

## **Thurmaston Liaison Group**

**7<sup>th</sup> November 2013 - 6pm at Roundhill College**

### **Third meeting**

#### **Attendees**

- Cllr Brenda Seaton – Charnwood Borough Council
- Cllr Kate Knaggs – Leicestershire County Council
- Dr Norman King – Barkby and Barkby Thorpe Parish Council
- Mrs Lynne Stewart – Representative of the Duck Pond residents
- Mr Steve McDonald – Roundhill Academy
- Cllr Paul Henry - Syston Parish Council
- Cllr Stephen Wright – Queninborough Parish Council
- Cllr Ralph Raven – Thurmaston Parish Council
- Mr Owen Bentley – BABTAG
- Mr Darren Gartside – Local resident
- Gerald Bowman – Thurmaston says No
- Rob Gill – CEG
- Steve Oliver – Steer Davies Gleave (SDG)
- Dean Swann - WYG
- Richard Wain – Hawksmoor
- Nick Baker- Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
- Victoria Walker – Beattie Group

#### **Apologies**

- Mr Dorrell MP
- Cllr Mark Lowe
- Cllr Ken Pacey
- Cllr Daniel Grimley
- Cllr Clair
- Cllr Tom Barker

#### **1. Welcome**

The minutes for the meeting were approved by attendees and VW will now upload these to the website.

Q) OB asked if there was any progress in terms of how the green spaces would be managed.

A) RW explained that discussions were still on-going and we would take this as an item at a future liaison group meeting so it could be debated in more detail.

Q) LS asked if the north-west link road route had been determined.

A) RW explained that it is shown on an indicative plan but more detailed work would need to be undertaken.

It was agreed that VW would highlight action points outstanding from the meeting at the end of each set of minutes for ease of review at the next meeting.

## **2. Transport**

- 2.1 WYG/Steer Davis Gleave ran through the transport presentation, detailing their experience in major schemes and in transport management during the London Olympics as well as their experience in putting together the first Government guidance on travel planning. They are currently developing a travel portal for Leicester and Leicestershire outlining a range of options regarding how you make your trip. They also undertake personalised travel planning where they individually advise people house- to-house and encourage participation in a new scheme.
- 2.2 For example, they delivered one of the demonstration schemes in Darlington speaking to 40,000 households and actively got 17,000 involved. This achieved a 9% reduction in car trips from 17,000 households, doubled the cycle trips and increased walking by 15%.
- 2.3 On this scheme for the SUE, it would be important to undertake the travel planning work from early in the development in order to influence the choices people make in terms of their travel.
- 2.4 By having two companies involved it enables SDG to concentrate on the green/public transport and WYG to focus on solving issues in terms of key the junctions and highway improvements. Both companies are then reviewing the information and solutions.
- 2.5 The latest masterplan was tabled and NB highlighted that the pattern of development is for three neighbourhoods within the SUE. Each of these is served by a local or district centre with appropriate services, schools, health, recreation and shops. This will reduce the need to travel and will contain many movements within the development itself.
- 2.6 In terms of public transport, the team is currently discussing the required bus routes with the City, County and Charnwood. These would be delivered early in the scheme and the number of services will expand as the development progresses. At the moment we are looking to begin with a 30 minute service and each house will be within 400 metres of a bus stop. All of these would have real time travel information, so there will be intelligent bus stops to tell you when the next bus will arrive. The buses can also have control of traffic lights to assist with their swift movement into the city. The City is about to implement one of these schemes and hopes to roll this out further afield.
- 2.7 Key routes for cycling are important as personal travel planning will seek to maximise safe cycling to the city. Routes need to be as easy as possible for recreational and commuter cyclists. A number of routes will need to be improved.

Q) LS reminded the team to remember horse riders as well. There are many using the area. Bridleways need to be separated from roads where possible.

A) SDG agreed to review this.

Q) DG: Is Leicester City deemed the centre? Nottingham and Derby were key commuter areas for those living in Hamilton.

A) SO: Predominately it would be Leicester City in terms of commuting by cycle.

- 2.9 There are two main access points to the north and south. A plan with the key junctions marked was tabled to show the junctions which are being assessed for improvements. This will be modelled by WYG and also through the LLITM (County) model.
- 2.10 Methods to avoid rat running are also included within the modelling process. Each change that is inputted into the model will show the 'knock on effect' so that all roads and junctions can be effectively assessed.
- 2.11 MVA undertook an initial study through LLITM; the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model. This produces traffic information and makes predictions as to the effect new vehicles will have on the network.
- 2.12 Economic models look at the growth of Leicester and Leicestershire and this is inputted into the system. Part of the model can also review strategic changes on the network, such as the effect of something such as HS2. All of this data can be inputted and it shows what effect it will have.

