

# Meeting record

**Regarding:**

Magna Park Lutterworth Community  
Liaison Group

**Date:**

Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> May 2017 6.30pm

Item	Minutes	Actions
1.	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tim Ottevanger – Ashby Parva PC</li> <li>• Ian Bentlett – Harborough Magna PC</li> <li>• Edmund Hunt – Cotesbach PC</li> <li>• Chris Staton – Claybrooke Parva PC</li> <li>• Councillor Tony Gillias – Harborough District Council</li> </ul>	
2.	<p><b>Agree minutes of 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017 meeting</b> Minutes were taken as read and will be uploaded to the website.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Introductions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gwyn Stubbings – IDI Gazeley (GS)</li> <li>• Bruce Topley – IDI Gazeley (BT)</li> <li>• Keith Beard – Savills/IDI Gazeley (KB)</li> <li>• David Eden – Savills/IDI Gazeley (DE)</li> <li>• Mark Kerr – Newgate Engage (Chair) (MK)</li> <li>• Ellie Naismith – Newgate Engage (Secretariat) (EN)</li> <li>• Kate Durrans – Newgate Engage (Secretariat) (KD)</li> <li>• Barbara Dent – Monks Kirkby PC (BD)</li> <li>• Bill Wooliscroft – Monks Kirby PC (BW)</li> <li>• Maggie Pankhurst – Magna Park is Big Enough (MP)</li> <li>• Nick Reseigh – Claybrooke Magna PC (NR)</li> <li>• Chris Faircliffe – Bitteswell Parish Council (CF)</li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b>Matters arising</b> MK ran through the actions from the previous meeting, and reported on the progress made with each of them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>EN to share details of who to get in touch with and how to report breaches of restrictions</i> – this was completed following the previous meeting (details below). <i>When reporting activity on weight restricted roads, please email</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="mailto:force.control@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk">force.control@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk</a></li> <li>▪ <a href="mailto:easterncounties.npa@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk">easterncounties.npa@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>EN to circulate weight restriction maps from IV</i> – this was completed when the minutes from the previous meeting were issued.</li> <li>• <i>GS to report back to the group regarding discussions on possible new signage</i></li> </ul>	

	<p><i>system and whether Magna Park would be able to take this on – this was included on the agenda at Item 6.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>EN to include S106 routing map on the agenda – this was included on the agenda at Item 6.</i></li> <li>• <i>EN to upload October minutes to website – this action is ongoing alongside the creation of the new website – EN will circulate a link to the new page when issuing the minutes from the meeting.</i></li> <li>• <i>BT to get information from electrical engineers about lighting standards and expectations / what happens at Magna Park – this has been included on the agenda at Item 7.</i></li> <li>• <i>DE to carry out informal assessment of lighting with CF and EH – this was carried out following the previous meeting and DE briefly summarised the content of the trip by way of follow up</i></li> <li>• <i>GS to approach Highways England about speaking at the meeting – this had been carried out, with further information to be covered at Item 5.</i></li> <li>• <i>EN to try to find the presentation on the A5 steering group website – EN had been unable to find such a presentation.</i></li> <li>• <i>GS and BT to report on Keltruck meeting and EN to include on the agenda – this has been included on the agenda at Item 8.</i></li> <li>• <i>BT to investigate containers – this was covered in AOB at Item 11.</i></li> </ul>	<p>EN to include web link with minutes</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Report back on discussions with Highways England</b></p> <p>MK introduced the conversation by explaining the background to the approach to Highways England.</p> <p>GS reported a series of approaches made by himself and BW to the A5 Steering Group, Midlands Connect, and Highways England, culminating in an email correspondence with a representative from the latter organisation. He noted that Samantha Pinnock had declined to attend this meeting (though had not ruled out doing so in future), but had instead provided a summary of works forthcoming in and around the area for GS to issue at the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GS summarised the email at the meeting; EN passed around printed copies of the message (the full text is included below for reference)</li> </ul> <p>EMAIL TO GS: (From Samantha Pinnock (HE), sent 5/5/17)  <i>Further to our recent conversation, mitigation measures that are currently in place for the A5 are as follows:</i></p> <p><b><u>Leicestershire</u></b></p> <p><i>For the DHL application at Magna Park, Highways England recommended highways improvements including the realignment of Mere Lane and the introduction of a new roundabout on the A5, along with a short length of additional duelling, few 100m.</i></p> <p><i>The Dodwells to Longshoot scheme, scheduled to commence in 2019 will improve the operation of the A5 in this location by providing two lanes in each direction on the existing A5 alignment.</i></p> <p><b><u>Northampton</u></b></p> <p><i>As set out in the DCO for DIRFT III / Rugby Radio Station SUE the developer(s) must carry out the following works on the A5:</i></p>	

