

## Thurmaston Liaison Group

7<sup>th</sup> August 2014 – Elizabeth Park Sports & Community Centre

### Eighth Meeting

#### Attendees

- Cllr Seaton – Charnwood Borough Council
- Cllr Ralph Raven – Charnwood Borough Council
- Cllr Sue Buckenham - Queninborough Parish Council
- Mr Owen Bentley - BABTAG
- Venilal Parmar - Hamilton Residents Association
- Lynne Stewart, Duck Pond resident's representative
- Dominic Young – Leicestershire County Council
- Rob Gill - CEG
- Nick Baker – nlp
- Dean Swann – WYG (transport consultant)
- Victoria Walker – Beattie Communications

#### Apologies

- Rt Hon Stephen Dorrell MP
- Cllr Kate Knaggs – County Councillor and Thurmaston Parish Councillor
- Cllr Pam Green- Barkby and Barkby Thorpe Parish Council
- Cllr Stephen Hampson
- Cllr Norman King
- Geoff Mee – Leicester City Council
- Richard Wain - Hawksmoor

#### 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

RW explained that this evening's meeting would focus on transport.

#### 2. MATTERS ARISING AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the seventh meeting were approved, VW to upload to website – **ACTION POINT**

It was requested that VW obtain details of website hits to ascertain if these were being read

VW confirmed that the response from the education authority was circulated with the seventh meeting minutes, but another copy could be provided upon request.

### **3. THE PURPOSE OF THE UPDATED TA**

Dean Swann, transport consultant explained why the Transport Assessment has been updated; this is in order to input information from the County's latest LLITM model.

Three highways authorities are involved in this application. At the outset, a parameters plan was agreed which looked at the junctions requiring analysis and assessment for mitigation. It also looks at where 'dissuaders' might be used to try and reduce the amount of traffic using certain routes.

When the TA began, the LLITM version 2 was in use. LLITM can be asked questions such as what will happen immediately but also in 20 – 30 years' time. As transport models are regularly updated to keep up with technological changes, it was understood that Version 5 of the model was being drafted and might be ready for inclusion in the application.

But, as we prepared for the submission at the end of 2013 it was clear that the LLITM 5 model would not be ready. It was therefore agreed that LLITM 2 would be used, in conjunction with a standard method of assessing junctions and roads, for the application. In addition, the statistics did not take account any modal shifts (such as increasing the use of bus, pedestrian and cycle methods of transport) to ensure it was as robust as possible. We also took traffic counts in the area to ensure that the data included in the application was up to date and robust.

### **4. THE UPDATED LLITM TRANSPORT MODEL AND THE UPDATED TA FINDINGS**

The LLITM 5 model was validated by the Authorities in spring 2014. As a result, we have updated the TA to provide information about the modelling work which has now been undertaken by inputting the data into LLITM 5.

There have been some changes in terms of where the vehicles are expected to be attracted to from our development and it also provides a more precise update about where commuter travel goes and how it gets there (particularly Barkby & Barkby Thorpe as a commuter route). This model allows us to input all of the growth areas around Leicester and Leicestershire (as they will also produce vehicles) and employment demand routes through Barkby and Barkby Thorpe as well as the surrounding area.

In order to use LLITM to input into the TA, we take a 'reference case' – this is the closest output year to our expected 'end year' within the LLITM 5, when all of the development would be finished. This is 2031. We then look at what happens if our development does not go ahead but every other committed development does. i.e. what number of vehicles use which routes. This is called a 'reference case'. It means we understand what would happen with all of the roads and junctions by that year without the NEoLSUE or its mitigation.

We then do our first 'test case' by adding the vehicles arising from NEoLSUE without any mitigation and 'dissuasion' measures, assessing what happens; this is called model 'run 2.' This highlights all of the junctions which are put under strain and the quantum of traffic that is using the "rat runs" we wish to dissuade.

We then add in the dissuasive measures, for example reducing speed limits, 20mph zones, gateway features in Barkby & Barkby Thorpe and potential road closures/diversions and we ran the model again. This is 'run 3'.

From model run 3 we have a picture of the final predicted "strain" and we then develop and add in the mitigation, including junction improvements for example. Therefore 'run 4' shows what the traffic will be like in 2031 with all of the improvement measures. It shows which routes vehicles will use, when and how many.

As an aside to demonstrate the model's ability to predict traffic flows, one of the "test" runs completed by the team also showed Hamilton Lane being closed off to see how this affected traffic movements.

DS tabled a plan which showed all of the statistics from the 4 runs in and around the Barkby and Barkby & Barkby Thorpe area during peak hours.

The final run shows the effect of closing off Hamilton Lane. This increased the use of Beeby Road despite inputting lots of methods of dissuading vehicles from using this route. As the school is located here, the conclusion was that the closure of this road would not be beneficial as when it remained open all of the key routes still had lower vehicle movements in 2031 with NEoLSUE plus all mitigation measures, than in 2031 without the SUE.