Q) DG: Do you revisit previous schemes once they are built?

A) DS: Yes validation checks are undertaken and the model is live so you can put in the new traffic figures.

Q) DG asked: So once Hamilton was complete will this have been remodelled?

A) The LLITM model is not just built from historic figures but is built on live data. Traffic surveys are undertaken continually and figures are updated. This might be County surveys or independent transport company surveys once they are verified. In addition, surveys which look at how people travel are inputted. Accident data is also inputted.

Costco and Sainsburys have also undertaken their own surveys for their developments for example.

LLITM will also input these and other committed developments so when we input our scheme all of the other developments (even those which might not have started) are reflected in the outputs. We work very closely with City, County and Charnwood during this process.

Q) OB asked: There are two developments which are not here. 150 homes on Barkby Road and number of infill schemes proposed in the area. These will have an effect on local roads.

A) DS: These will already be within the LLITM. This model is not ours but County's to input all committed developments.

Q) DG: Do you have the proposed 'gap' closure on the A607 Bypass?

A) DS: Any changes which are proposed for committed developments or completed developments would have to be inputted into the model. We are not the custodians of the model but we have the ability to input data into it and review the outcomes.

**ACTION POINT** – Can DG clarify if the gap closure referred to is Winster Drive so that the transport consultant can ascertain if this has been included by County in this model and report back at the next meeting.

Q) Cllr Seaton; We understand that the Sainsburys' traffic modelling was criticised this week as instead of 6,000 per hour it was 11,000.

A) DS: LCC should be able to clarify this.

2.13 A study area is determined at the start of the methodology; this outlines the key junctions around the development which will be reviewed. It is agreed by the authorities. Traffic figures are then assessed to look at how much traffic would travel in each direction and at what time of day. This is then run through the model and LLITM assesses the 'domino effect' on all of the junctions. This enables the consultancy team to ascertain the mitigation measures that are required as the development progresses.

2.14 Once we have the traffic figures we agree a nationally recognised growth figure which shows the whole plan period up to 2031. We can then model what happens at each phase, look at which junctions are affected from day one to the final phase, assessing each stage and ascertaining the priorities in terms of phasing of all of the road improvements.

Q) DG: The Bridge on Churchill Road regularly floods and is closed. The Duck Pond route also has the same issue. How is this taken into account?

A) DS: LLITM wouldn't consider unique events such as flooding. It reviews daily am and pm peak flows.

Q) OB: Are you still in the realm of ideas or are you finalising your transport assessment. We want to know what will be within the transport assessment in terms of what will happen to each junction.

A) DS: We are quite far on and when we are ready to submit those traffic mitigation proposals these will be reviewed and tested again by the council. There are a minimum of three LLITM runs which will assess this data. There is the baseline – running the traffic as it is now without improvements in place. We have already carried this out through another model in order for us to assess where the impacts are and best plan our improvements. Further assessments are made through LLITM adding additional data, such as the proposed improvements.

Q) LS: When was the traffic data collected?

A) DS: Some of it was 2013; we have also factored in the Council's surveys as well.

Q) Cllr Knaggs asked: If you have undertaken your own surveys, has this proven compatible with LLITM?

A) DS: We have not yet reached the stage of inputting into LLITM. It is an iterative process. We have to carry out our own assessments and model inputs as a starting point so we can check that our solutions will work. We then input the information into the County-wide model, LLITM. However, as we've used other models we usually find the outputs are usually similar.

Q) Cllr Knaggs asked: What if it doesn't match?

A) DS: It is rare this happens. We know there will be an impact it's just where each specific improvement is required. We also take information out of LLITM data and feed that into our process as well. LLITM just allows a lot more flexibility and assesses a far wider network. It allows the review of the entire county. We can then pull very small detailed pictures out of that wider strategic view. Our plan also looks at each individual junction at a very microscopic level. Our model is tested alongside the LLITM model.

Q) OB: When will the application go in?

A) DS: Before Christmas is the aim. We will do three LLITM runs, based on the final year of the development. The inputs into LLITM will include the base model – nothing, commitments – i.e. everything with planning permission with their improvements (but not our scheme), the 'everything' - with our scheme included but without us doing anything and look at what happens to the traffic. The final run then adds in our proposed improvements to the network and then look at what happens.

Q) Are you making assumptions about the people in the new development? Are you looking at existing neighbourhoods to make these assumptions?