*Prior to the occupation of more than 305,000 m2 of gross internal floor space*

*A5/A426 Gibbet Roundabout – widening and signalisation of A5 (north) approach, A426 (north-east) approach and A5 (south) approach, with additional widening to A426 (southwest) approach and exit, widening of circulating carriageway and associated traffic management measures*

*Prior to any occupation*

- *A5 Lilbourne crossroads – improved signage, carriageway markings, anti-skid surfacing, and associated traffic management measures*
- *A5 Catthorpe Crossroads – improved signage, carriageway markings, anti-skid surfacing and associated traffic management measures*
- *A5/A428 (Parklands) Roundabout – amendments to signing and carriageway markings on A428 (west) approach*

### **Warwickshire**

*There are currently no immediate or future plans for improvements.*

### **Wider A5 Corridor**

*In recognition of the traffic problems for the wider A5 between M42 and M69, a strategic improvement study is being undertaken. Given the constrained nature of the existing route, this includes an option to take the A5 off the current alignment though the Hinckley area akin to an Expressway concept.*

*The A5 is also referenced in current Midlands Connect documents and the Route Strategies which Highways England recently published. I have attached the link for your information*

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/future-investment-in-englands-motorways-and-major-roads#route-strategies>

GS went on to note the key dates about improvements to the A5:

- a research exercise 2015-2018
- decision 2018-2019
- mobilisation 2020
- delivery post 2020

GS had outlined in his correspondence with HE what the interest was in terms of this group, and further referenced previous conversations within the CLG about delaying expansion at Magna Park until after the improvements to the road. He concluded that the A5 has been identified for improvement but in the longer term.

MP noted that Midlands Connect has stated that the improvement is 'urgent' and that they're going to carry out a study on the A5 between the A38 and the A1 (J13) and make a decision by 2030 – there is currently no money allocated to support improvements.

- GS responded that it has been identified as a congested route but that it's not clear what the improvements will be.

	<p>BW noted his disappointment that HE has proven immune to lobbying – Alberto Costa MP, the A5 Steering Group and others have all spoken to them but to no avail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MK observed that there has been a great deal of inertia on highways strategy, but that is usually followed by a Parliamentary announcement of schemes set to receive funding.</li> <li>• BW responded that he had wanted to meet HE to make them aware of the problem so that the A5 improvements can be on a list when funding starts to come forward.</li> </ul> <p>GS reiterated that the A5 has been identified for a great deal of development, but agreed it is not clear when or how these improvements will come forward. However, he further noted that there is a great deal of funding available for the Midlands Connect Strategy. He went on to explain that the Leicestershire LEP had been likely to direct funding towards A5 improvements, but that they had only received a fraction of the funding they had applied for. As a result, their budget was already largely spent. He concluded by expressing his hope that the new Metro Mayor in Birmingham may have an impact on the speed with which improvements to the A5 are delivered.</p> <p>MK closed remarks on this topic by observing that Highways England may be willing to come to a future meeting; we have now established a contact. We may well approach her in future to ask her to come along.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Further update on lorry routing</b></p> <p>GS updated the group on the ongoing discussions with Warwickshire and Leicestershire Highways Authorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early conversations with Warwickshire identified a need to look into signage in the locality to ensure that drivers are being directed to the major routes on the strategic network. Gazeley carried out an audit of the signage in the area, which has been shared with Warwickshire ahead of a meeting on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2017. Discussion will cover whether the signage is fit for purpose, whether improvements can be made and how those improvements can be made. In all likelihood, improvements would be linked to any planning permissions granted.</li> <li>• In response to BW, GS reported that his meeting will be with Ben Simm and Joanne Archer at Warwickshire Highways Authority. He further noted that Leicestershire is aware of these meetings.</li> <li>• In response to BW, GS noted that the meetings relate to the planning applications and so the content would not usually become part of the public domain. However, he will explore sensitive ways of reporting back to the group on his progress. BW and CF agreed that this was an appropriate response.</li> </ul> <p>MK moved the conversation on to cover the discrepancy on the S106 routing map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BD had brought the <i>Warwickshire Advisory Lorry Route Map</i> for reference. BW reported that Warwickshire maintain this map was agreed prior to the S106 agreement</li> <li>• However, given it is not the map that appears within the S106 agreement, GS and Gazeley have no means by which to enforce it on existing tenants for whom the routing sits in their Head Lease.</li> <li>• To date, they have issued the revised map to all tenants on two separate occasions, encouraging their compliance, and have included it in tenancy agreements for new tenants where possible– they are trying to phase out the B4027.</li> <li>• GS reported that he had been advised by Gazeley’s lawyers that they are unable to enforce a revised map on tenants whose leases stipulate the map from the S106 – however, if Warwickshire were to put pressure on Gazeley to alter the map, they</li> </ul>	<p>EN to include on agenda for next time.</p>

