

---

## Meeting Notes

Project: **Canal Corridor North, Lancaster**

Meeting: **Master Plan – Highways Workshop**

Location: **Lancashire County Council, Preston**

Time: **12.00**

Date: **Wednesday, 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2005**

Attending:

Paul Stocker (PS)	- Mayer Brown
Asa Plant (AP)	- Mayer Brown
Ian Reay (IR)	- Reay and Co.
Clive Holt (CH)	- Lancashire County Council (Highways DC Officer)
John Burgess (JB)	- Lancashire County Council (Modelling/Traffic Impact)
Neil Stevens (NS)	- Lancashire County Council (Modelling/Traffic Impact)
Alasdair Simpson (AS)	- Lancashire County Council (Cycle Strategy)
Andy Whitlam (AW)	- Lancashire County Council (Public Transport)
Chris Amos (CA)	- Lancaster City Council (Engineering)
Nick Howard (NH)	- Lancaster City Council (Air Quality)
Jason Kennedy (JK)	- Lancaster City Council (Urban Design)
David Hopwood (DH)	- Lancaster City Council (Car Parks)

Circulate: All present + Andrew Dobson – Lancaster City Council

### Key Items Discussed

It was identified / confirmed that there is limited scope for highways improvements and therefore improving non car access to the site will be key to providing a sustainable and successful development on this site.

#### 1.0 Cycle / Pedestrian Access

##### 1.1 High percentage of people walk and cycle to work in Lancaster

- Walk to work – 15-20%
- Cycle to work – 4%

##### 1.2 Highest cycle usage on the north and west side of Lancaster towards Morecambe

##### 1.3 Previously been a tendency to ‘cherry pick’ the easier routes, however the more difficult issues now need tackling

##### 1.4 Council strategy is to use the alternative ‘back streets’ through the centre where possible

- 
- 1.5 Desire for pedestrian linkages through the Kingsway site connecting to possible contra-flow cycle route along Phoenix Street via Caton Road / Bulk Road
  - 1.6 Desire for a cross-town route along Church Street. Funding in place for cycle lane from Moor Lane to Church Street, Damside Street to Chapel Street and Phoenix Street link, possibly connecting to a bridge across the canal discussed linking to Bathmill Square. Possible issue of disabled and cycle access for a bridge due to objections from boat owners
  - 1.7 Link to Millenium Bridge and Millenium Path – Bridge carries approx. 2000 peds / day
  - 1.8 Agreed there is limited opportunity to improve cycle facilities on the ring road
  - 1.9 Links to towpath route to Aldcliffe Bridge should be explored from the site. East side of canal – pedestrian / cycle improvements funded by Persimmon Homes Development
  - 1.10 Agreed Master plan should include cycle links to the edges of the development site with strategic cycle parking provided at the main access points
  - 1.11 Possible cycle hire scheme at any new 'park and ride' car park
  - 1.12 Agreed Council pedestrian / cycle proposal plans to be forwarded **ACTION: Jason Kennedy**
  
  - 2.0 **Public Transport**
  - 2.1 St. Leonards Gate was discussed as possible route for bus use – agreed issues with route to bus station and that existing route to the bus station from the north felt to be most efficient
  - 2.2 County Council has programme to upgrade services as part of the 'quality bus route' and 'kickstart' schemes
  - 2.3 Desire for good pedestrian access from the site to bus station and links through Phoenix Street to bus routes, with possible bus stop improvements on Parliament Street - maintenance funding and capital funding would be sought as part of any contribution
  - 2.4 County Council require more information on the development proposals before providing 'ball park' contribution figures. However it was reported that the Fishergate Centre has made a contribution of £400K towards public transport improvements
  - 2.5 Agreed any future 'Park and Ride' should be located on key corridors such as Caton Road
  - 2.6 No 'Park and Ride' sites formally identified as yet, although ties in with Air Quality issues
  - 2.7 Bus service from train station to development to be considered
-

