

## LINBY PARISH COUNCIL

### TOP WIGHAY MEETING MINUTES

24<sup>th</sup> September 2020, 10:30am

#### *Meeting held remotely via Zoom*

Present: Linby Parish Council - D Ireland, C Harrison, L Gretton (Clerk)  
H Barter (Planning Consultant), Urban Vision (Representing LPC)  
C Bancroft (Traffic Consultant), Bancroft Consulting (Representing LPC)  
Gedling Borough Council - M Avery and N Bryan  
NCC Highways - D Sullivan  
Pegasus (Agent) - S Lewis Roberts  
BWB - P Wilson  
Papplewick Parish Council - S Roberts and N Penlington

N Bryan (GBC) advised the key thing is the viability assessment, which is publicly available online. Applicant position is that the development is only viable with 10% affordable housing (20% is policy compliant) He advised they will engage with Linby and Papplewick Parish Councils through the normal consultation process, through sending out letters. If permission is granted, they will encourage developers to engage with Parish Councils in advance of submitted the application. He advised it is hard to predict timeframes but would guess end of the year/early next year.

P Wilson (BWB) advised planning history of the site goes back to 2001. Site access looked at in a lot of detail in 2008 which was referenced in the next significant work produced by AECOM in 2016. He advised the transport assessment was formally agreed by NCC. He advised they are aware of the Linby Neighbourhood Plan which is referenced in the Traffic Assessment. He advised they have looked at the site access, Waterloo Road roundabout and the assessment confirmed no mitigation was required at these two junctions. They have looked at the 11 traffic aspirations which are all referenced in the Traffic Assessment. \*Maps/figures of traffic movement, schemes and figures shared onscreen. He advised no impact on the A611 or B6011 through Linby and Papplewick have been triggered through the study area. In terms of Waterloo Road, Forest Lane, Griffins Head junction if you compare them to the trips in the Transport Assessment there are no significant increases as a result of the proposals. He advised the reason for this is that even though it's such a large development, the roads are at capacity, so it puts people off travelling on these roads and will be re-routed and distributed elsewhere. He advised they have assessed Annesley Road and no increase expected and no mitigation required. This is similar at Waterloo Road. Main Street and Church Lane which haven't been looked at but assumes these are working fine. He advised a net reduction has been shown in the morning because of re-routing but an increase in the evening. He advised he will forward a summary of what has been set out here, and forward to all attendees after the meeting.

C Bancroft (Bancroft Consulting for Linby PC) commented that a lot of detail is buried in a very complex network of appendixes and tables and a big part of the issue is that the information isn't readily available to make simple conclusions. Paragraph 108 of the NPPF is relevant and the PC has several concerns. He advised the evidence isn't presented clearly. He advised he is pro-development but has an obligation to ensure that things are done properly. He advised they have issues with all areas which are fundamental to the application. He advised there is a 15- year buildout schedule, but only have a commitment to bus stops, a couple of access roads and 2 metre footways. He advised he is pushing for the development to demonstrate there is reasonable choice for modes available in the scheme from day one and for the life of the development and indefinitely. If it isn't done right, then people will adopt car use. He advised showing a timeframe for the internal bus routes from day one so that when residential come on board, the travel options are there for them. At the moment there is no information available. He advised they have commitment for £75,000.00 and asked where does that go? Where are the buses coming from? It says the frequency is 30 minutes - for how long, 5 years? What happens when the development finishes? He advised that all these issues need to be properly addressed prior to agreeing the application.

Regarding the access, he commented the application still needs to demonstrate how the ambitious buildout rate will be achieved, in an area where a lot of other development is taking place and where there is competition for new housing/workers. He commented that nothing has been done on the road safety issues, they seem to have been swept under the carpet. There are legal implications for not addressing road safety audits properly and they need to be dealt with before a safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users at the site. He also commented that re table 4.2, he has not seen it before and would like to look through it. As per the recent email, the study area has been ring-fenced. No explanation of how the traffic disperses through the network, just broad-brush presumptions that traffic modelling is sufficient, which is not acceptable for a development of this scale. He commented that if there's going to be up to 500 peak hour movements on the western arm of the roundabout, we need to see where the traffic goes through the network. Advising 113 movements through Linby, which isn't in the report, has been underestimated. He advised a proper and clear approach is needed to show where traffic cascades through the network so that it can be established where the study area can be extended. Looking at 500/600 traffic movements just to the left of Wighay Road roundabout, there is a good chance that a large proportion of that will go through Linby, which is far more than 113.

H Barter (Urban Vision for Linby PC) commented that they support Linby PC and understand that the development is going to come forward, it's about making sure that the evidence base is sufficient. She advised they appreciate comments about previous modelling, but AECOM have produced a report which has identified capacity analysis is needed to identify impact on these routes. She advised future proofing the development, as retrospectively changing it will be very costly.

