

Thurmaston Liaison Group

6th March 2014 - 6pm at Roundhill Academy

Sixth Meeting

Attendees

- Cllr Seaton – Charnwood Borough Council
- Mohammad Ishmal – Charnwood Council
- Gerry Bowman– Thurmaston Action Group
- Venilal Parmar - Hamilton Residents Association
- Cllr Norman King- Barkby and Barkby Thorpe Parish Council
- Cllr Kate Knaggs – County Councillor and Thurmaston Parish Councillor
- Cllr Ralph Raven – Thurmaston Parish Council
- Lynne Stewart, Duck Pond resident’s representative
- Nick Toms, BABTAG
- Steve McDonald – Roundhill Academy
- Rob Gill - CEG
- Richard Wain – Hawksmoor
- Nick Baker - nlp
- Victoria Walker - Beattie

Registered apologies

- Rt Hon Stephen Dorrell MP
- Cllr Eric Vardy – Charnwood Borough Council
- Cllr Rita Patel – Leicester City Council
- The Mayor of Leicester
- Mr Darren Gartside
- Queninborough Parish Council
- Mr Owen Bentley

1.0 Introduction and welcome

2.0 Approval of minutes

VW explained that following two queries the minutes had been amended and recirculated. It was agreed they were approved and VW should upload to the website.

ACTION POINT – VW to upload minutes to the website

3.0 Matters arising

Cllr Seaton queried if the CPO would affect any homes and if we had approached any of the Duck Pond residents with a view to purchasing their properties considering how much they would be affected?

RW explained that it is an outline application at this stage so the detail would be determined later. It is land which is affected, rather than the buildings. We have approached residents in the Duck Pond area to arrange a meeting in early April and it is envisaged this will be the first of a number of meetings but at this stage it is too early in the process to provide any further detail.

Cllr Knaggs queried if Roundhill is developed and the sports fields are replaced on the SUE site, how would that land swop be undertaken? NB explained that we are currently liaising with Sport England as well as the school.

We've agreed we will come up with a mechanism which will be secured by a condition or a planning obligation in the legal agreement to provide for that replacement. We'd agree in advance with the school, education authority and Sport England the parameters in terms of providing the same or better quality and quantity of provision.

There will need to be some flexibility in the mechanism as this is an outline application. As to where this goes, this is tied in with the education provision and that is yet to be determined. It was clarified that should the sports pitches be relocated for Roundhill if it stays in its current location and we are not considering the Parish Council land.

Cllr King asked if Roundhill would be redeveloped on site or relocated onto the proposed development site. RG explained a site is safeguarded on site for either a new school or Roundhill's relocation and the third option the education authority is considering is the redevelopment on Roundhill's existing site with additional land for the relocated sports pitches and green space.

Mr Bowman suggested that two smaller schools would be preferable. RG said that all options are being considered and Roundhill is currently a small school with growth aspirations. In addition, if a new school was delivered it would provide competition challenges for Roundhill.

Steve McDonald from Roundhill explained that the school's aspiration is to accommodate 11 – 16 year olds and it aimed to grow. The school is pleased to be involved in these discussions and ultimately, the aim is to provide the best education facility for the children. Cllr Knaggs added that the school has development plans in place in terms of modifying and continual improvement of the school.

Cllr Seaton queried if Roundhill is relocated, what is in the plan for the land the school sits on? RW said that as it is the County Council's land, they would be under an obligation to get best value for the land if it were surplus to requirements. This would also be subject to Roundhill's existing lease for the land.

OB had asked for clarification regarding a previous question about Hamilton Lane and Barkby Thorpe Road having some road closures on completion – is 'on completion' 2028 or when the final house of

the 4500 is completed? NB clarified that in the TA it explains that timing is not yet confirmed and is subject to LLITM and consultation with the highways authorities.

RG confirmed that while the TA is actually a completed document and has been run through LLITM model 2, it has been agreed that it would be run through LLITM 5 (LCoC's latest model) and we are awaiting the results of that. RG confirmed that data included within the TA is appropriate and not out of date. The majority of data has been taken from 2012/2013. NT queried when this modelling work would be completed, RG explained that we are hoping for a response by the end of April or beginning of May. We are not envisaging a vastly changed document as we have already run this through the earlier LLITM model. There might be minor alternations and additional mitigation measures to junctions, but it would not be a wholesale redraft of the TA.

