

Meeting record

Regarding:
Magna Park Lutterworth Community
Liaison Group

Date:
Tuesday 22nd May 2018 6.30pm

Item	Minutes	Actions
1.	<p>Apologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan Butcher – Claybrooke Magna PC • Maggie Pankhurst – MPIBE • Lutterworth Town Council • Leslie French – Pailton Parish Council 	
2.	<p>Agree minutes of 6th February meeting Minutes were taken as read and will be uploaded to the website.</p>	
3.	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwyn Stubbings – Gazeley (GS) • Bruce Topley – Gazeley (BT) • David Eden – Savills/ Gazeley (DE) • Ellie Naismith – Newgate Engage (Chair) (EN) (To replace Mark following his retirement) • Kate Durrans – Newgate Engage (Secreteriat) (KD) • Chris Faircliffe - Bitteswell PC (CF) • Nick Reseigh - Claybrooke Magna PC (NR) • Bill Wooliscroft - Monks Kirby PC (BW) • Barbara Dent - Monks Kirkby PC (BD) • Councillor Adrian Warwick - Warwickshire County Council (AW) • Ian Bentlett – Harborough Magna PC (IB) • Edmund Hunt – Cotesbach PC (EH) <p>CF wanted to give his best wishes to Mark and thanked him for his efforts chairing the meeting.</p>	
4.	<p>Review Terms of Reference</p> <p>EN noted that following the last meeting it had been agreed that the Terms of Reference for the group would be reviewed in full.</p> <p>[insert terms of reference]</p> <p>Following a review of the Terms of Reference, EN highlighted three points which needed to be amended:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the IDI from the company name • Removal of the word 'DRAFT' • Update the link to the project website <p>EN paused to explain that following the last meeting of the group, there was a question on the possibility of inviting new members and whether invitations should be issued to new members.</p> <p>EN invited members to have a think of any potential invitees and report back to KD who will take responsibility for any potential recommendations for invitations to be issued.</p> <p>GS informed the group that they are occasionally contacted by organisations further afield and that DE had recently been to see the Welford Action Group following an enquiry from them.</p> <p>DE noted that in conversations with this group they had discussed the roadworks on the M1 which diverted traffic onto the A14. As a result of this enquiry, DE had put them in touch with the relevant parties who managed these works.</p>	<p>KD to remove accordingly</p> <p>KD to remind members of possible space for new members when issuing the minutes</p> <p>KD to issue map of potential invitees to members</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Update on Lorry Routing</p> <p>AW updated the group and explained that since the last meeting he still needed to progress arranging a meeting to discuss lorry routing at Warwickshire Highways Authority.</p> <p>In response to AW and BW, IB explained that his understanding was that the old route map was no longer being used and questioned why this was still an item on the agenda.</p> <p>BW seconded this and added that conversations with Warwickshire Highways Authority were not progressing.</p> <p>GS reminded the group that the reason for repeated discussion on lorry routing was the conversations on the declassification of the A road to a B road through Pailton and how this impacted the approved routing of lorries visiting Magna Park. He added that despite the road being declassified, as the route was approved before this, lorries could still use the road included on the original approved map.</p> <p>GS stated that all new developments and tenants would be required to adhere to a new routing map which excluded this road. With existing tenants the new routing could not be enforced but that Gazeley were advising and encouraging, as far as possible, for them to use the new route. When new tenants are secured they are being asked to adhere to the new routing and this is being included within their leases.</p> <p>In response to AW, BT explained that he would have to speak to Gazeley lawyers on whether they would be able to supply a list of tenants and their leases.</p> <p>In response to IB, GS agreed and said a clearer map could be supplied to lorry drivers and tenants on site to make the preferred routing for lorries to take.</p>	

	<p>BT added that it would be beneficial to have continued conversations with the highways authorities.</p> <p>EN seconded this and enquired as the possibility of getting a joint letter from both Leicestershire and Warwickshire Highways Authorities to advise against any use of the old routing.</p> <p>EN explained that they could not enforce it but could strongly advise.</p> <p>AW agreed that he would look into this and report back.</p> <p>All agreed that this item should not be included on the agenda going forward.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Update on Lighting</p> <p>Following the last meeting, BT explained that a third of the lighting at Building units 2110 had being reduced and asked CF if anyone had noticed this change in lighting levels.</p> <p>CF stated that he had not looked yet and would do so and report back.</p> <p>In response to EH, EN explained that the lighting levels had been reduced at Building unit 2110.</p> <p>EH stated that the lighting hadn't been reduced across the whole site and particularly referenced the levels of lighting on the Culina building. He stated that he would not make a judgement on the improvement of lighting levels in this group until an assessment had been carried out to prove this was actually the case.</p> <p>In response to EH, BT explained Gazeley had investigated all possibilities to reduce overall lighting levels. However, for security reasons this could not be done.</p> <p>NR added that his main issue with lighting was the colouring levels of the light and expressed a desire for Gazeley to ensure that on any future buildings this was considered.</p> <p>In response to NR, DE agreed but recommended that people follow a similar approach to CF by enquiring as to the possibility of changing the direction of the lighting. He added that this was the most successful way at mitigating the impacts of lighting on the site.</p> <p>In response to EH, DE explained that in terms of lux levels these were controlled by tenants and as a result made it harder to change or influence.</p> <p>CF seconded this and encouraged Gazeley to ensure they were keeping informed with the latest lighting technology to ensure it was as environmentally as well as residentially friendly as possible.</p> <p>In response to EH, BT clarified that Gazeley owned less than 10% but added that through the management company they could advise and recommended strongly to all tenants.</p>	<p>KD to reshare the Primark lighting note to members.</p> <p>KD to include on the agenda for the next meeting.</p>