The next plan tabled was the raw data from the model without any mitigation. The lines on these plans showed red for more traffic, green for less and the thicker the line represents more vehicles using that route. (commonly known as difference plots)

Once the new spine road is in, the junctions are improved and the methods of dissuading vehicles from using certain routes are implemented, it was shown that the B&BT roads are all green and the spine road is red – this is good as this is where we want the vehicles to go. It shows that the junction of Barkby Lane nearest to Thurmaston will now be assessed for mitigation measures as well.

The next plan shows where the vehicles from our development will go. The model shows that we are successfully dissuading commuters from using the village.

In terms of the reference case, this only includes committed developments (those with planning permission whether started or not). The housing numbers in the Local Plan need to be delivered with or without the SUE so there will still be vehicles arising (without the SUE and its mitigation measures, there would be a spate of speculative planning application). It was highlighted by LS that this is already happening.

Q) SB - It was queried if the application for 1,000 homes between Syston, Queninborough and B&BT (which is due to go to Charnwood planning committee this year) is included.

A) DY highlighted that this is unlikely this is included as it is not a committed development.

Q) OB - When will the updated TA be a public document, when will it appear on the Charnwood website?

A) NB explained we are looking to submit one amendment to the application so other elements, for example noise and air quality, will need to be updated as well as the TA. We're hoping to have all of these documents completed for submission next week.

Q) SB - Think it's good to see this in place for B&BT but by improving the situation here it may push vehicles into Queninborough. Does your mitigation also apply to Queninborough so it doesn't move the problem from one area to another?

A) DS showed on the plan the figures for Queninborough Road; by putting in the 'convoluted' routings to the south to dissuade traffic from using these roads. It will reduce the vehicles using Queninborough road. It was shown that the vehicle numbers were lower on Queninborough Rd than in the 'reference case' (without the SUE).

DS confirmed there is a plan with all of the major junctions but it is presented in a different format as part of the TA which is a more technical document.

Q) SB - There is a proposal at Barkby Road for 165 homes (north of Syston) near the crossroads. There is concern about the effect of this development. Unless those vehicles are taken into account will you get a true picture of how Queninborough is affected?

A) DY explained he dealt with this application to assess if there was any interaction with this and the SUE and it was concluded that this was unlikely. Although the SUE with its mitigation measures doesn't affect the crossroads, the impact from those 165 houses will affect it. As a result, the County has put a request that should planning be granted the developer of those 165 houses will improve these crossroads. SB said that this improvement might not be in-keeping with the village.

Q) LS - If the improvements are planned for 2031 will we suffer until then?

A) The intention is to phase improvements alongside development so mitigation measures come forward in stages with the housing developments.

Q) LS - Unless Troon Way is duelled it will not deter people from using the village as a commuter route.

A) DS - If this road was duelled but the Thorne Lighting junction wasn't improved, it wouldn't have any benefit. Journey times are affected by the junctions acting as a constraint, slowing traffic and resulting in queues. Adding extra lanes just attracts more vehicles when what needs to happen is junction upgrades. Our improvements to the junctions, in conjunction with the proposed changes in the villages, will encourage vehicles onto the main roads as these will be flowing better.

The reference case shows the developments that will be coming anyway – this is a base position. Our mitigation has to make sure we don't make this any worse –demonstrating that there are potential benefits to be gained on top of pure mitigation.

Q) OB - Until the Spine Road is completed what will happen to the vehicles, surely this needs to come forwards sooner. It was asked previously if we can look at this, has it been considered?

A) RG - It is impossible to deliver this level of infrastructure up front but we are ensuring that the necessary level of improvements in line with each house delivered.

Q) OB - Has this work made you look at reducing the numbers of homes?

A) RG - The mitigation measures show how the vehicles can be accommodated so we are comfortable with the existing application. What has been shown is that the draw into Leicester is not as big as originally expected. LLITM 5 has taken into account different committed employment zones across Leicestershire as well as working from home and that more of the vehicles than originally expected will go north rather than south and our mitigation measures need to accommodate that.

Q) Cllr Seaton - This will have an effect on Thurmaston. It was once a village and is now dissected by a bypass. If you pull traffic out of B&BT you will send it onto the spine road. This will go through the new SUE village. This could be another planning disaster in 20 – 30 years' time.

A) The masterplan does consider this and it has been deliberately designed to allow for this so it is appropriate to a village environment. It is pedestrian friendly not a bypass. It will be more attractive to vehicles than the roads we've mentioned, but there will be areas where there is a village square which reduces speeds.

We are also providing improvements to the existing primary network, focusing on the junctions. By improving the junctions on the primary routes this will improve flows and therefore reduce delays in peak hours; making the primary routes more attractive and able to accommodate more vehicles.