A) DS: In terms of trip generation, LLITM looks at everything that's currently happening in the local area, including the 2011 census. We also look at trip numbers per household. One of the recent areas we've looked at in terms of modal shift has been Hamilton; this is 17% in cycling, walking and buses rather than use of the car. Charnwood and the City will also confirm the modal shift they are happy with being used.

Q) SW: How do you know which direction people will be travelling?

A) DS: We have to look at census data, travel surveys and how people are currently travelling in the local area.

Q) SW: Hobby Horse roundabout had to be improved twice as it wasn't correct first, how will you get it right first time?

A) DS: The SUE will allow a greater number of strategic improvements which can't be delivered by smaller developments of the same number of homes in the area. We have to model, make the improvements and continue to track how successful those changes are so that these can be reviewed and further improvements made as the development evolves.

Ultimately an SUE does allow the ability to deliver improvements to the network which couldn't be delivered any other way.

Q) DG: Will the roads be delivered from the beginning?

A) DS: No because they are not needed from the beginning, there are other improvements which are required from the first phase and we must prioritise these. We will comprehensively model the phasing and prioritise the areas which will need improvements from the outset and programme improvements alongside the development so they come forward together.

Part of the planning response for this uncertainty is to build in changes. For example, we don't know what will happen with fuel prices, environmental taxation and other influences so we have to build in flexibility so that the scheme, residents and a steering group can influence the strategy as it develops, [and the development can adapt in the future.](#)

Q) LS: Barkby Thorpe Lane will be taking the majority of traffic before you complete your new link. You are not mitigating for the traffic. It is the small residential lanes which are suffering, what will happen to these?

A) DS: The Asda roundabout is included for mitigation which will positively manage the traffic currently using village routes.

Q) OB: the spine road will have 20mph yet this spine road is seen by County as a Bypass/relief road.

A) DS: In capacity terms we realise it will be heavily trafficked, but there will be sections of 20mph. This will not recreate the A607 road which is a major arterial route into Leicester. This road is to service the development but will need a significant capacity.

Q) OB: Can it do both?

A) Yes with good design it can; such as materials, street furniture, some speed restrictions. It will not limit the capacity. The County Council's remit is to provide strategic highways; our role is to deliver mitigation measures for the traffic generated by development. If you build a three lane motorway it will fill with cars, it will attract traffic and pull it in and that will bleed out into the local area. Instead you want to serve the development, we appreciate there will be other additional cars using it but we don't want to actively pull new traffic in.

Troon Way was discussed and Nicklaus Drive was identified as one of the key junctions which need to be improved and both Sainsburys and the SUE is looking at this.

It was highlighted that the latest census has indicated a 10million population increase over the next 75 years. With small scale developments you get the same number of homes but do not get the extensive funds and strategic review of the highway network to deal with the effects, you do get this with an SUE.

Q) DG: When Councillors leave here how do we give them confidence that there will be improvements up front?

A) Mitigation measures are proposed for each phase to cover junction and road improvements as well as public transport improvements.

Q) LS: What guarantees are given to ensure bus services continue if not used?

A) SO: The developer commits to a set number of years of contribution. The steering group will look at the uptake of public transport and how people are moving from A to B and each year, this group then makes decisions on where on-going investment is best made.

Q) Cllr Seaton: There is an estate which was not built for buses. They can't get through for parked cars on the street. Can we be assured that the routes suggested for buses will be wide enough?

A) SO: Yes, there will be a minimum width of road as required by the county and city to allow safe and easy bus routes and we need to build this in. Planning policy has also changed so we can now provide sufficient parking for each home to reduce the need to park on the street. We will be designing this effectively for buses in both directions as well as service vehicles.

Roads are specifically designed for their functions and requirements. It is very hard to put it in afterwards, but we are designing to future proof.

Q) DG: Where will the schools be?

A) RG: There are three primary schools planned, one for each local centre.

Q) Cllr Seaton: Can you design in a safe drop off point near each school so we don't have the issues we have at the moment with schools in cul de sacs?

A) RG: We are talking to local schools at the moment about the design. We have the benefit of designing it properly from the outset rather than retrofitting.

Q) RR: Are you liaising with Arriva as well as First Bus?

A) SO: We are intending to liaise with both, but First has been the most pro-active to date.

Q) Cllr Wright: Have any decisions been made in terms of encouraging rail travel?

A) There is no intention at the moment to look at providing a railway station. We did consider this but Network Rail is not interested in pursuing this. Syston would have to close as it is too near in terms of stopping points. New high quality buses are seen as a more preferable solution.

