

# Meeting record

**Regarding:**

Magna Park Lutterworth Community Liaison Group (CLG)

**Date:**

5pm, Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> July 2021

**Attendees:**

Cllr Bill Woolliscroft – Monks Kirby PC (BW)  
 Cllr Tony Gillias – Rugby BC (TG)  
 Cllr Adrian Warwick – Warwickshire CC (AW)  
 Cllr Margaret Wild – Cotesbach PC (MW)  
 Scott Harker – SEC Newgate UK (SH)  
 Alison Wright – Willey Parish Meeting (AWr)  
 Karen Moore – Highways England (KM)  
 Gwyn Stubbings – GLP (GS)  
 Angela Jeffrey – Magna Park (AJ)

Richard Allington – GLP (RA)  
 Rebecca Coleman – SEC Newgate UK (ReC)  
 Olivia Hinds – GLP (OH)  
 Cllr Jonathan Bateman – Harborough District Council (JB)  
 Neil Blackhall – Claybrooke Parva PC (NB)  
 Simon Mortimer – RPS (SM)  
 Nigel Chapman – Bitteswell and Bittesby PC (NC)  
 Richard Nunn – Lutterworth Town Council (RN)  
 Chris Faircliffe – Bitteswell and Bittesby PC (CF)

Item	Minutes	Actions
1	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Scott Harker (SH) welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that the meeting was being recorded to assist with drafting the minutes. The recording will be deleted once the minutes of the meeting are agreed.</p> <p>SH received apologies from Claybrooke Magna Parish Council and advised they had submitted questions for SH to raise during the meeting.</p>	
2	<p><b>Agree minutes from 30<sup>th</sup> March 2021 meeting</b></p> <p>Tony Gillias (TG) raised a point of clarification on the minutes from the previous meeting. The minutes state that TG commented that disruptions at the Gibbet Hill roundabout had led to vehicles taking short cuts on local roads. He clarified that this was a longer route but often took a shorter amount of time due to traffic. SH acknowledged this and noted that the minutes would be amended to clarify this.</p> <p>Nigel Chapman (NC) stated that he had not received a copy of the minutes. SH said that he would share the minutes following the meeting.</p>	<p><b>SH to amend minutes of previous meeting.</b></p> <p><b>SH to send minutes to NC.</b></p>
3	<p><b>Update from Highways England</b></p>	

	<p>SH welcomed Karen Moore (KM) from Highways England to the meeting, explaining that KM had been invited to provide an update on the A5. KM noted that she had also been asked to attend the meeting by some members of the A5 Partnership.</p> <p>KM had technical difficulties in sharing a presentation and SH advised that the meeting should move on to the next agenda item while these problems were resolved.</p>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Update on archaeological works</b></p> <p>Simon Mortimer (SM) introduced himself and provided an overview of results from archaeological fieldwork that had been carried out at Magna Park North. He noted that detailed reports on each of the areas were available to view on the Magna Park website.</p> <p>SM explained the scope of excavation works that had been carried out, totalling around 13ha. Results and trenching activity have shown further evidence of a medieval settlement (Bittesby deserted medieval village), as well as Iron Age and Roman settlements. SM informed the group that the Roman activity identified has been accepted as being part of the setting of the scheduled monument.</p> <p>SM advised that all materials recovered were at the Museum of London’s office in Northampton and would be subject to further assessment and analysis over the next 18 to 24 months. SM shared images of some of the materials recovered from the site. This included a small cremation cemetery, a Roman amphora lid and a small collection of silver coins.</p> <p>SH thanked SM for the presentation and invited questions.</p> <p>BW asked if the objects found would be displayed locally. SM stated there was a commitment to display the objects within the new Lutterworth Museum building. Gwyn Stubbings (GS) confirmed that all the findings would be made available to view once they had been analysed. GS explained that there had been intention to establish a heritage centre as part of the Magna Park North site, and he was now working with Harborough DC and Lutterworth Town Estates to provide this in the town centre. Under these proposals, the top floor of the building is likely to accommodate displays and information dedicated to the history of the Magna Park site and would offer a timeline of its use up to the present day.</p> <p>SM advised that display boards would also be put up around the Magna Park site with detailed information on what had been found and more information about the scheduled monument. SM noted that they now know more about the parish than at any point in the town’s history.</p> <p>Chris Faircliffe (CF) noted that the presentation was very interesting.</p> <p>SM left the meeting.</p>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Update from Highways England</b></p> <p>KM thanked members for the invitation and advised that Highways England Strategy and Planning had expressed interest in attending a future meeting. Since the last</p>	<p><b>SH to reshare email from Highways</b></p>

