

LCC/SRBC3

Appendix 7

Minutes 30/05/22

Minutes

The Lanes, Penwortham – LCC/NH Meeting

Location: MS Teams
 Date: 30th May 2022
 Time: 1430hrs
 Date of next meeting: TBC

Attendees:

First	Last	Initials	Company	Position
Neil	Stevens	NS	LCC	
David	Watson	DW	LCC	
Dan	Spencer	DS	LCC	
Mohammed	Patel	MP	LCC	
Warren	Hilton	WH	National Highways	
Emma	Trevett	ET	WSP	
Mike	Axon	MA	Vectos	
Paul	Whitaker	PW	Vectos	

Apologies: N/A

Distribution: NS, DW, DS, MP, WH, ET, MA

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
1.1	PW identified that this is the latest meeting which provides the opportunity to focus on a key topic area that is subject to disagreement with LCC and NH, but also to assist with identification of areas of agreement. MA noted that a 1 st draft statement of agreement and disagreement had been circulated to NS prior to this meeting. PW noted that there was no formal agenda for this meeting and welcomed input from LCC and NH with the intention of focussing discussions.		
1.2	NS identified that progress needs to be made to assist the Inspector. NS noted that the meeting on the 27 th was useful. Issues with the applications are still as noted in the formal tracker document and LCC's statutory comments. Queried if VECTOS are satisfied with TA undertaken, highlighting issues raised by NH and LCC need to be overcome to reach resolution where possible.		

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
1.3	MA noted that he had a view on the assessment submitted with the applications and acknowledged that there was a difference of opinion. However, MA would like to find a way through this and is open to suggestions, without prejudicing the works previously completed and submitted. MA queried whether there are other things beyond that included in the TA that Vectos could be doing to satisfy LCC/NH separate to discussing the areas of disagreement in respect of the work already submitted.		
1.4	NS happy to share thoughts for discussion and confirmed that a separate analysis is being undertaken by LCC to inform the Inspector, effectively a parallel TA. Highlights this should ordinarily take several months. This is being progressed so that if the Inspector asks the question, what does NS think the impacts are on the network, an appropriate answer can be provided. The assessment will present numbers flowing through the network to see impacts at any single junction. NS noted that the previous Croft assessment was not 100% but LCC are more closely aligned with the Croft approach in terms of traffic data, growing, trip rates rather than the Vectos approach. NS states traditional approach, use of standard proprietary software, enables clearer understanding of impacts in specific locations. Microsimulation could be supplementary		
1.5	MA queried what the LCC approach is, what the process is to test what is important, and how the answers from the assessment will be used to make judgements about the degree of impact and whether it is acceptable or not.		
1.6	NS disagrees with Vectos view on the empirical answers from the models and states they show whether junctions are operating within capabilities and enable understanding of where changes are needed. States there are solutions to the A582 with many changes taking place. Need for VECTOS work to link in with wider work. MA sought confirmation that the LCC position was that if 100% DoS/RFC was breached based on a commuter peak hour stand alone model assessment then this was a fail. NS said that this was a good starting point.		
1.7	NS reemphasised the importance of improved reliability and reduced delay and the associated impact on highway safety. NS explained LCC's position that highway safety is related to congestion and inconvenience, where the highway network is unsafe if it experiences congestion		
1.8	MA queried whether a forecast demand on the network which results in a DoS/RFC of over 100% in a single hour should warrant changes to the network to accommodate it and bring it to 100% or below. NS stated this would be a good starting point.		
1.9	MA queried how much weight should be given to drivers changing habits as a result of increasing congestion. NS responded by saying under that logic if drivers changed their habits, there would be no congestion. Evidence shows this is not the case, there is a need to focus on the peaks within the network.		

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
1.10	MA queried, in the interests of trying to get to a position where an agreement is reached, which locations on the network would need to change? NS identified that there was no data or modelling to answer the query at this point but there is local knowledge of the network regarding operation and known pinch points. NS noted Stanifield Lane signalised junction suffered severe congestion prior to Covid with impacts back to motorway and A582 beyond WCML bridge, Croston Road double roundabout also suffers from problems due to proximity of roundabouts to one another and link to Lancashire business park, Leyland Road double signalised junction queues back from signals towards Preston beyond Bee Lane with severe congestion.		
1.11	MA queried when LCC believes we will be without the Covid influence for traffic on the network. NS didn't know the answer to this, acknowledged that things were changing but did not know what normal would look like. As such, NS reiterated that established pre-Covid data should be the starting point for any assessment.		
1.12	MA queried whether LCC were happy on the position of sustainability. NS noted that the site is allocated in the Local Plan and can be made sustainable. MA queried whether the applications were making it sustainable or whether something was being missed.		
1.13	NS referenced the large cul-de-sac that would be created, with a single point of access and buses in and out at only one location. Any extended service serving this would likely lose patronage, a substantial subsidy would be required and once all contributions had been spent then the service would be unlikely to sustain a reliable service of appropriate frequency to a range of destinations. A separate access and egress would be beneficial as it would make this much more likely.		
1.14	MA stated Kingsfold link cannot be delivered queried whether active travel and micro-mobility provide good links. NS reiterated that the site needs to be sustainable for all modes and isn't convinced that the mobility hub described in the application documents would provide benefits to residential developments over and above a traditional development site with a travel plan having regard for phasing and buildout.		
1.15	NS noted that there are a number of options to ensure multiple access points. MA queried whether in LCC's view the development is stymied by not having land to provide a vehicular access to Kingsfold. NS referenced the CBLR, possibility of agreement with SRBC regarding using their land for a vehicular link to Kingsfold and a new pedestrian/cycle bridge over the railway at Bee Lane. NS queried VECTOS' understanding of the latest position of Network Rail regarding the Bee Lane bridge.		
1.16	MA stated that Bee Lane is not suitable for both a CBLR all vehicle link and active and shared travel and therefore Bee Lane should be prioritised for active travel given the hierarchy of movement but that did not preclude shared travel using Bee Lane bridge, PT accessibility may be possible. NS emphasised the importance of the overall masterplan, how it works in supporting active travel and facilitating two-way vehicle movements safely. Encouraged looking at Bee Lane/Leyland Road/The Cawsey sustainable provision		

