

Meeting record

Regarding:

Magna Park Lutterworth Community Liaison Group (CLG)

Date:

6:00pm, Monday 15th May 2023

Location:

Remote meeting held on Zoom

Attendees:

Iain Millington – Bitteswell and Bittesby PC (IM)
 Bill Woolliscroft – Monks Kirby PC (BW)
 Alison Wright – Willey Parish Meeting (AWr)
 Cllr Tony Gillias – Rugby Borough Council (TG)
 Jo-Ann Allcoat – Claybrooke Magna PC (JA)
 Gwyn Stubbings – GLP (GS)
 Angela Jeffrey – Magna Park (AJ)
 Richard Allington – GLP (RA)
 Olivia Hinds – GLP (OH)
 Scott Harker – SEC Newgate UK (SH)
 Rebecca Tomlin – Harborough District Council (RT)
 Adrian Warwick – Warwickshire County Council (AW)
 Ian Doust – National Highways (ID)

Item	Minutes	Actions
1	Apologies Scott Harker (SH) welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received from Jonathan Bateman, Tony Hiron, Tim Otevanger and Nigel Chapman. SH noted that Nigel has been in contact to raise several talking points. SH said he will bring these up later in the meeting.	
2	Agree minutes of Tuesday 31st January 2023 meeting SH noted the actions from the previous minutes. Members agreed the minutes of the previous meeting. SH noted that he had received a comment on the previous minutes regarding application numbers. This included a request that future minutes note the application number for applications related to Magna Park to improve their readability. SH noted that he will action this in future editions of the minutes.	SH will note the application number of applications relating to Magna Park in future editions of the minutes.
3	Update from National Highways on the Gibbet Hill Roundabout SH handed over to Ian Doust (ID) who attended the meeting on behalf of National Highways. ID stated that National Highways has been working on a study of three options for upgrading the junction at Gibbet Hill: the developer-led scheme	ID to share presentation/slides with SH who will distribute them to

<p>which was part of the mitigation for the original Magna Park; a 'quick-win' scheme which responds to feedback that National Highways have received from stakeholders; and a pipeline study which feeds into an investment strategy for a future upgrade.</p> <p>ID said that National Highways has been undertaking modelling to discover which is the best-value option for road users, taxpayers and developers. The modelling and study are now complete with the initial outcome being that the developer-led scheme makes best use of the funding. A drawback is that it requires land from outside the boundary of the existing highway, requiring land purchases and negotiation. This would cause slight delays, meaning the earliest construction could start would be 2026.</p> <p>The quick-win option could be completed on a much quicker timescale because the land required is within the existing highway boundary. The modelling data has shown that individual junctions, such as the one with the A5, could become very congested because of the upgrade. ID noted that National Highways has considered other options for this junction.</p> <p>Discussion moved onto the RIS Pipeline Scheme, which would be used to fund an improvement scheme alongside funding secured by development contributions from Magna Park and several other local developments. Three potential options from this scheme, 3a, 5a, 5b. ID noted they are promoting 3a heavily which sees the A5 as a flyover, but all the scheme's present complications. This is due to the fact there are extensive utilities underneath Gibbet Hill roundabout, as well as a large protective concrete slab lying under the pavement. ID stated that it is important to weigh up the cost of potential disruption against the benefits of the scheme.</p> <p>The benefit of a scheme brought forward under RIS 3 is that it would give National Highways Development Consent Order (DCO) status, allowing the use of compulsory purchase powers (if necessary and were the project to receive development consent). Such a scheme could allow National Highways to move the junction slightly to carry out an offline construction. This would leave the existing road network operational while the work is carried out.</p> <p>ID stated that National Highways hopes to hear whether the RIS 3 Pipeline scheme is a viable solution within the next six months. ID stressed that National Highways is aware of the importance of not rushing a decision – noting that it will be crucial to bring stakeholders on the journey.</p> <p>Gwyn Stubbings (GS) asked what the delivery timescale would be if the scheme were to be delivered under the RIS 3 programme. ID said that he cannot commit to a timescale at this time but that it would take around two years for a scheme to reach the delivery stage should approval be granted. ID also noted that there are potential barriers that could slow the progress of a scheme such as environmental or archaeological concerns.</p> <p>Bill Woolliscroft (BW) asked if he could have a copy of the slides that ID presented from. ID confirmed that he will send them to SH, who will distribute them to members following the meeting.</p>	<p>members following the meeting.</p>
--	---------------------------------------

