

Agenda

Regarding:

Magna Park Lutterworth Community
Liaison Group

Date:

Tuesday 7th February 2017 6.30pm

Item	Minutes	Actions
1.	<p>Apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Tony Gillias • Lutterworth Town Council • Cllr Rosita Page • Tim Ottevanger – Ashby Parva 	
2.	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwyn Stubbings – IDI Gazeley (GS) • Bruce Topley – IDI Gazeley (BT) • Mark Kerr – PPS (Chair) (MK) • Ellie Naismith – PPS (Secretariat) (EN) • David Eden – Savills (DE) • Barbara Dent – Monks Kirkby PC (BD) • Bill Wooliscroft – Monks Kirby PC (BW) • Chris Staton – Claybrooke Parva (CS) • Maggie Pankhurst – Magna Park is Big Enough (MP) • Nick Reseigh – Claybrooke Magna PC (NR) • Edmund Hunt – Cotesbach PC (EH) • Ian Bentlett – Harborough Magna PC (IB) • Chris Faircliffe – Bitteswell Parish Council (CF) • Troy Johnson – Pailton Parish Council (TJ) • Lesley French – Pailton Village Trust (LF) 	
3.	<p>Update on Lorry Routing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Officers presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ian Vears, Leicestershire County Council (LCC) <p>IV introduced himself, and his background in the area, with 28 years working for the council, then opened the floor for questions.</p> <p>GS stated that he had two questions, particularly regarding the DHL application and the conversations held at the planning committees around that application. His first question was why the Magna Park HGV routing agreement wasn't imposed on the DHL application; his second was do LCC monitor traffic flows through the surrounding villages and if so had they</p>	

identified a spike in traffic at the shift turnovers at Magna Park?

IV began by responding to GS's first question regarding routing agreements. He noted that he had had the opportunity to discuss the agreement with the county solicitor who had been at the original public enquiry before his retirement. Although the original routing agreement had been imposed in the early 1990's, LCC felt that the road network had changed significantly since that time and more effective alternative means were available to control HGV routing. He further stated that LCC tend not to ask for routing agreements except on construction management plans; they find it is more efficient to put weight restrictions on roads, as they can be enforced by the police.

MK clarified: if you want to limit or restrict road usage, it is achieved through a weight restriction which the police can enforce rather than by a planning condition.

IV noted that this is correct. He further clarified that within designated weight restriction areas, HGV's cannot travel from one side to the other; however they could drive into the area for a legitimate reason i.e. for access only reasons. He stated that LCC throughout the 1990's, LCC had imposed numerous weight restrictions throughout the County.

IB asked how supportive LCC had been of the rural communities campaigning to keep HGVs away from smaller roads unable to take their weight.

IV responded that LCC invested a huge amount in major routes in the early 90s because of the impact on mining operations, to try to direct HGVs to the major roads. At the time, they weren't able to put weight restrictions on A and B routes because drivers navigated by maps, making it much more difficult to change routes at the last minute when faced with a weight restriction. However, they have brought in 60 – 70 new weight limits in the last ten years: the only places not covered are where there are so few lorries (20 or fewer traffic movements) there is no point in creating restrictions, or where there is no viable alternative.

CF responded that, although technically the police can enforce these restrictions, the reality is that they don't. There is no record of prosecutions, and no evidence of investigations in the area. From the local residents' perspective, at least with a dedicated Magna Park routing plan, any breaches would constitute a breach in the terms of the lease and the site owners could then take action. He further stated that it is meaningless to pass the buck to the police, who do not have the resources to act.

MK clarified that Sgt Mark Williams, who attended the meeting last time, had suggested that parish councils notify the local force of any breaches.

CF responded that this process does not work; parishes have been reporting these concerns for the last ten years, and nothing has come of it.

