



CABINET – TUESDAY 26 APRIL 2022

ORDER PAPER

ITEM DETAILS

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Mr. O. O'Shea CC

1. MINUTES (Pages 3 - 16)

Proposed motion

That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2022 be taken as read, confirmed, and signed.

2. URGENT ITEMS

None.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Cabinet are asked to declare any interests in the business to be discussed.

4. MAJOR ROAD NETWORK - IDENTIFICATION OF THE NEXT PRIORITY CORRIDOR (Pages 17 - 78)

Representations from the following are attached to this Order Paper -

- *Hathern Parish Council - '4a'*
- *Mr. Max Hunt CC, Labour Group Transport Spokesperson - '4b'*
- *Mr. Max Hunt CC and Mrs Betty Newton CC, local members - '4c'*
- *Mr. John Marriott, local resident - '4d'.*

Mr. Max Hunt CC will also speak on this item.

Proposed motion

- (a) That the MRN evidence and corridor identification report, Appendix A, which sets out an evidence base to help inform the County Council's next priority MRN corridor, be noted;
- (b) That the A6 North (N) corridor between the Leicester boundary and Kegworth (including the A6004/Epinal Way in Loughborough) be approved as the County Council's next priority MRN corridor for potential investment;

- (c) That the Director of Environment and Transport, following consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member for Environment and Transport, be authorised to carry out further investigation work, to enhance the A6(N) corridor evidence base and to use it to identify potential transport interventions and as a strategic narrative for future investment.

5. NORTH AND EAST MELTON MOWBRAY DISTRIBUTOR ROAD - LAND ASSEMBLY (Pages 79 - 86)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the Director of Environment and Transport and Director of Corporate Resources be authorised, in consultation with the Director of Law and Governance and following consultation with the relevant Cabinet Lead Members, to:-
 - (i) Agree minor alterations to the scheme that may arise as a consequence of detailed design work,
 - (ii) Continue discussions with landowners and other stakeholders, with a view to reaching voluntary agreement over the purchase and/or reservation of rights over land for the northern and eastern sections of the MMDR where possible,
 - (iii) Take all necessary steps to confirm and implement the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) and Side Roads Order associated with the scheme pursuant to the Highways Act 1980 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981;
- (b) That the latest position with regard to costs and timescales for the implementation of the CPO and the scheme be noted.

6. EAST MIDLANDS FREEPORT - COUNTY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (Pages 87 - 104)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the latest position and next steps in the incorporation of the East Midlands Freeport company be noted;
- (b) That the Council becomes a member of the Freeport Company with the Leader of the Council as the nominated member to serve on the East Midlands Freeport Board;
- (c) That the Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources be authorised to take such actions as are necessary for the Council to implement the above decisions including to incorporate the Freeport Company as initial subscriber;
- (d) That the Council assumes the role of Lead Authority and Accountable Body for the newly incorporated Freeport Company and the Chief Executive following consultation with the Director of Corporate Resources and Director of Law and Governance be authorised to make decisions as required i) as

Council in the event of conflict of interest arising or as required by the Freeport Company governance arrangements and ii) on behalf of the Lead Authority and Accountable Body.

7. REVISED MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME FOR LEICESTERSHIRE (Pages 105 - 122)

Proposed motion

That the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme be adopted as the new timetable for work on the Review of the Leicestershire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

8. LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (Pages 123 - 162)

Proposed motion

That the revised Statement of Community Involvement be adopted.

9. LEICESTERSHIRE NET ZERO CARBON 2045 STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN (Pages 163 - 334)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the findings of the "Net Zero Carbon 2045 Roadmap for Leicestershire" research be noted;
- (b) That the draft Leicestershire Net Zero Strategy and Action Plan be approved for consultation.

10. DATES OF COUNCIL MEETINGS 2022/23 AND 2023/24 (Pages 335 - 336)

Proposed motion

That the County Council be recommended to hold meetings on the following dates during the next two municipal years:-

Wednesday 6 July 2022
 Wednesday 28 September 2022
 Wednesday 7 December 2022
 Wednesday 22 February 2023 (to consider the budget)
 Wednesday 17 May 2023 (Annual Meeting)
 Wednesday 5 July 2023
 Wednesday 27 September 2023
 Wednesday 6 December 2023
 Wednesday 21 February 2024 (to consider the budget)
 Wednesday 15 May 2024 (Annual meeting)

11. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

None.

12. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN HAS DECIDED TO TAKE AS URGENT

None.

13. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The press and public are likely to be excluded during the following items of business in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972:-

- Appointment of Trustee for a Looked After Young Person
- SEND and Inclusion Programme Partner Proposal.

4a

**Submission to LCC Cabinet****26th April 2022****Item 4: Major Road Network - Identification of the next priority corridor.**

The A6North/A6004

Hathern Parish Council has become aware of the recommendations set out here, although it has not been formally consulted. As part of the corridor in question Hathern is the only village on this section not to have a by-pass and so all through traffic travels via the village itself. Currently Hathern is a bottleneck by nature of the volume of traffic using the road, especially at peak time, with tail backs regularly reaching the Epinal Way in one direction and onto the dual carriageway toward Kegworth in the other direction. This is exacerbated by the necessary pedestrian and junction traffic lights, the unnecessary change in speed limits on different sections of the road and the ever-increasing number of access points for new housing developments and business sites along this stretch.

The short sightedness in planning road infrastructure is also a contributing factor. The opportunity was there in the past to by-pass Hathern but the Local Authorities failed to act on that. The Highways Authority, who approve access to the A6 from new developments in Hathern (there have been 6 substantial developments in recent years), continually say that these will have no undue effect on traffic flow. One case in point is the new roundabout, currently being constructed to allow for the main entrance to the 3,500 house Garendon Estate development. This will put an additional and significant number of vehicles onto the A6 and, together with the disruptive nature of roundabouts anyway (compared to the situation previously here), substantially increase the problems associated with congestion on the section through the village.

It is extremely difficult to see what mitigation measures can be put in place to resolve the issues that are evident here without having a negative impact on residents. For example, altering the phasing on traffic light at junctions to favour (even further) through traffic will have an impact on residents trying to get onto the A6. A further concern is that any improvement to the flow of traffic down-stream in the corridor will create even more of a



bottleneck in Hathern unless effective and resident sympathetic mitigation measures are applied through the village section as well.

Hathern Parish Council is seriously concerned that by designating the A6 North as a priority MRN corridor there is significant potential to actually create more traffic problems for Hathern to the detriment of users and residents alike.

Roy Dann, Chair Hathern Parish Council

4b

Submission to Cabinet
26th April 2022



From Max Hunt, Loughborough NW,
Labour Group Transport Spokesperson

Item 4: Major Road Network - Identification of the next priority corridor.

There are three main reasons to treat this with great caution. Firstly, LCC has had great difficulty in controlling costs of large road projects. Secondly, that the selection is made on limited desktop considerations, disregarding costs. And finally, as experience shows, we simply can't build our way out of congestion.

“Be careful what you wish for”

The offers made under RIS2 look enticing but, as the County Council knows to its cost, the Government's Road investment strategy does not cover its costs. Estimates must be made early, and costs escalate through the life of the project. Contributions from Local Planning Authorities can create deadlock, as we know, and developers' contributions appear to shrink while taxpayer contributions grow. The Cabinet will recall in June 2019 they were told two weeks before contractors were due the A512 site that a legal agreement on costs had still not been secured and more public funds had to be backfilled later.

Even Leicester City needs more than 20 points!

The selection process is too simple ending on a count of 20. With only one to be chosen, there are too many rejected on the slimmest of margins - as well as Kibworth at the bottom who made the strongest plea.

There are only two areas considered, and they are based on (a) speed and (b) proximity to journey attractors. There is no consideration of the **land available** or **compulsory purchases**, nor **ground conditions** nor other engineering aspects. There is absolutely no consideration of **carbon savings** or any **alternative routes**. Nor, crucially, was there consideration of **future traffic volumes**, highway **safety** and **air quality** once current capacity increases.

Under the circumstances, a decision based on such limited criteria at this stage could be described as reckless without much greater assurance that the selected project would not lead to greater costs on the taxpayer.

The dream of “the open road”

It is impossible to simply build your way out of peak hour congestion. This is because extra capacity is quickly filled by additional traffic and traffic migrating from other less attractive roads and into peak time. As soon as we see an empty road, we seem to want to fill it. Transport engineers know this, and it's called *induced travel* demand.