	<p>BW asked if dualling of the A5 at the junction was being considered as part of any of the options under consideration by National Highways. ID confirmed that such an option is not currently being considered, with dualling of the A5 being isolated to the M69 to M42 corridor. ID stated that he thought it would be preferable to keep the two matters separate for this scheme as inserting it in would result in a weaker business case, presenting less value for money for the taxpayer and the Treasury. BW stated that he considered duelling of the A5 to be crucial considering the level of congestion on the A5. BW added that he did not understand why duelling plans are restricted only to the M69 North. ID said that he was unable to answer why that was at the meeting.</p> <p>Tony Gillias (TG) asked ID what discussions had taken place with the county authorities regarding the A426 running over-capacity. ID confirmed that National Highways had engaged both Warwickshire County Council and Leicestershire County Council in workshops, and that they are all working closely to find a solution. TG asked ID to ensure that they are pushed every day regarding solutions, ideas, and start-dates. TG noted that extensive development is taking place, especially around Rugby, and the road infrastructure needs to be in place to support it. ID confirmed that they have regular meetings with Warwickshire County Council and are pushing hard for solutions.</p> <p>SH asked if there are any other questions for ID and confirmed that ID is only attending for this part of the meeting. BW asked if SH would distribute the presentation/slides to all participants after the meeting. SH confirmed he will once ID provides them.</p> <p>TG noted that as the government had allowed longer HGVs (2.5m) on roads, would the design of improvements and new roads evolve to take this into account, e.g., presumably they will require a wider turning circle. ID said that he had only heard of the update when the Department for Transport (DfT) announced it during the previous week. ID said that he could not confirm whether the information was given to designers but noted the great deal of requests National Highways receives over diversion routes and weight limits for HGVs.</p> <p>SH thanked ID and moved onto the planning update. ID left the meeting.</p>	
4	<p>Planning update</p> <p>GS stated it would be a quiet update at this meeting. Referring to a Magna Park map on the screen, GS pointed out MPN5 (Application reference: 23/00438/REM). GS said that GLP has submitted a reserved matters planning application for that unit to bring it forward. GS noted that developments are gradually progressing along the route of the A5 in a northerly direction.</p> <p>At the other end of the park, GS confirmed that GLP had received consent/reserved matter approval for MPS10 and MPS11, and had lodged a reserved matters application for MPS9 which is under consideration (Application reference: 23/00287/REM). This is the last unit of Magna Park south that requires a reserved matters planning approval. Also, the Mere Lane lorry parking</p>	

	<p>amenities outline application is still under consideration, awaiting final comments from National Highways and Leicestershire County Council Highways.</p> <p>GS stated that the timing for any approval would be difficult to estimate due to uncertainty around future planning committee meetings following the local elections, e.g., the meetings scheduled for May have been cancelled. There is a meeting on the 6th June which GS hoped would cover some or all of these applications. Otherwise, the applications will be addressed in July.</p> <p>Away from Magna Park, GS noted that the Cross-in-Hands HGV parking scheme appeal had been dismissed by the inspector on landscape grounds. GS stated that a very similar application relating to the same site had already been submitted. BW noted that he had heard that the application would incorporate changes that would differentiate it from the original application.</p> <p>TG stated that as this application will go to planning committee, as a member of said committee, he cannot comment on it.</p>	
5	<p>Update on highways work</p> <p>GS said there was not much to cover under this item beyond what was discussed at the previous meeting. GS noted that a new roundabout would be delivered on the A5 to serve Magna Park North. GLP is obligated to deliver this roundabout before occupancy of the final unit, MPN7. GS said that GLP has begun work and dialogue with National Highways and Leicestershire County Council Highways.</p>	
6	<p>Update on construction works</p> <p>TG noted that he had received complaints regarding the island at the top of Mere Lane, namely that it is difficult to negotiate with a long vehicle. TG linked this to a point he made earlier about longer HGVs, and asked whether the design of this new island was agreed with longer vehicles in mind. GS confirmed that it had not but would factor in all changes to future designs.</p> <p>Iain Millington (IM) asked how long the construction work and disruption would take on the new roundabout and the A5. GS said that he could not confirm a timeframe but that disruption would be timed evenly between projects, so it would not become overwhelming.</p> <p>On behalf of Nigel Chapman, SH brought up the proposed footpath from Woodby Lane to Bittesby. SH asked if per their previous discussions whether this would form a community fund application. IM confirmed that the parish council had not met since the previous community liaison group (CLG) meeting.</p> <p>Angela Jeffrey (AJ) noted the closure of the car park on Mere Lane. The car park has seen a great deal of fly-tipping in recent weeks, damaging the car park surface. It has been cleared now, at the cost of £22,000.</p>	

7	<p>Future meetings and speaker suggestions</p> <p>SH noted a suggestion from Cllr Page about the possibility of looking at other developments in the area, such as the Tritax Symmetry DCO. SH believed that considering where that development is in the planning process, it might not be appropriate to invite them to the forum.</p>	
8	<p>AOB</p> <p>Rebecca Tomlin (RT) noted that the council/economic development team were in the process of delivering the Lutterworth Masterplan in the town centre. This includes the area outside the town hall. This would hopefully only take until the end of the month, at that point the Council will look to carry out works to the town centre to create a public space for the community and residents.</p> <p>TG thanked AJ for being the go-between the council and HGV drivers who have caused damage to the war memorial island and residents' cars in Pailton. AJ stated that they have managed to stop Expo vehicles in recent weeks and are trying to speak to DPD.</p> <p>BW asked, as per the last meeting, for help from GS regarding the section 106 monies to help with traffic issues in Warwickshire. BW thanked GS for his assistance and noted the difficulty in getting Warwickshire to spend the funds locally. BW noted his frustration and asked if there was anything GS can do to put pressure on Warwickshire County Council. GS asked BW to copy him into correspondence and he will try to help.</p>	
9	<p>Date of next meeting (September 2023)</p> <p>The next meeting of the CLG is due to be held in September 2023, in-person.</p>	