

## **TESCO RESPONSE TO SOME THIRD PARTY COMMENTS**

### **Further responses**

Tesco has been reading with interest the third party comments on the Groceries Market Investigation that the Competition Commission has been publishing on its website. Our formal submissions have addressed, and will continue to address, the issues raised by the Competition Commission, the main parties, and some of the professional lobbying organisations.

In addition, however, a number of third party submissions on the Competition Commission's website contain more specific comments about Tesco which we have not covered in our formal submissions. Some of these comments are inaccurate and misleading, and we are providing a series of short notes in order to put the record straight.

### ***Submission from Consumer No. 71c - Pontyclun***

This submission contains the incorrect allegation that “*The Highways Dept have effectively been gagged*” in relation to the proposed development in Pontyclun.

Pontyclun is a developer-led scheme and the original application in Pontyclun was submitted by a developer, not Tesco. This first application was refused, primarily due to highway issues, and this decision is being appealed by the developer. Concurrently, the developer has submitted a second application which seeks to deal with the highway concerns raised by the Highway Department. Tesco have a contract with the developer and will be a tenant in the development.

The Highways department have made representations during the assessment of the first application and during the appeal process and therefore the accusation that the Highways Department has been “gagged” is incorrect.

### ***Submission from Consumer No. 200 - Belper***

This submission contains the incorrect statement that “*We have TESCOs holding on to derelict land in Belper, Derbyshire that could be put to good use.*”

In Belper we are engaged in a complex land assembly project for a mixed-use development which will provide the town with a new county library and key worker housing.

We are in the process of buying additional land to facilitate the building of a bypass – a bypass which is required for a development of this size. Development is made more complex by the fact that the planned route for the bypass goes through a flood plain and we plan to relocate a football and cricket ground to improved new facilities. Only when we have addressed these issues will we be in a position where we can submit a planning application. Accordingly, the accusation that we are holding on to this land without trying to develop it is incorrect.