	<p>EN said that as a longer-term action it would be advisable to keep updating members and Gazeley on national lighting policy as well.</p>	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Future meetings and speaker suggestions</p> <p>BW noted that his meeting with Mr Pawsey had been cancelled and would be rearranged.</p> <p>AW explained the he would continue to investigate the possibility of getting someone from Highways England to attend and discuss the proposed highways improvements for the area with the group.</p> <p>BW noted that back in 2017, he had contacted the Department of Transport on the proposed highways improvements and that they had explained that evidence was being gathered on the various improvement options.</p> <p>CF added that the Leicester Growth Plan had also stated future highways improvements for the surrounding area.</p> <p>In response to BW, EN explained that we would look into opportunities of being involved with the Department of Transports evidence gathering on future road improvements in the area.</p>	<p>KD and EN to look contact DOT on providing evidence on future improvements</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>In response to CF, GS explained that they recently held a meeting with Alberto Costa MP and Gazeley remain committed to increasing the Magna Park Community Fund funding proportionately to the footprint of Magna Park increasing in the future.</p> <p><i>Highways improvements</i></p> <p>In relation to the approved development, GS updated the group on the discharge of planning conditions. Once all applications to discharge conditions were approved work will commence.</p> <p>GS added that they were currently working on the detailed design of three S278 agreements with Leicestershire County Council and these would be agreed in July. EN added that an update would be issued once this was completed.</p> <p>GS added that letters would also be distributed to residents to inform them of any highways works commencing.</p> <p><i>GDPR</i></p>	

	<p>EN stated that alongside the minutes from this meeting, KD would also be issuing an email of consent to all members for them to agree to if they wished.</p> <p><i>CLG Survey</i></p> <p>EN informed the group that as per the terms of reference, we would soon be carrying out an anonymous survey to record the progress and views on the group.</p> <p><i>New Tenants</i></p> <p>BT informed the group that the two former Primark buildings were now under offer by potential occupiers and they had had a number of enquiries for the 2110 building. GS added that should the new tenants seek planning permission for refurbishment works etc. then this could present the opportunity for lighting to be upgraded.</p> <p><i>Planning applications</i></p> <p>GS explained that he was aware that the Steinhoff (tenants at Building 1440) were seeking permission to alter their access arrangement together with some additional car parking.</p> <p>In response to CF, GS explained that he was aware of the Magna Park access concerns relating to Mere Lane but that that this access arrangement (extending Argosy Way to Mere Lane) had already been approved and was required to connect the approved development to the existing Magna Park.</p> <p>In response to CF, BT explained the freeholder lease for the former Primark buildings would remain the same but the tenancy lease would be different.</p> <p>In response to BD, GS stated that due to the hybrid planning application stalling, discussions with Keltruck regarding a vehicle maintenance facility had also stalled but conversations were still ongoing.</p> <p>BT added that conversations were ongoing with ASDA who are considering establishing a Vehicle Maintenance Unit within their demise.</p> <p>In response to EH, GS updated the group and stated that there was no update on the hybrid planning application since February and that Gazeley were still reviewing their options.</p> <p><i>February Minutes</i></p> <p>EH seconded the note from the last meeting that it would be interesting for bus providers to supply a leaflet on their services and their current position within the area, following the change from Stage Coach to Arriva.</p>	<p>KD to issue email to members</p> <p>KD to issue survey to members</p> <p>Gazeley to prepare overview of bus services</p>
--	---	---

EH added that his main enquiry was to investigate why Cotesbach lost their Stage Coach X44 service.

Misc.

GS advised the group that Keith Beard had now stepped down from his role as site manager and in the interim DE had taken over the role. Following the appointment of a new manager, they would begin to attend these meetings.

CF asked that the new site manager be reminded of the fire that took place at the site. GS confirmed that this would happen.

In response to BW, GS explained that a number of traffic surveys were being carried out in the surrounding area by the County Council as they were updating their traffic modelling system.

Next meeting – 25th September agreed. 19:40 closed.