Q) OB: What are your figures in terms of trip generation in each direction am and pm?

A) DS: Generally as a rule of thumb without mitigation it would be approximately 2,200 in the peak hours, two way flow.

Q) OB: will there be 50 cars per minute needing to exit this estate in the peak hours onto principle routes?

A) DS: The AM is the only time the highest number of movements would leave the development, the figures above when split into one way traffic give a crude 28 vehicles a minute. This is the number we have to mitigate as part of our proposals. However, mitigation would be undertaken as the development progresses to ensure these vehicle movements can be accommodated.

The measures proposed would also include methods of encouraging vehicles onto the routes we want them to take by making this a more attractive options, this will deter vehicles from village roads.

For example the Nicklaus Drive / Troon Way Junction , once through this junction the road flows, but because you can see traffic backing up vehicles seek alternative routes.. If we solve the

issues with this junction (which the County is currently unable to due to lack of funds) we have a better chance of keeping vehicles on the principle routes.

Q) Cllr Seaton asked: In terms of the Asda roundabout, there is no capacity for changing this and the road isn't long enough so it is resulting in delays. What is the solution?

A) DS: We are looking at improvements which cover storage, and vehicle turning patterns, also the option of improving the entrance to the old coop and Asda and holistically assessing the movements on this junction so that an array of solutions can be proposed. We will model and present the findings, but they then have to be accepted and approved by County.

2.15 As part of the mitigation measures, we are not against closing [country lanes](#) if it helps to manage which routes vehicles will use. A development of this size actually enables you to look strategically about the routes people will want to travel and to actively manage that process, directing people to the strategic highway network and not rat running. This is coupled with improvements and green transport opportunities. While we can't get everyone out of cars, we can include mechanisms to make this an attractive choice. LLITM will need to test every solution proposed.

Q) Cllr Wright asked who would pay for the mitigation measures.

A) DS: The developer would pay.

Q) Cllr Wright queried what would happen if the developer didn't pay?

A) DS: The mitigation measures are all legally binding. They are conditioned based on trigger points so without delivering them it prevents more homes being built.

Q) Cllr Wright asked if local areas can apply for S106 monies.

A) DS: It was explained that CIL funding which is given as part of a development is borough wide. However, S106 funds relate to a development and include funds towards infrastructure requirements to accommodate a development and mitigate its effect on the local area.

Charnwood has not yet decided what to do in terms of CIL, however the consensus has been that in terms of SUEs it is far better for S106 monies to be used and tied to specific improvements across the local area rather than giving funds for borough-wide improvements. So it is likely that the investment would be linked to projects, infrastructure and improvements across the local area.

Q) Cllr Wright queried the proposed north west access road and its junction on to the A607 and vehicles turning north towards the Hobby Horse junction

A) DS: It was explained that an all movements signalised junction was proposed and set to be assessed through LLITM.

Q) It was queried when the traveller's site would be delivered as part of the phasing.

A) RW: This is yet to be determined.

Q) Cllr King queried who would make the decision about which junctions the developer has to pay to improve.

A) DS: This would be the Highways Agency, Leicester County Council and Leicester City Council. We are meeting/discussing the mitigation measures with all of these stakeholders. All have agreed that we should use LLITM to model the movements. Some of the proposed investment into the proposed mitigation measures fall into each of their designated areas and money will need to be spent in each area.

2.16 In terms of sustainable transport, there will be a package of measures. There would be a travel plan office within the site; this would be a focal point in the district centre where can get help, route plans, hire bike or car etc...

2.17 The green travel planning process means that a series of measures area agreed and targets are set, these include reducing in car trips, increasing bus or cycle use, for example, as the site develops. These are monitored and the travel plan coordinator will then be responsible for taking ownership of this and will engage with residents via a travel plan steering group to look at what the monitoring is saying and which measures are working. This group would meet annually and decisions are made to draw down additional funds for improvements or to restructure the green travel plan in order to maximise the success of the travel planning initiatives.

### **3. Summary**

3.1 It was agreed that there would need to be a series of meetings to discuss transport and access.

3.2 The transport consultants agreed that they are fully aware the scheme will have an effect in terms of traffic. Their role is to identify where we can mitigate, making improvements. We aim to work with local people to deliver this.

### **4. Date of Next Meeting**

This was agreed as 12<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

### **OUTSTANDING ACTION POINTS**

- Can we clarify the developments in Barkby & Barkby Thorpe area have been included by County in the model - DS
- Once DG clarifies the gap closure WYG to confirm that is in the County traffic model - DS