RG also confirmed that any development of less than 150 homes does not have to be run through LLITM and anything under 80 homes does not have to produce a TA or deliver any highway improvements. He explained the LLITM modelling includes all vehicles arising from developments underway and those with planning permission; it is Leicestershire wide. All of the movements arising from this proposed development are inputted into the model and it shows the effect without mitigation. All of the mitigation measures are then added in and the model is run to show the effect.

VP queried if public transport is incorporated in the proposals? RG explained that one of the primary reasons for looking at the link through the park is to provide a dedicated bus and public transport facility via Hill Top Road to increase capacity, viability and attractiveness of public transport.

Cllr Seaton asked what are 'acceptable mitigation' measures. RG explained our TA includes what we believe are acceptable mitigation measures ranging from junction upgrades and improvements to new roads. CEG feels it is robust and could be used in its current form in order to determine a planning application. However, we have agreed to wait for the testing through LLITM and then we can have a meeting to discuss the detail. We appreciate it is frustrating for all parties as we are all awaiting the outcome of the County's modelling work.

4.0 Green Space Management

RW gave a presentation about local governance and management options (the presentation will be uploaded to the website). No one has any pre-conceived ideas about how the site could be managed and input is welcomed by the liaison group.

The presentation explored a number of options that are available. The site falls into a number of different parishes as well as the Hamilton area. Funding, management time and costs as well as the effective management of the land are all very important to the Parish Council's, landowners and CEG, as well as assisting to deliver a new community with a sense of place.

The development could provide new community assets, which in turn could generate income, as well as liabilities which require on-going investment. There are three broad types of management – private, local Governance or community based. In terms of local Governance, it is possible for a Parish Council to work alongside a management company or trust.

CEG has approached The Land Trust for a proposal for the management of the green spaces on the site. The Land Trust website (www.thelandtrust.org.uk) has information about how they operate as an independent charitable organisation. The proposal we get from them will provide more detail about how they operate and we could invite them to present to this group at the appropriate time if that would be useful. They provide long term sustainable management of open spaces, but don't usually get involved in the community buildings. They also make contributions to wider regeneration projects in the area as part of their charitable status.

These are initial ideas and we can pursue and investigate more of these options. We would like to debate matters in this group and engage with Parish Councils to formulate positive ideas for the future management and governance.

Cllr King asked whether local services would remain the responsibility of the local authority or whether the new structure would take on this responsibility. It was agreed that roads would remain in the control of the County and rubbish collections for example, would be the Local Authorities control. At the moment there is a level of local Governance in the Parish Council where local people can go with any concerns, how would that function work?

RW explained that there are a number of options; Parish Councils can still govern the areas of the site within their parish boundary. Also, there is nothing stopping a community forum being set up by a Trust which has local residents, representatives and businesses on it which can follow the function of a parish council albeit the legal arrangement is different and instead of a parish precept, residents pay for the governance of this Forum/Trust by way of a "management charge contribution". Alternatively there might be a totally new Parish created. All of these are options; we would like to discuss what Parish Council's prefer as ultimately there is an option for local people to mould what they would like to see.

Cllr King said the issue is revenue stream. Ideally people didn't want to see individual parishes taking a section up to a boundary line and governing it differently.

Mr Bowman asked if there is control regarding how the decision is made in terms of which model to follow. RW explained that the public open space could be offered to Charnwood to manage, or parishes can take on this responsibility. Either way, the developer could put money (via the S106) into a sinking fund to be drawn down to effectively manage the space in addition to the funds raised on an on-going basis via either parish precept, resident contributions or money raised from the assets on site.

Cllr Seaton queried the affordable housing and how those residents financially contribute. Lynn Stewart queried what green space incorporates. RW said that it would include parks, play areas, allotments, agricultural space and any other green infrastructure.

It was explained that there could be representatives from each of the Parishes on a central forum or management trust if that was a preferred approach.

The preference at the meeting was for a Trust or Council so it is accountable, not a private company.

