3 | £19.1 | £20.9 | £22.8 |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.0 | -£1.1 | -£0.6 | £0.9 | £2.8 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | $£ 5,818$ | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -595 | -204 | -103 | 138 | 404 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13c: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expenditure | $£ 556.4$ | £600.1 | £683.6 | £804.8 | £948.4 |
| Tumover from study area | £13.3 | £14.2 | £16.0 | £18.7 | £21.9 |
| Market share | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.9 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.8 | £14.7 | £16.7 | £19.5 | £22.8 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £13.8 | £14.6 | £16.1 | £17.6 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.2 | £0.6 | £1.9 | £3.6 |
| Indic ative sales density for new comparison goods floorspace ( $£ /$ sq m) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 36 | 106 | 299 | 512 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13d: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £556.4 | £600.1 | £683.6 | £804.8 | £948.4 |
| Tumover from study area | £3.5 | £3.7 | £4.2 | $£ 4.9$ | $£ 5.7$ |
| Ma rket share | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.4 | £0.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £3.7 | $£ 4.0$ | $£ 4.5$ | $£ 5.3$ | £6.2 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £3.7 | £3.9 | $£ 4.3$ | $£ 4.8$ | $£ 5.2$ |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.1 | £0.2 | £0.5 | £1.0 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace ( $£ / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 11 | 31 | 84 | 143 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION A

## TABLE 13e: COMPARISON G OODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £556.4 | £600.1 | £683.6 | £804.8 | £948.4 |
| Tumover from study area | £6.8 | £7.4 | £8.6 | £10.4 | £12.4 |
| Market share | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £7.4 | £8.0 | £9.3 | £11.2 | £13.4 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £7.4 | £7.8 | £8.6 | £9.4 | £10.3 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.2 | £0.7 | £1.8 | £3.1 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 40 | 121 | 278 | 448 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 12a: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | $£ 419.2$ | $£ 443.4$ |
| Tumover from study area | £101.3 | £102.7 | £108.3 | £115.5 | £122.4 |
| Market share | 27.4\% | 27.5\% | 27.5\% | 27.6\% | 27.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £7.1 | £7.2 | £7.6 | £8.1 | £8.6 |
| Total tumover potential | £108.3 | £109.9 | £115.9 | £123.6 | £130.9 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £105.1 | £105.44 | £106.18 | £107.25 | £108.32 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.2 | £4.5 | £9.7 | £16.4 | £22.6 |
| Indic ative sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace ( $£ / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 268 | 371 | 804 | 1337 | 1828 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 12b: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | £419.2 | £443.4 |
| Tumover from study area | £40.2 | £40.7 | £42.8 | £45.4 | $£ 48.0$ |
| Ma rket share | 10.9\% | 10.9\% | 10.9\% | 10.8\% | 10.8\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £2.6 | £2.6 | £2.8 | £3.0 | £3.1 |
| Total tumover potential | £42.9 | £43.4 | £45.6 | £48.4 | £51.1 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £46.4 | £46.5 | £46.8 | £47.3 | $£ 47.8$ |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.5 | -£3.1 | -£1.2 | £1.1 | £3.3 |
| Indic ative sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -292 | -258 | -102 | 90 | 267 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 12c: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | $£ 419.2$ | $£ 443.4$ |
| Tumover from study area | £20.5 | £20.8 | £21.7 | £22.9 | £24.1 |
| Market share | 5.6\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.4\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £1.3 | £1.3 | £1.4 | £1.5 | £1.6 |
| Total tumover potential | £21.9 | £22.1 | £23.1 | £24.4 | £25.7 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £18.6 | £18.6 | £18.8 | £19.0 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.3 | £3.5 | £4.3 | £5.5 | £6.5 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 274 | 287 | 358 | 446 | 527 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 12d: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | £419.2 | $£ 443.4$ |
| Tumover from study area | £9.2 | £9.3 | £9.7 | £10.2 | £10.7 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.4\% | 2.4\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.8 | £0.9 | £0.9 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.0 | £10.1 | £10.6 | £11.1 | £11.7 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.5 | £6.6 | £6.6 |
| Residual expenditure | £3.5 | £3.6 | £4.0 | £4.6 | £5.1 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic ative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 295 | 302 | 334 | 373 | 410 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptionsmade in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 12e: CONVENIENCE GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available convenience goods expenditure | £369.0 | £374.1 | £393.9 | $£ 419.2$ | £443.4 |
| Tumover from study area | £9.4 | $£ 9.9$ | £11.2 | £12.8 | £14.3 |
| Market share | 2.5\% | 2.6\% | 2.8\% | 3.0\% | 3.2\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.8 | £0.9 | £1.0 | £1.1 | £1.3 |
| Total tumover potential | £10.2 | £10.8 | £12.2 | £13.9 | £15.6 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £11.0 | £11.1 | £11.1 | £11.2 | £11.4 |
| Residual expenditure | -£0.8 | -£0.3 | £1.0 | £2.7 | £4.2 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new convenience goodsfloorspace (£/sq m) | £12,000 | £12,036 | £12,121 | £12,242 | £12,365 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -66 | -25 | 86 | 218 | 343 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 4.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 7a-7e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 taken from Tables 10 and 11, projected forward assuming a growth in efficiency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only and reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 13a: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Stroud