Q) Cllr Seaton - Why is your spine road not on the edge of the development rather than through the middle of the development?

A) We feel that if done correctly and designed correctly, the through traffic actually adds to the sustainability. Fast roads are not attractive places; this road is open and provides ease of access to retail and other services along its route. It has been designed to accommodate the vehicles which are predicted in the future.

We are looking to strike a balance. Over the last few years we've seen more part time working, working from home and flexible hours – we are likely to see more of this. In addition, we are also looking to make public transport more efficient and attractive as well as improving local roads. We are also providing facilities within the development to reduce the need to travel by car by providing shops, services, school and healthcare within easy reach.

Homes need to be delivered, what we are trying to do is manage how the vehicles coming from this development move and reduce the effect they have on local villages.

Q) OB – Syston will also get more vehicles. What is the City's reaction? Can its ring road take the vehicles coming in from Charnwood?

A) Yes they are comfortable. The spine road will actually help Troon Way through the provision of an extra road.

Q) Cllr Seaton – will the Spine Road attract HGVs as you've diverted them away from village roads.

A) DS - The idea is to provide 7.5t weight limit excluding deliveries (as it already is in the area)

Q) OB - Are you committed to the northern link of the spine road, the one that goes over Melton Road and the school fields?

A) The TA to show delivery of 4,500 requires this link. So, unless something dramatically changes then yes it is part of the phased works. NB explained that there was a meeting today with the Council where a possible clause within the S106 to include regular provision for highways reviews (similar to Lubbesthorpe) was discussed. This could allow flexibility for investment into different junctions/measures, if required, once the development has commenced by assessing what is actually happening on the ground.

Q) OB – When will consultation take place on the revisions?

A) The City and Charnwood will consult on the revisions to the application. The consultation period is 21 days but it's likely to be longer than this between submission and the committee date.

**ACTION POINT** – VW to upload to [www.thurmastonurbanextension.co.uk](http://www.thurmastonurbanextension.co.uk) and will circulate an email with a link to this document once available.

DY explained that the desire to bring forwards the Spine Road as soon as possible is appreciated. In the case of Lubbesthorpe, the Council has been proactive in bringing forward grant funds to build the M1 bridge at the outset of development, and County, with the developers, will look at similar sources of funding in this case.

## **5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Cllr Seaton has had a letter from the Scouts Association, it's in the old village, They are full now and need to find more capacity and are building a new hut. Cllr Seaton will forward the letter to VW for CEG - **ACTION POINT**

RG has met with the Lands Trust. They have put a proposal forward for the management of the green space on the site. Once the holiday season is out of the way we will set up a meeting to discuss this and ask them to present to you so they can explain how this will work. Their website is quite informative as well. **ACTION POINT** – Lands Trust to attend a future liaison group meeting

NB queried if there is a desire for Thurmaston to seek (part of) the library contribution from this site. Cllr Raven will liaise and feedback. **ACTION POINT.**

VP queried the status of the Southern Link Road going through the Park.

NB tabled the latest illustrative drawing and explained we have now agreed a package of mitigation, how we can improve the environment of the Park. It has been presented to the planning officers and the Leicester City Mayor and there is support for the mitigation and the access road route.

The key elements are:

- Leicester has agreed that part of the pond can be realigned. An attractive island feature can be created at the wooded element, terraced natural seating can be provided with a nice aspect over the water.
- In terms of the environmental mitigation there was keen interest in creating a circular link but also isolated restricted areas for nature to flourish.
- We felt Hamilton was isolated from the park so we've opened up existing green spaces into a new park area directly adjacent to the residential area so it creates a better joint up

environment with an even bigger circular walk. Also new ponds will be introduced into the northern area which will encourage new habitats.

- The area north of the roundabout (at the southern end of the Park) has been improved
- There is provision for a jetty and fishing pegs
- By encouraging much more use of the park, as many options as possible with long and short walking routes, sports pitches, fishing, seating and improved accessibility it will be more well used, attractive and safer
- The road is being pushed as close to the industrial area as possible and this, plus the proposed investment into improving the park, will actually make the park far better.

We feel we have come forwards with a strong proposal and a massive improvement in the aspect.

Q) LS - Where does the water in the pond come from?

A) Some comes from the Hamilton development. We are looking at improving the outflow, dredging and clearing so flows and water quality improve. We are also suggesting putting the park into the Lands Trust so it is well managed.

**ACTION POINT** – VW to update Hamilton Resident’s Association.

Q) Will there be any additional parking provision as the numbers near the football club is not adequate?

A) An additional parking area is proposed in the area near the Victoria Road East Extension roundabout.

Congratulations were given to Cllr Raven on his new appointment.

It was agreed VW would now prepare a newsletter regarding the updated TA and other application documents, the Park improvements and Lands Trust.

## **6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> September at 6pm.** VW to book either Elizabeth Park or Roots and Shoots – **ACTION POINT.**