Steve McDonald queried if the school could become part of this Trust, Roundhill already pays a large grounds maintenance fee for green space management on the school and its likely there would be a preference to pay that to a local Trust run by the local community.

Cllr King asked if we can come to the Parish Council and help to present the options to the Parish Council. RW agreed that can be arranged. **ACTION POINT – VW to arrange a date for Richard to present to Barkby & Barkby Thorpe Councillors.**

NT asked if there was an example where a new development has evolved? RG suggested Cambourne would be a good example to research. NB added that so far they have maintained good quality green spaces and drainage systems.

4.0 Newsletter

It was agreed that VW would revise this to a one page document which stated the facts as bullet points and provided guidance regarding where to find out more information. It would prioritise the consultation process, an update regarding the submitted application and review the topics discussed at these meetings to date.

NB circulated a summary document which effectively condenses the original summary into four sides. These would be sent to all of the Parish Clerks. **ACTION POINT – RW to distribute to Parish Clerks.**

LS asked if we could provide an overlay of existing field patterns/masterplan for the Duck Pond residents meeting in April. **ACTION POINT - RG – bringing a larger plan to bring and will look at field patterns as well.**

6.0 Questions raised regarding planning submission

NB ran through questions raised by OB as follows:

- Can the road through Hamilton Country Park be rerouted through an improved Hill Top Road? To avoid disturbance to existing businesses and to free up Hill Top Road as an attractive, dedicated public transport route (cycles and buses only) the new road is proposed through the Park; there is a mitigation package to improve and extend the park as part of a comprehensive scheme.
- Can the southern and northern link roads and spine road be delivered earlier to bring relief to residents of Barkby, Barkby Thorpe and the Duck Pond? The answer is yes and no. The roads are linked and funded through the delivery of the development/sale of houses, if other sources of funding are available these can be delivered sooner. Such funds could come from re-diverting some of the S106 obligations to transport in the earlier stages (contributions towards affordable housing, health, education and other infrastructure for example) or through external or Government funding sources.
- It was agreed that the query about the Transport Assessment had been answered earlier in the meeting with regards to the latest LLITM modelling.

- What are the projected AM and PM traffic loads north and south on the completed spine road between Barkby Thorpe Road and Barkby Thorpe Lane in 2021 and again in 2031? The table below provides the interim figures in PCUs (Passenger Car Units):

2031 with full development

| Section of Spine Road | AM PEAK | | | PM PEAK | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|------|-------|---------|-----|-------|
| | N/B | S/B | TOTAL | N/B | S/B | TOTAL |
| South of Barkby Thorpe Lane | 979 | 643 | 1622 | 773 | 854 | 1627 |
| West of Barkbythorpe Road | 1047 | 1497 | 2544 | 1355 | 920 | 2275 |

2021 with 1725 dwellings plus associated schools / centre

| Section of Spine Road | AM PEAK | | | PM PEAK | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|-----|-------|
| | N/B | S/B | TOTAL | N/B | S/B | TOTAL |
| South of Barkby Thorpe Lane | 538 | 431 | 969 | 472 | 487 | 959 |
| West of Barkbythorpe Road | 506 | 749 | 1255 | 701 | 473 | 1174 |

Tables above sourced from: TA Appendix R and O

The tables provide estimates subject to the LLITM modelling for two of the three spine road sections and each of their associated movements. Therefore the numbers cannot be added together as this will lead to double counting.

- In the light of strong opposition to the proposed location of the gypsy and showmen's pitches is an alternative site in the SUE under consideration? CEG remains of the view that the location proposed is optimum for all. In terms of the showperson's pitches as these are linked to Loughborough Fair the site should be near to Loughborough not on this SUE.
- The need to provide space for a cemetery was voiced at the last liaison meeting, is CEG considering it and allocating space? Burial space provision is currently being considered as part of the tweaks which are underway to the masterplan. Other suggestions made through this forum and representations are also under consideration. It was asked if this would be a Parish Council managed facility. NB pointed out that there are private facilities as well as publically managed facilities.

7.0 Any other business

VP queried if consultation had taken place with existing businesses at Hill Top Road. RW said that yes, they have been consulted by the City as part of the consultation process.

8.0 Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held at 6pm on 10th April 2014 at Roundhill College.