Every road we have widened or improved has either become congested or has created two further congested roads – one at each end. The belief in '*predict and provide*' has long since been blown, not least because it became unaffordable.

All our district Local Plans contain clear policies for low carbon sustainable growth with maximum access to public transport and active travel and should be held to that. However, the criteria used in this desktop exercise assume that Sustainable Urban Extensions and other large developments aren't sustainable at all if they depend almost exclusively on the private car.

Even though most businesses have travel plans, and this includes the major employers in the county, many of these are not enforced or reviewed over time. Meanwhile the County Council has no parking strategy, no answer to WPL, our bus services are in pieces, and, for that matter, there is no transport strategy for the freeport. In Leicestershire, active travel is an expression of hopelessness at best and, at worst, an invitation to join the increasing injury statistics for Vulnerable Road Users. Our Local Transport Plan is out of date.

I would urge Cabinet members to spend just a few minutes looking at slides produced for Worcestershire County Council on the question of traffic congestion before agreeing to bid for another underfunded major road upgrade.

<https://worcestershire.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s20260/Item%206%20Congestion%20Presentation.pdf>

Thank you.

4c

Submission to Cabinet

26th April 2022

From Max Hunt CC, Betty Newton CC

Item 4: The A6North/A6004 Option

Cabinet members will know that for the majority of the distance of this corridor it is a fast dual carriageway held up only at peak time at the A46, Loughborough and Hathern.

So the plan attempts to speed traffic through:

- the 40mph limited route through the town of Loughborough.
- The busy local shopping centre at Shelthorpe
- The passage of pedestrians and cyclists to and from the university campus.
- Nine large roundabouts and several more protected crossings
- The existing high volume of traffic through Hathern village itself

Even if it was possible 'speeding up' the traffic through Loughborough or Hathern in the peak hours would have a very negative impact on street scene, as well as the amenity and accessibility for people living in Loughborough and Hathern. The increase in traffic created by the plan would be to the detriment of air quality, road safety and noise in residential, commercial and educational environments.

If current practice is followed works are likely to be focused on widening junctions and carriageways but these offer considerable difficulties in this urban and constrained environment.

The report suggests that as a Major Road the route would carry traffic to and from the developments at M1 Junction 24. But the M1 already takes that traffic and its intersections have recently been hugely upgraded with massive investment. If the route has been chosen to relieve the motorway, then it should be openly admitted in the report.

New homes are referred to in the report, but there is no agreement of collateral funding from developers and those with the Garendon and north Birstall (Broadnook) site have already been concluded, or are nearing conclusion.

It must be remembered that the County Council has very recently paid for improvements to the Forest Road Roundabout and before that with the Town Centre Inner Relief Road which took traffic out of the town centre.

When the Garendon SUE was planned we asked for the Ashby Road/Epinal way roundabout to be improved to take traffic from the development. With all the tools and data at their disposal the County Council found this to be unnecessary, save for some minor works by the developer.

Hathern is threatened with more traffic and congestion by this scheme, as presented to Midlands Connect for their approval. We urge you to study Hathern Parish Council's submission in addition to ours before taking a hasty decision.

Thank you.

4d

CABINET MEETING ON 26 APRIL 2022 - AGENDA ITEM 4**MAJOR ROAD NETWORK - IDENTIFICATION OF THE NEXT PRIORITY CORRIDOR****COMMENTS FROM MR. JOHN MARRIOTT**

I note there is a report going to Cabinet on 26th April, Major Road Network - Identification of the Next Priority Corridor. The purpose of this is to increase the capacity of the road network which would facilitate an increase in traffic.

In another Cabinet report on the Net Zero Carbon 2045 Roadmap for Leicestershire, Theme 1 of the Action Plan is to reduce vehicle mileage. The Action Plan fails to note the extent to which poorly designed and badly located new development has contributed to increasing traffic and will continue to do so for decades.

These two reports are therefore not compatible.

Identification of Next MRN Corridor

Appendix A to the MRN Cabinet report is an attempt at a pseudo-technical approach to making such a decision using a very crude scoring system applied to "Conditional outputs" and "Economic Objectives" suggested by Midlands Connect. In the Director's report to the Scrutiny Commission this is referred to as a "comprehensive scoring framework", but this belies both the factors used and the crudeness of the scoring system.