	<p>might have some teeth with which to approach existing tenants to enforce the revised map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BT underlined that without the official backing of the Highways Authority, there is little they can achieve.</li> <li>• BW agreed to report this back to Warwickshire. It was concluded that there is agreement regarding the aims of these conversations, the challenge now is achieving the outcome.</li> </ul> <p>CF asked whether, when an authority like HDC is imposing conditions, it can impose conditions outside of their jurisdiction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MK responded that HDC receive consultation responses from a variety of statutory consultee, including the Environment Agency and neighbouring highways authorities. Planning conditions are drafted based on these responses.</li> <li>• GS expanded on this point by observing that improvements could be imposed on a roundabout outside the jurisdiction but impacted by the development. For example, a condition on the hybrid application could be improvements to the Gibbett Hill Roundabout.</li> <li>• MP gave an additional example, and underlined that improvements like these, even outside the jurisdiction of the planning authority, are not voluntary.</li> </ul> <p>MK concluded this discussion by observing that this cooperation is a good example of what this CLG can achieve.</p>	
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Report from M+E Consultants on lighting</b></p> <p>MK invited BT to report back on the various lighting issues discussed at the previous meeting.</p> <p><i>[NB – the report to which the below refers is enclosed with these minutes]</i></p> <p>BT first updated the group on discussions regarding the Culina building (facing south). KB has met with them; they have recently upgraded their lighting system from orange sunlight to white LED, specifically designed to light the hard areas. Although in theory they could reconstruct their lighting system, they are reluctant to do so given their recent expensive upgrade.</p> <p>BT secondarily updated the group on the report he had on Lux levels. He reported that Gazeley has offered a free survey to all tenants carried out by Gazeley’s lighting consultants on the park to review how lighting could be improved in their areas. These improvements come with a cost, but the likely payback of improvements would be over 3-5 years; furthermore, Gazeley can help to facilitate these changes.</p> <p>Regarding the common areas, Gazeley is updating lighting to LEDs when existing lighting fails – KB interjected that all lighting in common areas go off at 12pm, although this is subject to an ongoing health and safety review, given shift changeovers after midnight.</p> <p>GS added that there is a commitment on the DHL approval that there is a lighting management plan approved prior to occupation, so that lighting on Mere Lane will be upgraded to LED.</p> <p>NR noted that he understands why tenants want to change; LEDs are better for the environment and less expensive. However, he asked whether the industry has any figures about the kind of light emitted by LEDs and their glow. He wanted to know whether tenants are taking into consideration the increasing light spillage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CF agreed with NR; he said that residents applaud the saving of energy, but that the</li> </ul>	