	<p>meeting KM had ensured that the CLG (via SH) was included on the circulation list for updates on the route strategies that Highways England is preparing.</p> <p>SH confirmed he had received an update which he had shared with members and would pass on any future correspondence. KH noted that Highways England is keen to involve the CLG in future consultations.</p> <p>KM shared a presentation relating to the A5 Gibbet Hill roundabout. KM acknowledged that there were capacity issues and increased pressure on the junction which had led to disruption and queuing. Further developments had also contributed to increased pressures. However, where funding contributions had been made these had mostly been invested in improving the local route network.</p> <p>KM confirmed that Highways England is looking to deliver an improvement scheme that would consider historic and planned developments as well as future traffic growth. KM advised that a small amount of money had been allocated to Highways England to progress detailed options for the improvement scheme. Overall, 22 options had been considered. KM stressed that no option has been chosen and plans were at a preliminary stage but would focus on improving the existing road. The most likely solution at this stage would involve widening the approaches and the main part of the island. This could also include traffic control systems.</p> <p>KM advised that the next steps would involve speaking to local authorities to consider future developments in the final design, undertaking further site surveys and traffic modelling, as well as continuing to develop and define options.</p> <p>KM shared preliminary timescales of the works based on current assumptions, noting it would be at least six years before construction work began. Due to the significance of the project, there will likely be a considerable amount of disruption and Highways England is keen to ensure that the solution delivered is the most effective.</p> <p>SH thanked KM for the presentation and invited questions.</p> <p>BW asked who would be consulted as part of any future consultation. KM said at this stage they were speaking with local authorities to consider potential impacts on local plans. There would be a consultation on an option or options as part of the scheme, and they would be consulting with interested parties, which could include the CLG. BW asked if this would include parish councils, to which KM confirmed that it could.</p> <p>BW referred to an earlier point in the presentation where reference was made to a consultation on current plans. SH asked if this was in reference to the strategy. KM explained that Highways England was developing route strategies which were out for consultation that would look at wider issues. KM wasn't sure who was being consulted but advised that the CLG were included, with SH as the point of contact.</p> <p>SH said he would forward on the most recent email from Highways England introducing the consultation. BW asked if this would go down to parish council level. KM said she would check this but did not think parish councils were being consulted at the current stage.</p>	<p><b>England with members.</b></p>
--	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>TG thanked KM for attending the meeting, raising the issue of the single carriageway from Gibbet Hill to the M6. TG asked if the traffic modelling undertaken had considered traffic that detoured through villages to avoid the bottleneck. TG noted that any scheme should make sure that the A426 route was the fastest route to use. KM agreed that the A426 was the most appropriate route and said she would check with the modelling team that displaced traffic was included. KM noted that the improvement scheme would be designed to make Gibbet Hill an attractive junction to ensure the right traffic stayed on the right routes. TG thanked KM for the work she was doing on this matter.</p> <p>GS asked if the timeline of six years had already commenced and was interested to know how Highways England, in its position as a statutory consultee, would consider and respond to planning applications made during this time period, as these could increase pressure on the A5. GS asked if Highways England would request financial contributions over the time period to enable a bigger improvement.</p> <p>KM confirmed that the process was underway, and that we were in year 1 of the six year timeline. KM stated that the solution will be based on existing traffic and likely developments Highways England is aware of, as well as a growth factor for traffic. KM said that Highways England would continue to seek contributions for this as the cost was significant, likely totalling £15-20 million. GS noted that GLP were in discussions to make a financial contribution.</p> <p>GS suggested a hypothetical scenario to KM where a major planning application came forward during the timeline, and if Highways England would recommend refusal due to increasing pressure on the roundabout. KM said that she hoped that this would not be the case, and the role of Highways England was not to frustrate development but to create a network that caters to the economic needs of the area.</p> <p>TG noted that there is a lot of development happening in Rugby and a lot of these projects would be built out sooner than the improvement scheme. TG felt it was important to be one step ahead of other developments. KM stressed that Highways England were conscious that the future scheme would cause disruption so it was important to take the time to get it right.</p> <p>Alison Wright (AWr) asked if this accounted for planning applications at the Cross in Hand roundabout north of Gibbet Hill. KM said it should do as the traffic modelling considers the wider landscape.</p> <p>NC asked if it was correct that Highways England had to wait for developments to take place to pay for the improvement scheme. KM said that this wasn't the case as Highways England is always looking to make improvements based on background traffic growth.</p> <p>SH thanked KM for her contributions. KM left the meeting.</p>	
<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>Planning update</b></p> <p>GS stated that a reserved matters application had been submitted for earthworks, enabling works and landscaping for Magna Park North. This was approved at planning</p>	