Under Resource Implications it states that there is potentially £200,000 available for study work in 2022/23 but a suggestion that a business case could cost "millions of pounds" with no guarantee of funding for any proposal. In fact the prospects already look poor before the reality of climate change is factored in.

The recommended priority is the A6(N) from Leicester City boundary to the M1 at Kegworth (J24), including the A6004 through Loughborough.

A bit of history

A bypass for A6 Trunk Road Loughborough was approved by the Department of Transport in the 1930s. Part of this was built as a dual carriageway between Ashby Road and Alan Moss Road in the 60s but the rest was abandoned for use as a trunk road bypass. Charnwood subsequently approved development over the alignment north of Warwick Way without informing the County Council. When the County Council found out it was furious.

Subsequently the remainder of the bypass route was prioritised in a 1979 Loughborough Highway Review for use as a local road. This became Epinal Way, which opened in stages during the 80s, connecting Warwick Way to Park Road. The Quorn-Mountsorrel bypass opened in 1991 and was constructed as a trunk road. Epinal Way was later extended from Park Road to Quorn to join up with the Quorn-Mountsorrel bypass.

When the Department decided to de-trunk the A6 the County Council was given an assurance that it would look at a bypass for Loughborough. A scheme was developed during the 1990s for a route that wriggled its way past the railway station to avoid the SSSI and flood plain east of the town. A few weeks before this was due to go to public consultation the government scrapped numerous bypass schemes, including Loughborough.

The remainder of the route has numerous constraints including Birstall and Hathern, although Kegworth now has a bypass. The A46/A6 junction, north of Birstall, is an obvious constraint, which is likely to get much worse given the scale of car-dependent development that has been permitted across the County.

The report also contains a reference to Charnwood Local Plan modelling. The extensiveness of this modelling work shows clearly that the pressure of development is already such that traffic growth will far outstrip any realistic funding for any infrastructure led approach. Ninety years after a bypass was first proposed for Loughborough there is no prospect of any solution to reduce traffic in the town.

Role of the A6 between Leicester and Kegworth

I suggest there is virtually no traffic that uses this route from end to end, not least because of the constraints at Loughborough. In terms of providing a link from Loughborough to the developments around the M1 / A50, then Hathern is a significant constraint with no obvious solution. The Garendon and Shepshed developments will both affect this area adversely.

The Charnwood Local Plan proposes significant development around the south of Loughborough and in the Soar Valley, in addition to Broadnook and Thorpebury. Leicester City Council is proposing even more development at Beaumont Leys adding to the traffic through Thurgate which is already avoiding the A6 through Birstall.

The close proximity of the M1 to Loughborough at Junction 23 means that this is the obvious alternative for travelling north and south from much of Loughborough. However, the pressure from all the development at Garendon Park, the Science Park and in Shepshed looks set to swamp Junction 23. The expensive works there seem to have achieved very little. This has been recognised in some of the modelling work for the Charnwood Local Plan, which suggested further improvements, but of course the traffic impacts extend over a much wider area. There is now virtually no opportunity for significant developer funding from this area as all the major sites have been approved with very little attempt to reduce the traffic generated by them.

There seems to be no prospect for increasing bus use unless the Government acknowledges that a major reform is needed to the way bus services are planned and funded together with ensuring that developments are put in places where they can be served efficiently by bus and designed to support bus use.

A Suggestion

At some stage the Government will have to reconcile its climate change commitments with its aspirations to allow seemingly unfettered development

regardless of its implications for increasing traffic. The MRN report makes it clear that funding is limited and it is far from clear what may emerge.

Loughborough, being a compact university town, would be an ideal place to demonstrate what could be achieved with a strong commitment to making cycling attractive and safe. It works very well in the Netherlands and Denmark and there's no reason why it couldn't here given the will.

Forget chasing money for roads that will make things worse, especially when essentially only crumbs are on the table, and start to tackle climate change by reducing the traffic from new developments. Demonstrate that cycling is the quickest, cheapest and most effective way to achieve it by making it safe and convenient.

Regards

John Marriott (author of the 1979 Loughborough Highway Review)

This page is intentionally left blank