IV observed that the on site management at Magna Park was very proactive

<p>about enforcing the routing agreement and that park management were still entitled to act in this manner. In his experience, involvement of the police is more likely when the problem is more severe, and when representations from the community are numerous, well evidenced and forceful. He suggested that, if a lorry is spotted in an area it shouldn't be, report it to the supplier as well as to the police.</p> <p>NR asked for clarification about the comment that "you cannot travel from one side to another"; he also asked about the forthcoming police cuts and what that will mean for dedicating resources to enforcement.</p> <p>IV defined the difference between a weight limit and a weight restriction (a weight limit has no exemptions and applies to the total weight; a weight restriction is based on the gross plated weight and does not matter if the vehicle is loaded or not). He responded to NR's question that if you have no reason to go within the weight restricted zone, then you have broken the restriction. You cannot shortcut from one side to the other.</p> <p>IV explained that, first and foremost, the highway authority manages the roads – the enforcement is for the police; the local authority has no power to enforce beyond parking restrictions, which itself is a drain on resources. He suggested getting in touch with the Police and Crime Commissioner on this matter to make representations.</p> <p>MK asked how it was possible to tell whether a vehicle has travelled all through the weight restricted zone.</p> <p>IV observed it is very difficult. Usually, the police would set up lorry traps; they need to see the lorry go in and go out of the zone. The whole system is complicated by lorry drivers who get lost, and those who are led astray by Sat Nav systems.</p> <p>GS noted that problems often occur when lorry drivers use generic Sat Navs which do not identify height or weight restricted roads. He announced that IDI Gazeley has been exploring with Aston University the potential to create a bespoke Magna Park app that highlights weight restrictions as well as routing agreements. He stated that it may be possible to include the Pailton road in that.</p> <p>BW stated that, following the suggestion that WCC and LCC attend the CLG to speak, there was a meeting in early December at which Magna Park routing was raised. MK asked what was discussed; BW reported that discussion was held about the A5 and the strategic planning around that. Adrian Hart, Head of Transport Strategy for WCC was in attendance; attendees at the meeting agreed that something needed to be done about the A5. Since that time, there has been work to lobby Highways England about the matter, resulting in a debate in the Houses of Parliament. The Department for Transport has responded that something needs to be done, but the date they propose is a long way off. BW expressed concern that work to improve the A5 is not complete before work to expand Magna Park begins.</p>	<p>EN to share details of who to get in touch with and how</p> <p>EN to circulate weight restriction maps from IV</p>
--	---

<p>GS noted that WCC were invited to this meeting as well, and that he sent them a list of questions they could respond to. Briefing note from WCC sent via email shown to the room:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Hi Gwyn,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">There's not too much for us to say on this really.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">If there are no weight limit restrictions, be that structural or environmental, on the B4027, then there is no legal reason why HGVs cannot use this road.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">If the residents along this route are unhappy with Magna Park vehicles using the route - and you wish to address their concerns, then WCC would be prepared to design a signing scheme to encourage HGVs to use alternative routes, however this would need to be fully funded by Magna Park.</p> <p>MP, BW and IV agreed to circulate the minutes of the December meeting among CLG members who were unable to be present in December.</p> <p>IB asked whether IV works with his counterpart at WCC. He confirmed that he does.</p> <p>IV responded to the earlier question from GS about traffic flows through villages; he confirmed that they have not noticed any abnormal levels, and that all data will be shared with parishes in the area.</p> <p>It was agreed that the group's displeasure with WCC's response would be passed on to them by GS.</p> <p>MP asked how much a signage system as suggested by WCC would cost to implement, and whether Magna Park would be able to take this cost on.</p> <p>GS responded that, although at present they have been unable to establish HGVs using the road through Pailton being associated with Magna Park, they had commissioned a signage audit which recommended that improvements could be made, particularly at the Magna Park exit. With this and WCC's reference to improved signage, they will discuss this further with WCC.</p> <p>At this point, discussion moved on to the routing agreement, and the discrepancy around the S106 routing map which does not restrict access along the B4027 (former A427). BW produced a map on behalf of Cllr Gillias who was unable to attend. The map did not include the B4027 as a permitted Magna Park HGV route.</p> <p>GS reiterated that the S106 legal agreement between LCC and Gazeley permits the use of the B4027, which was supported by WCC's reference to the B4027 in the email [above].</p> <p>MK suggested that, given IDI Gazeley has taken legal advice on this, BW should go to WCC with both his map and the legal agreement MP relies on. BW agreed to look into the background of this alternative map with WCC.</p>	<p>GS to report back to the group regarding these discussions</p> <p>EN to include on the agenda at the next meeting</p> <p>EN to circulate updated route map</p>
--	---

	<p>GS advised that the historic / original routing map had been updated and overlaid onto a more up to date OS plan to make it clearer and easier for drivers to use.</p> <p>GS showed the map, not including the B4027, which has been circulated to all businesses to discourage lorries from using it. IDI Gazeley have taken legal advice on this matter – if WCC agree that the B4027 should not be used as a permitted route then there may be an opportunity to amend the formal routing agreement, which would enable IDI Gazeley to alter the head leases; they need WCC to take this matter further. GS would be more than happy for this to happen. In the interim a revised routing agreements will be issued to any new tenants based on the amended map.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Agree minutes of 4th October 2016 meeting Minutes were agreed.</p>	<p>EN to upload minutes to website.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Matters arising</p> <p>BT noted that the matter about the Culina lights is still outstanding, as there has been a new general manager. He agreed to provide an update at the next meeting.</p> <p>CF observed that the overall light levels seem to be lower, but that there are examples where the lighting is still bright and intrusive, including Culina and the new developed unit (2110). He asked whether lighting was within the remit of this group.</p> <p>MK responded that this group could discuss lighting but that it would be best for GS to liaise with occupiers. CF further noted that, generally speaking, the lighting issue has been taken on board, but that there is a continued need to seek improvements where necessary.</p> <p>GS stated that he is happy to speak to occupiers on behalf of the group. Lighting within buildings and service yards is continually being upgraded to LEDs and improved lighting technology. He noted that he will follow up with the owner of the Primark units about whether improvements to lighting are included in the proposed refurbishment works before a new tenant is found. He further observed that there is a S106 obligation through the DHL application to improve the lighting on Mere Lane.</p> <p>NR asked whether there is a maximum amount of light given that for Health and Safety reasons there is a stated minimum.</p> <p>DE noted that the difference between LED and standard light is the wattage, with the LEDs giving out a lower amount of light. From a statutory perspective, there is no maximum.</p> <p>BT, CF and NR discussed the information that was required to answer this question – BT will get information about lighting standards being employed at Magna Park, while CF will identify the buildings that cause the greatest problems.</p> <p>MK asked whether the group would like a specialist to come and talk about</p>	<p>BT – to get information from Electrical Engineers about standards and expectations and what happens at MP.</p> <p>CF to identify the buildings that cause the greatest problems. To be arranged with DE. EH also volunteered. <i>[NB this meeting has now been arranged]</i></p>