	<p>committee in June and earth works had since begun on the southern site adjacent to Wayfair.</p> <p>Another reserved matters application has been submitted for three distribution buildings on the southern portion of Magna Park North and would be considered on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> July. This would deliver the first three units at Magna Park North following hybrid planning permission being granted in 2019.</p> <p>GS provided an update on the planning application for roadside services at the land south of Mere Lane. This was still being considered by Harborough District Council.</p> <p>GS provided details of a reserved matters application for two new units at Magna Park South. These would sit either end of the existing four units, which have now all been let. GS advised that should permission be granted; construction would commence early 2022. GS also updated members that the restoration works at Bittesby House had been completed, and the logistics academy would be launched later in the month.</p> <p>CF asked if there were any footpath diversions associated with the new units and if more details could be provided. GS confirmed that there were a network of footpaths and bridleways running across the northern expansion site. GLP were looking to retain as many of the permissive routes as possible and those that are diverted are designed to link back up into the network. GS advised that an application has been submitted to the government office for the formal diversions agreed at the outline stage. CF queried this, stating he was not familiar with this route as usually it went to the county council, who would consult with the Leicestershire Local Access Forum. CF raised some issues with the documents submitted, such as W86 marked as a footpath and not a bridleway. CF asked if there was scope for consultation with interested parties and requested that this could be passed on.</p> <p>GS welcomed the comments and noted that applications to divert footpaths could be submitted either to the government office or to the county council. GS confirmed that the government office should consult with the county council and believed that this had occurred as Leicestershire CC had offered comments on the application which may accord with the points raised by CF. GS said that he would provide a note outlining any updates, and stated that what is proposed is in accordance with the approved outline application.</p> <p>CF noted that the new bridleway along Mere Lane was exemplary and said that he was raising this point to make sure that the good work continues. GS stated that he was aware that some existing routes had become overgrown but that this was in the process of being resolved.</p> <p>AWr raised that there were issues with getting over the A5 to access footpaths from Willey. AWr asked if there was any way that GS could assist with getting safe crossing points introduced on the A5.</p> <p>GS stated that GLP would work with AWr to engage with Highways England as the road is under its control. GS added that GLP would continue to look for opportunities to help within their own land remit, noting that GLP had previously entered discussions with Highways England to place a crossing over the A5.</p>	<p><b>GS to provide note on PROW diversions</b></p>
--	--	---

<p>7</p>	<p><b>Update on construction works</b></p> <p>SH and GS felt that this agenda point had been covered under the previous agenda item.</p> <p>GS restated that should the three units at Magna Park North be approved, there would be construction activity on site. GLP is continuing to engage with Highways England in respect of Magna Park. GS noted that GLP had designed a scheme to deliver road improvements as part of the Magna Park expansion, but Highways England had not wanted it to be delivered. Instead, GS advised that GLP would be making a financial contribution to help deliver Highways England’s preferred scheme, which would total around £2.4 million.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p><b>Update on Community Fund</b></p> <p>GS advised that a large number of applications had been received, with 29 applications receiving funding through the first round. The trustees are processing the payment of funds to successful applications. GS noted that the first round had been a learning curve, having taken longer than anticipated, however, awards would be received over the coming weeks. There were a wide range of successful applications including bids that would help deliver defibrillators, school equipment and electric vehicles as well as longer term projects such as a clubhouse extension for Lutterworth Athletic Football Club.</p> <p>Richard Nunn (RN) stated that there was a misunderstanding relating to the Lutterworth Museum. RN explained that Lutterworth Museum is a small charity separate from the building they were anticipating moving into, which is controlled by Lutterworth Town Estates. The Museum had applied to the fund for £30,000 for display cabinets but had only received £5,600. RN felt there may have been confusion between Lutterworth Museum and Lutterworth Town Estates. RN asked if Lutterworth Museum would be excluded from making future applications to the fund.</p> <p>GS stated that applicants were welcome to reapply, caveating that as the fund runs for five years, repeat applicants were likely to receive a second tranche of funding towards the back end of the fund’s lifetime, to give priority to those who had not received funding yet. GS suggested that this issue was taken offline as it was his understanding that Lutterworth Museum’s application had been presented on the basis of it moving into the new building as it factored in display cabinets and moving costs, and was keen to understand if the situation had changed.</p> <p>RN clarified that Lutterworth Museum did wish to take up residence within the building built by Lutterworth Town Estates as the current venue was not fit for purpose. He noted however that most of the money had gone to Lutterworth Town Estates and not the Lutterworth Museum Trust. GS stated that the GLP contribution of £175,000 had included cabinets in the new facility so was keen not to duplicate funding. RN asked if the cabinets were for the existing Lutterworth Museum or to display artefacts found at Magna Park. GS said that he would check.</p> <p>TG reported that he had received feedback on the application process from some parish councils who had found the forms difficult to use. They had also noted that the website still stated that all of the funding was available. TG raised that one parish</p>	