P Wilson (BWB) commented they are not looking at an increase of 600 vehicle trips through study trips, they will be re-routed and that is shown in the Saturn modelling. He commented regarding the sustainability

- the bus will route through the site and there will be temporary bus stop arrangements so people can get on from the outset,
- improved pedestrian and cycle path connectivity and
- new pedestrian crossing on Wighay Road

D Sullivan (Highways) commented the transport assessment and methodology was agreed prior to the application. They are satisfied with the traffic model, a lot of work happened prior to the application. Regarding the sustainability issues raised by C Bancroft, pedestrian and cycle links have been looked at, nothing has formally been agreed but measures are proposed. A response to previous comments has been sent to the Public Transport team and they are awaiting a response. A Travel Plan has been submitted as part of the application and NCC have looked at it and it is recommended for approval. With the public transport, there will be a loop through the site, however the finer details have not yet been agreed with it still being an outline application.

C Bancroft (Bancroft Consulting) advised we are not being given clear information. If the information is there to support this application, then it needs to be simplified and made more accessible. He advised the applicant needs to provide a technical note summarising the highways position to help residents to see clearly where traffic increases will occur. He advised it is also important to inform other stakeholders on other parts of the route, as they should be told what increases they can expect to have because of the development. He commented that they need to clearly demonstrate what the baseline traffic conditions are and how they will change as a result of the development. The information provided is high level detail and not enough real-world assessment on what the impact to the residents of Linby and Papplewick will be.

D Ireland (Linby PC) commented the site is particularly contentious and there is a conflict of interest between the landowner and key decisions that are being made. We need to be going back to our residents and reassuring them that everything has been looked at appropriately and all information has been sent. The Parish Council do not have large funds available and have already spent a great deal of money to pay for expertise to ensure that we are guided to make informed decisions and to ensure the development is viable. NCC are planning a major office building within that site which will generate additional traffic coming and going she enquired if the TA reflected this in their modelling. What we don't want is emails back and forth and no headway being made. All we want to do is move forward in a positive way. On the viability summary it mentions installing a raised plateau at the Griffin's Head Junction, which both Linby and Papplewick PC's do not support.

D Sullivan (NCC Highways) advised the junction improvement is being undertaken by Bellway Homes and not linked to the Top Wighay Development. He advised it won't be a raised table, there will be anti-skid surfacing and visual approaches to the junction.

S Roberts (Papplewick PC) commented they are very concerned about the increase in traffic that will come through Papplewick. Any traffic coming from the East out of that development is going to be heading through Linby to Papplewick, yet they are told there will be no further traffic at the Griffin's Head cross-roads. She also pointed out the impact re traffic coming from the new developments at Bestwood Village and the

new Bellway site off Papplewick Lane. She advised she was relieved to not have the raised table in the middle of the conservation area, but antiskid surface deals with speed, and speed is not the problem at this junction, it's the volume of traffic. What is needed is something that allows parishioners to move safely around the village. The Parish Council has not received any information about the alterations to the cross-roads. She commented mitigation must be in place before a development starts. She commented there had been suggestion of a park and ride on the Top Wighay Estate which would be useful as vehicles can use that and then the bus service to the tram stop.

N Penlington (Papplewick PC) commented on P Wilson's presentation that estimated 12 HGV movements per day, however this is in an area where there should not be any HGV movements unless they are authorised. He also commented on the peak time flows and asked what the movement is between these times, as people change their behaviour to avoid those peak times. He advised that this needs to be included within the modelling.

P Wilson (BWB) responded that in respect of the park and ride, that was considered in 2016 as a potential mitigation option, but it was agreed that there was not much benefit in terms of impact. He advised he does not disagree regarding the peak swap, but that the assessment work undertaken only focuses on peak hours and they wouldn't be able to get the information easily for in between the peak times. School and employment trips will be primarily focused on peak period with regards to those uses.

M Avery (GBC) confirmed that S106 contributions for public transport improvements will be required at trigger points as the development progresses.

D Sullivan (NCC Highways) commented that in terms of public transport they have a specific transport department that will deal with the bus operators. He commented that the park and ride hasn't formed part of this application. He advised there is potential for a park and ride which is being looked at off the A60 in Gedling at Leapool Roundabout.

M Avery (GBC) advised that this information is in the public domain and funding for park and ride has been reported in the press. He advised he cannot comment on the pre-application. If an application comes forward in due course, there will be a consultation in respect of those proposals.

S Lewis Roberts (Pegasus) commented that it has been useful to hear the concerns and to highlight the specific issues. He advised there is a wealth of information in the Environmental Impact Assessment and Traffic Assessment but appreciates that it may be difficult to interpret. He advised providing a non-technical summary will be helpful to the PC, as stakeholders and to the planning authority as well. He advised he will be happy to commit on behalf of the applicant to issuing a technical note through P Wilson and will be provided to everyone at this meeting. This should be within the next 2 weeks.

M Avery (GBC) commented that a summary would be useful and will be published on the website and N Bryan will make all key stakeholders including members of the public aware of any additional information.

The meeting ended 11:54