	lighting – it was generally agreed that GS will get a report from his M&E consultants, with a view to possibly inviting them at a later date.	
6.	<p>Update on Planning Applications</p> <p>GS explained that following the DHL application being approved at planning committee in July, the s106 agreement had been completed and the planning permission issued at the end of October. Following this, there was a statutory 6 week period during which a judicial review could be registered; on the last day of this, DB Symmetry lodged a judicial review, challenging HDC's procedures. IDI Gazeley, are an interested party and will support HDC where necessary. As a result, the grounds for challenge will be considered by a judge at a full hearing expected to be in May / June 2017.</p> <p>GS then provided an update on the hybrid application – with the JR lodged against the DHL consent, determining the hybrid application planning committee meeting has now been postponed until the judicial review process is concluded. Hopefully this will be determined, assuming nothing slows down the JR process, towards the end of 2017. He noted that although the JR is scheduled for May / June, there is an opportunity to an appeals process after this, which would further delay the timetables. GS remains confident the issues will be resolved, and in the interim, planning conditions and technical approvals for the DHL application are being discharged,</p> <p>BW asked whether it was acceptable for HDC to postpone the hybrid application during the JR – GS stated that this is absolutely acceptable, indeed that it is advisable from a members' perspective to let the process run its course without making any further decisions.</p> <p>MK noted that there is nothing to update on the S106 at present as a result.</p>	
7.	<p>Future meetings and speaker suggestions</p> <p>Cllr Rosita Page has made a suggestion:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For whatever it is worth , may I suggest to suggest as a future speaker somebody who can clearly define the future proposals /improvements for the A5 and what long term (time scales) benefits there will for the Hinckley to Magna Park stretch ?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The question could be asked of Ian Vears who is able to answer that but a speaker from Highways England may be forced into taking notice of residents' views and to work this into their future deliberations.</p> <p>As a result of this, GS has already spoken with the Chairman of the A5 steering group, Bill Cullen. He was supportive of the idea of someone from the group attending this meeting providing it's convenient.</p> <p>BW noted that the steering group are unlikely to give any answers on the A5. GS reported that IV had mentioned that there are significant announcements due in March about the A5 and its funding; the names GS has been given at the steering group are representatives from the Midlands Connect initiative and as such may be able to advise on future proposals for the A5.</p>	

	<p>The group remained sceptical, and offered to lobby to get HE to come and speak (it was noted it would be a major achievement to gain their attendance). IB referred to minutes of a meeting of the A5 Steering Group at which a David McCann from Highways England gave a presentation – it was agreed that GS would approach him first.</p> <p>MK suggested that approaching Highways England first, but that if unsuccessful approaching A5 Steering Group / Midlands Connect. The group agreed to this, on the understanding that in this instance we would provide questions in advance for them to respond to.</p> <p>IB further noted that he felt the Q&A with IV had been useful, and more constructive than a presentation.</p>	<p>GS to approach HE. EN to try to find the presentation on the steering group website.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p><i>ASDA Lorries</i> GS updated the group on an issue raised by Tim Ottevanger about ASDA lorries going through the town centre in breach of routing. He reported that meetings are ongoing with Keltruck (who operate a lorry service centre in Lutterworth); they have been made aware of the routing restrictions on Magna Park suppliers. Discussions are ongoing about relocating the facility to Magna Park itself, which would resolve the issue. GS stated that they are trying to find a solution that works for all parties and avoids Keltruck having to close.</p> <p><i>Outside storage</i> CF observed that based on aerial images outside storage has certainly improved since the group’s last conversation on the matter, though he did state that there has been some backsliding, and asked that Magna Park try to keep on top of it. He further noted that he has observed an increase in lorry bodies and containers parked permanently on the site, particularly in the warehouses by the services farm. He asked what they were being used for, particularly whether they contain materials that give cause for concern. BT agreed to look into this.</p>	<p>GS and BT to report on this meeting at the next meeting in March.</p> <p>EN to include in minutes for next time.</p> <p>BT to investigate containers.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Date of next meeting 16th May – 6.30pm</p>	