	<p>white light is harsh and intrusive – the upward light spill onto the building itself increases the glare – lighting of the structure isn’t necessary. He observed that this is an opportunity to improve the situation – the opportunity is being missed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KB noted that this applies to building lighting rather than street lighting, so it is up to tenants to enact the kind of changes CF and NR are discussing.</li> <li>• CF asked if there was another way of lighting fire escapes</li> <li>• DE responded that might be difficult – there are obligations about the Lux levels from a safety point of view. He went on to explain the ways of relighting a building – either tenants can retrofit LEDs, which is significantly less expensive, or alter the wiring and change the fittings to point downwards.</li> <li>• NR reported that the street light opposite his bedroom had been fitted with an LED – since he reported this to the council, they have fitted a cowl to the night, which directs the lighting downwards and reduces the glare. He asked whether there was a low-tech way of doing this on the buildings to reduce splashback.</li> <li>• CF suggested IDI Gazeley prepare a manual of good practice – although light pollution has observably lessened over recent years, there is an opportunity to keep improving.</li> <li>• MK suggested that, since this responsibility lies with the tenants themselves, that KB report this conversation and these suggestions back to the tenants as something to consider. GS agreed to encourage and promote good practice when the opportunity arises – there will be an opportunity to share what’s being promoted on Mere Lane across the park.</li> <li>• CF noted that the application to refurbish the old Primark buildings will include big light columns on Mere Lane – although GS acknowledged these things are beyond Gazeley’s control, he offered to prepare some wording that CF could submit when the Parish Council are consulted on Magna Park planning applications which include details of new lighting.</li> </ul>	<p>BT / GS to share wording</p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Update on ASDA lorries using Keltruck</b></p> <p>GS reminded attendees about the issue, raised a couple of meetings ago, regarding ASDA lorries in particular traveling through Lutterworth High Street to access Keltruck. Since the last meeting, GS and BT have been progressing the potential for Keltruck to occupy some of the space on the land to the south of Magna Park, where Gazeley has planning permission for a lorry park. They have furthered these conversations by including an operator who could provide LPG refuelling on the site and an operator who could provide a lorry parking facility. These operators are going to meet with Gazeley and a masterplanning architect on 30/5/17 to develop a detailed plan for the facilities on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MK clarified that the theory behind these conversations is to have: a more environmentally friendly refuelling station; somewhere for Magna Park vehicles to park on site; and somewhere for lorries to be serviced at Magna Park to avoid them driving into the town centre (Keltruck would leave the town centre). This would serve to discourage Magna Park vehicles from parking in and around villages, to encourage drivers to avoid the town centre, and to reduce pollution through a more environmentally friendly offering.</li> <li>• GS cautioned that delivering compromise between three different sets of commercial interests is complicated, but hoped that progress would be made on 30<sup>th</sup> May.</li> <li>• EN will put this on the agenda for the next meeting – but GS further noted that we would be more likely to have some progress to report on by October.</li> </ul>	<p>EN to include on October agenda</p>
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Update on Planning Applications</b></p> <p>GS observed that there is not much to update on since the last meeting. The Judicial Review challenge still stands against the DHL application; the date for court hearing is projected for</p>	

	<p>15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> June. The District Council remains reluctant to bring the larger applications to a joint committee until that judicial review has resolved itself.</p> <p>CF asked whether there is an appeal process on Judicial Reviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GS explained that the Claimant can apply for leave of appeal, but it has to be accepted by the court – the right to appeal is not automatic, a case has to be made to justify the appeal.</li> </ul> <p>GS further noted Gazeley is progressing with the discharge of conditions associated with the DHL planning application.</p>	
<b>10.</b>	<p><b>Future meetings and speaker suggestions</b></p> <p>There were no additional suggestions beyond the possibility of Highways England's attendance.</p>	
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>KB reported back to the group about the containers by CML – they are being used for racking storage, which is not combustible. CF was reassured by this, but asked KB and GS to keep on top of the matter.</p> <p>No additional other business.</p>	
<b>12.</b>	<p><b>Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017</p> <p>Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017</p> <p>The dates were approved and the meeting was closed at 19.40.</p>	