	<p>council had received a letter of rejection stating that they could not receive feedback on their application. TG also raised that it had been difficult to speak to anyone involved in administering the Community Fund.</p> <p>GS clarified that no money had been given out, however, once this has happened the website would be updated to reflect this. GS acknowledged that there were teething problems with the application forms but there had been a high number of applications received. GS added that they would be looking to update the website with FAQs. GS stated that they did not have the resources to go through applications with applicants individually and had tried to give feedback in the letters sent out.</p> <p>TG stated that any feedback would be appreciated as some applicants had worried about striking the right balance in providing information. GS said that he would feed this back to the team and try to refine the criteria on the websites.</p> <p>SH read out a comment submitted by Claybrooke Magna Parish Council which reported a delay in receiving payments from the fund. GS noted this and restated that there had been some teething issues with this round but was hopeful that the next round would be sped up by taking into account the issues found.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<p><b>Update on layby campaign</b></p> <p>Angela Jeffrey (AJ) provided an update on the litter campaign GLP was working on in partnership with the environmental crime team at Harborough District Council. AJ stated that the team had visited local laybys to put the posters up. Posters would also be delivered to businesses at Magna Park for them to display. At the park, GLP has installed eight double bins to encourage people to leave litter at Magna Park.</p> <p>Margret Wild (MW) asked if the layby along the A426 between Gibbet Hill and the Frank Whittle roundabout was included. AJ confirmed that the posters had been placed westward along the A426. GS confirmed all posters were now in place.</p>	
<b>10</b>	<p><b>Future meetings and speaker suggestions</b></p> <p>SH encouraged members to get in contact if they had any ideas for future meetings or speaker suggestions.</p>	
<b>11</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>NC raised a traffic safety issue between the two new roundabouts at the A5/Mere Lane. NC reported that there are usually two or three HGVs parked in the road before the second roundabout moving towards the Wayfair building. NC was concerned that there would be a serious collision if this continued and asked if there was anything that could be done to encourage drivers not to do this.</p> <p>GS thanked NC for bringing this issue to his attention and asked for clarification if this was on the curve in the road. MW confirmed it was on the curve, and echoed NC's sentiments that it created a blind spot for road users.</p>	

	<p>AJ reported that she has written to highways concerning this piece of road and existing parking issues, but to date had not received a response. NC suggested some road lines be drawn to prevent parking. GS suggested that a barrier along the stretch should be considered and advised that the road was owned by Leicestershire CC but if they were to agree permission GLP could install one.</p> <p>TG passed on a request from Stretton-Under-Foss Parish Council asking to be included in the Community Fund. GS said that he would take this away to the panel in charge of the fund, as it was not in his remit to decide.</p> <p>BW advised that Warwickshire County Council is holding a meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> July to address traffic issues on the A5. SH asked who the best point of contact would be if members wished to attend. BW said that he would share details if requested. GS raised that the expansions of Magna Park had contributed £200,000 to Warwickshire County Council to help address any traffic issues.</p> <p>AW clarified that the meeting was about how the money received from GLP should be spent and he had circulated the details to local parishes. GS thanked AW, stating that members should get in touch if any further information or background was required. GS stated that £200,000 had been given to both Warwickshire and Leicestershire county councils, however LCC had not accepted its share of the funding yet. AW confirmed that WCC had received its share of the funding.</p>	
<p><b>12</b></p>	<p><b>Date of next meeting (late September 2021)</b></p> <p>SH advised that the next meeting would take place in late September/early October.</p> <p>SH thanked all members and the meeting concluded.</p>	