- 
- 2.8** Desire for bus service information to be displayed within the development site as part of Travel plan
- 2.9** Reported no Town Centre Travel Plan at present - Possibility for an on-line Travel Plan to be investigated
- 3.0** **Scope of TA / Modelling**
- 3.1** NS agreed TRICS not appropriate to estimate traffic attraction – agreed development traffic flows should be based on the town centre’s existing traffic profile, which can be based upon the town’s existing car park usage and the town’s current main traffic generators. The profile can then be applied to the development’s proposed parking provision
- 3.2** TA to show traffic impact with and without mitigating measures
- 3.3** Investigation of pass-by trips required
- 3.4** NS reported no progress made on town centre PARAMICS model which has been validated but not tested
- 3.5** PS proposed Mayer Brown to help Council with town centre model – NS agreed it would be sensible for any modelling to use the Council’s town centre model. NS agreed to confirm the availability of the model to Mayer Brown ASAP, in order to assess various highway improvements – **ACTION Neil Stevens**
- 3.6** NS stated that town centre model would also require checking by a third party consultant
- 3.7** Additional TRANSYT modelling will be required
- 3.8** NS and JB to confirm as soon as possible the scope of junctions to be modelled and data collected however classified volumetric turning counts and queue lengths will be required. Counts to be carried out late January / early February 2006 – **Action Neil Stevens**
- 3.9** JB requested that modelling takes account of the immediate access onto the network and the ring road system as a whole
- 3.10** NS agreed that a high proportion of traffic is through traffic and a gravity model will be required for the development traffic
- 3.11** Improvements to the SCOOT system may be required, JB has SCOOT information available
-

**3.12** Management of car park access – JB proposed bollard system to restrict queuing onto highway network

**3.13** Rat-running problem through site and Ridge Estate discussed – number plate trace required through the site to ascertain extent of the problem

**3.14** JB stated no committed money available for Variable Message Signing (VMS)

**4.0 Town Centre Car Parking**

**4.1** City Council currently developing 'Draft Car Park Strategy'

**4.2** Main aims of the draft strategy:

- number of spaces to be maintained and not increased
- number of short-stay spaces to be gradually increased
- improve quality of off-street parking

**4.3** Improved / relocated coach parking facility will be required

**4.4** No detail on 'park and ride' in the draft strategy at present

**4.5** Coach parking could possibly be linked with a 'park and ride' location

**4.6** Auction Mart car park located to the southern section of the ring road has the worst facilities and is a possible 'traffic interceptor' location. Possible redevelopment to accommodate a multi-storey car park with improved access arrangements

**4.7** Increased development parking provision may provide opportunities to redevelop existing parking stock

**4.8** Multi-storey car park would be 1<sup>st</sup> phase of development construction – thereby reducing impact during development period

**4.9** Ratios of parking / town centre development to be assessed

**4.10** Funding Issue – Asset Management Strategy

**5.0 Air Quality**

**5.1** N.H. role is to find air quality problems and advise people such as N.S.

**5.2** Lancaster air quality situation is improving, however is light on data / facts

**5.3** Currently 50/50 whether will exceed government targets at one or two residential locations

- 
- 5.4** Air quality measured at residential frontages, approximately 10-12 monitoring stations around town
- 5.5** Modelling assessment being carried out
- 5.6** City centre low on residential development
- 5.7** Through traffic a problem, unlikely to be solved
- 5.8** Not obliged by law to meet targets / objectives, however must 'be seen to be trying'
- 5.9** Development Control to have final say in weighing up the issues
- 5.10** Not looking for a single solution, however interested in bolder solutions
- 5.11** Planning Policy Statement – residential to be located near city centre nodes
- 5.12** Air Quality Assessment will be required as per recent developments:
- Lancaster property Network – Bulk Road Site
  - Cromwell Building
- 6.0 Summary**
- 6.1** Non-car access to the site considered to be key to providing sustainable development
- 6.2** Heynsham Link Road - application submitted mid-December  
- unlikely to have a major impact (relief) on ring road
- 6.3** Consolidation of car parks may result in localised air quality benefits
- 6.4** No localised air quality strategy
- 6.5** Alfred Street alleviates some gyratory traffic
- 6.6** University expansion, if committed, will need to be taken account if in the TA
- 6.7** Associated developments, which will also need to be included in the TA
- Luneside East – Committed
  - Kingsway – Committed
  - Luneside West – Not Committed
-