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £559.4 | £600.0 | £683.4 | £804.4 | £947.7 |
| Tumover from study area | £97.0 | £104.1 | £118.9 | £140.4 | £165.7 |
| Market share | 17.3\% | 17.4\% | 17.4\% | 17.4\% | 17.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | $£ 5.8$ | £6.2 | £7.1 | £8.4 | £9.9 |
| Total tumover potential | £102.8 | £110.4 | £126.0 | £148.8 | £175.7 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £102.8 | £108.4 | £119.6 | £130.9 | £143.1 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £1.9 | £6.4 | £17.9 | £32.5 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 363 | 1103 | 2807 | 4675 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 13b: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Cam \& Dursley

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £559.4 | £600.0 | £683.4 | £804.4 | £947.7 |
| Tumover from study area | £12.9 | £15.6 | £17.8 | £20.9 | £24.6 |
| Market share | 2.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.8 | £1.0 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.4 | £16.2 | £18.5 | £21.8 | £25.6 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £16.4 | £17.3 | £19.0 | £20.8 | £22.8 |
| Residual expenditure | -£3.0 | -£1.0 | -£0.6 | £0.9 | £2.9 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | $£ 5,818$ | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | -595 | -195 | -95 | 146 | 411 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa $2020-2031$.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 13c: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Nailsworth

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expenditure | $£ 559.4$ | £600.0 | £683.4 | £804.4 | $£ 947.7$ |
| Tumover from study area | £13.3 | £14.2 | £16.0 | £18.7 | £21.8 |
| Market share | 2.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.5 | £0.6 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.9 |
| Total tumover potential | £13.8 | £14.7 | £16.6 | £19.4 | $£ 22.7$ |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £13.8 | £14.6 | £16.1 | £17.6 | £19.2 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.2 | £0.6 | £1.8 | £3.5 |
| Indic ative sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | £5,275 | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 34 | 100 | 288 | 497 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 13d: COMPARISON GOODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

Wotton-under-Edge

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goodsexpenditure | £559.4 | £600.0 | £683.4 | £804.4 | £947.7 |
| Tumover from study area | £3.5 | £3.7 | £4.2 | $£ 4.9$ | $£ 5.7$ |
| Ma rket share | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.3 | £0.4 | £0.5 |
| Total tumover potential | £3.7 | $£ 4.0$ | $£ 4.5$ | $£ 5.3$ | £6.2 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £3.7 | £3.9 | $£ 4.3$ | $£ 4.8$ | $£ 5.2$ |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.1 | £0.2 | £0.5 | £1.0 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indicative retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 10 | 29 | 81 | 139 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5 f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expenditure inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES

STROUD DISTRICTCOUNCIL
STROUD RETAIL STUDY UPDATE 2013-11500 OPTION B

## TABLE 13e: COMPARISON G OODS CAPACITY, 2013-2031

## Stonehouse

|  | 2013 | 2016 | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Available comparison goods expend iture | £559.4 | £600.0 | £683.4 | £804.4 | £947.7 |
| Tumover from study area | £6.9 | £7.6 | £9.1 | £11.3 | £13.9 |
| Market share | 1.2\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | 1.4\% | 1.5\% |
| Expenditure inflow | £0.6 | £0.6 | £0.7 | £0.9 | £1.1 |
| Total tumover potential | £7.5 | £8.2 | £9.9 | £12.2 | £15.0 |
| Benchmark tumover of existing and committed facilities | £7.5 | £7.9 | £8.7 | £9.5 | £10.4 |
| Residual expenditure | £0.0 | £0.3 | £1.2 | £2.7 | £4.6 |
| Indic a tive sales density for new comparison goods floorspace (£/sq m) | £5,000 | $£ 5,275$ | £5,818 | £6,367 | £6,961 |
| Indic a tive retail floorspace capacity (sq m net) | 0 | 65 | 201 | 427 | 668 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes:

Total expenditure taken from Table 5f.
Tumover from study area taken from Tables 9a-9e.
Market share is the tumover from study area expressed as a percentage of total available expenditure
Expenditure inflow based on assumptions made in 2010 Retail Study.
Total tumover potential is the study a rea derived tumover plus expend iture inflow.
Benchmark tumover at 2013 assumed to match total tumover potential, projected forward assuming a growth in effic iency of 0.1\%pa 2013-19 and 0.2\%pa 2020-2031.
Sales density for new floorspace is indic ative only a nd reference should also be made the tumover of individual proposals.

## 2011 PRICES


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See paragraph 5.4 of the 2010 study
    2 Used with the kind permission of the Property Alliance Group, who commissioned the survey

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Commissioned by the Property Alliance Group, in support of a forthcoming retail proposal in the Stonehouse/Stroud area