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
1.17	MA referenced the statement of agreement and disagreement that had been circulated and requested input from LCC before the 8 th June. NS stated as it had been received after meeting commenced, he had not had an opportunity to look at it yet.		
1.18	MA queried how, in LCC's opinion, land can be safeguarded for the CBLR. The Vectos approach proposes a route which aligns with the masterplan and then safeguards a corridor which is included in a legal agreement. The views of LCC on this approach would be welcomed, plus any alternative suggestions. MA noted that the parcel of land closest to Bee Lane would be safeguarded until such time that clarity regarding delivery of the CBLR is provided. The views of LCC on this approach would be welcomed, plus alternative suggestions.		
1.19	NS queried whether the existing lanes were to be retained, including access to existing properties. How does the development layout work with these constraints? MA stated routes and lanes for existing dwellings will be maintained for those users only and agreed to provide an annotated plan to show how this would work, including accessibility for existing and proposed dwellings and separation between users		
1.20	NS queried the trip rates, distribution and modelling presented by Vectos, and asked whether these figures would be reviewed by Vectos in light of LCC's statutory comments. Asked if Vectos will be looking at Croft's work. MA stated that the door will not be shut until the last possible moment with the aim of trying to seek agreement, if Vectos looks at it the way LCC suggests and the measures are not significantly different suggests this might be the solution. Vectos is not backing away from the assessment presented and will stand by it but emphasised the need to be pragmatic in an attempt to reach agreement, acknowledging the different approaches to transport assessment between parties.		
1.21	ET referenced the tracker that was already in circulation and highlighted that many National Highways points are points of clarification. National Highways are happy to progress their review in line with the tracker if Vectos provide the data and relevant masterplan information.		
1.22	ET noted the April 2021 data that was used to construct the micro-simulation model and suggested the use of WebTRIS data to assist with checking validity. ET felt that there is an opportunity to resolve National Highways' issues by replying to points noted in the tracker, line by line and evidencing points. Email dialogue in the first instance followed up by meetings where required.		
1.23	NS noted that all parties need to be in agreement, not just National Highways. NS stated that emails need to cc everyone to make sure everyone is onboard. The tracker provides a clear audit trail.		
1.24	WH supports continuing the discussions to date and use of the tracker. Use of the tracker doesn't mean all issues will be resolved and there is a need to get to grips with the trip generation and distribution though the LCC network before an assessment of the SRN can be made.		
1.25	MA queried whether National Highways had any issues with the SRBC Local Plan site allocations. MA noted that all he could find in the Local Plan representations was a letter from the Highways Agency suggesting that it was satisfied with the Local Plan, and not setting out any requirement for new highway infrastructure. WH not aware of anything other than this, but will review. WH noted that at the time of this Local Plan preparation, National Highways would not have looked at the Plan in the detail that they now do, and circumstances have changed.		

Reference	Description	Action Required	
		Initials	Date
1.26	NS would like to see individual junction models, with an agreed set of peak hours, trip rates, distribution, base flows, growth and committed development. MA noted that in the spirits of moving forward and without prejudicing the current position, Vectos will look at producing individual junction models in addition to those already submitted.		
1.27	NS noted the network peaks of 0730-0830hrs and 1630-1730hs with the development effects over these hours requiring assessment. The Croft TA is being used to inform NS evidence, in terms of the approach to assessment (i.e. car-based). Whilst Vectos work is more broken down in per mode, this is required due to the uncertainty in the Vectos approach in relation to assumptions. Need to know what impact is and what is required to support sustainable travel. NS is taking a simpler approach.		
1.28	MA queried the approach and asked whether the assessment would be considering more cars than we would want to see, or is likely, in terms of traffic demand. The aim of the council is to minimise car trips to and from the development but acknowledged for the purposes of assessment minimised car trips is an issue.		
1.29	NS highlighted that any assessment needs to be realistic. Realism is more important than idealism.		
1.30	PW noted that as the tracker has been in circulation for a number of months, are all key items identified. In working through the tracker, National Highways nor LCC had identified any key omissions to date.		
1.31	NS keen to make real progress on the fundamentals. NS also asked whether Vectos would reposition the assessment to align with LCC's requirements?		
1.32	MA noted that Vectos are happy with the work that it has done and are not repositioning their assessments. However, in the spirit of reaching agreement, are looking at further work on the basis that if the answers are broadly similar no matter agreement on approach, there is an opportunity for agreement, or minimisation of issues between us. Therefore Vectos would be looking at additional standalone modelling and provision of additional information to assist. It is likely that this would be shared within 2-3 weeks. NS happy to hear that this is the approach taken by Vectos.		
1.33	Further meeting date discussed at 1530hrs on 16 th June. This could be used if required to discuss specific assessment topics and information. If not needed due to assessments progress, alternative dates could be arranged.		