

LCC/SRBC3

Appendix 5

Minutes 21/07/21

Minutes

The Lanes, Penwortham with Lancashire County Council

Location: MS Teams
 Date: 21st July 2021
 Time: 1100hrs
 Date of next meeting: TBC

Attendees:

First	Last	Initials	Company	Position
Neil	Stevens	NS	LCC	
David	Watson	DW	LCC	
Nicola	Elsworth	NE	Homes England	
Mark	Phillips	MP	Homes England	
Mike	Axon	MA	Vectos	
Paul	Whitaker	PW	Vectos	

Apologies: N/A

Distribution: NS, DW, NE, MP, MA

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
1.0	Introduction		
1.1	PW introduced the meeting which builds upon the first Vectos meeting w/ LCC on the 12 th July. Following the first meeting, NS had been speaking with NE regarding progress on the masterplan and new applications, which resulted in the scheduling of todays meeting.		
1.2	NS trying to work with applicants to get a development and masterplan that works for all. NS very much of the opinion that there are options available to allow development to come forward on a sustainable site, but a clear masterplan is required which delivers necessary infrastructure.		
1.3	MA noted that mutual agreement is in the best interests of all parties and welcomed the opportunity to discuss further with LCC.		
2.0	Vision and Validate		

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
2.1	MA sought to establish whether LCC were aligned with a Vision and Validate approach which is policy compliant and is reinforced by recent publications from the CIHT, TfN, DfT and RTPi.		
2.2	NS noted that he is aware of Vision and Validate approach, but NS has serious concerns with the approach. Concerns largely relate to what happens if the vision isn't validated resulting in operational issues on the local highway network. Networks need to be convenient, reliable and safe for all.		
2.3	MA referenced the reduced importance of peak hour demand in policy terms, and highlighted how the 'what if' scenario can be dealt with identifying numerous research articles in which people will always seek to minimise cost and maximise convenience. MA also noted that it is climate, health and the economy that drive the need for new infrastructure, not peak hour demand. MA stated that 'no gridlock on a regular basis in the north west. NS disagreed with the statement and gave an example on a journey to Manchester by car		
2.4	NS and MA believed that there were significant differences between both parties , but both agreed that this should not prevent a common ground from being established.		
3.0	Masterplan		
3.1	NS would like to be convinced regarding the proposed masterplan for the site. Given the proposed submission timescales at the beginning of August, NS queried how well developed or fixed the masterplan was in order to ascertain how best to provide input. MA noted that a lot of work had been done, building upon previous consultations and comments,NS indicated that it appears that most matters are fixed and that we are tinkering around the edges. MA noted the point highlighted.		
3.2	PW shared an indicative draft layout of the masterplan for discussion. The key features being a main vehicular site access on Penwortham Way, a mix of facilities within the site, and a separate active travel network using existing lanes providing links within and around the site, which can be considered the primary movement network. Options are available to integrate with plans for the proposed dualling of Penwortham Way, but the development is not reliant on the dualling infrastructure.		
3.3	NS noted that a single point of access for any new public transport services accessing the site is not in line with best practice and would not be acceptable. DW requested clarity regarding the proposed site access which PW confirmed would be sufficient for the development demands. MA stated that the site does not require the dualling of the A582, but would not oppose it.		
3.4	MA noted that accessibility to facilities is the first and core principle of the masterplan. It was explained that this included access to facilities within the site, but also those within adjacent local communities where active travel would be key as part of promoting local living. Shared travel is then considered, of which one type is the bus. Finally, travel by car is not necessarily a bad thing, but it shouldn't be the first thought when considered in the context of local living.		
3.5	NS understood the approach , but didn't support the masterplan.		

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
3.6	NS referenced a number of options that LCC have considered in relation to an overall masterplan for the site. The first is a traditional and typical approach with a new bridge over the railway, high capacity improvements to the network and the CBLR delivered. The second is a foot/cycle bridge only over the railway with the existing Bee Lane bridge accommodating vehicle movements as part of a tortuous route to limit through movement along the CBLR. The LCC options compared to the VECTOS are at either end of a scale.		
3.7	<p>NS noted a third way which would be a hybrid, considering sustainability, build out, access needs and SR policy. Satellites of development could be promoted with suitable all mode connectivity to the wider built environment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Main access at Penwortham Way linking to Kingsfold Drive to the north for all modes. This would then serve a significant development satellite in the northwest quadrant of the site supporting PT routeing and local need 2way by all modes. 2. A second development satellite could be provided to the northeast of the site promoting the use of the existing Bee Lane bridge for all modes, but with development scale limited accordingly linking through to Flag lane, with clear links to provision at TardyGate. 3. A third satellite could consist of the safeguarded land to the south with access provided via Chainhouse Lane/Coote Lane. 4. Initially there would be no vehicular links between the development satellites internally. Accessibility and connectivity to the wider network would exist by each road network . 5. The approach would still allow the CBLR to be delivered at some point in the future through the provision of a centrally located internal link as part of the Bee Lane and Penwortham Way satellite, but the roads would not link until a new bridge was provided.. 6. Maintain the use of existing lanes for active travel modes. 7. Improvements would be required at the Leyland Road/Bee Lane roundabout to include traffic signal control and improved crossing facilities. <p>The LCC suggested approach would not require the satellite development to deliver a bridge but does not prevent one being delivered in the future with CBLR.</p>		
3.8	MA thanked NS for giving so much thought to a potential masterplan solution. MA believed that the vision described by NS meant that we were not actually that far apart, with the main difference being the proposed all vehicle link to Kingsfold Drive to the north.		
3.9	NE and MP highlighted that there had been many previous discussions regarding the need for and ability to deliver an all vehicle link to Kingsfold Drive. Land is not adopted, and is outside of the applicant's control, thereby resulting in the development being undeliverable if a Kingsfold link is required. NS suggested that the site forms part of South Ribble local plan and should offer support to this infrastructure (land) to enable the local plan to be delivered		
3.10	MA highlighted the numerous active travel connections that would be available along the northern boundary of the site, providing accessibility to the Kingsfold community to the north. NS noted that accessibility should include all modes.		

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
3.11	Meeting came to a close on the understanding that the applicants would consider the vision presented by NS with a further meeting date to be coordinated in the coming weeks.		