

CYCLE USER GROUP
THURSDAY 10th JANUARY 2013
DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees:

Richard Clark, Road Safety Manager, SMBC (Chair) **RC**
 Iain Roberts, Executive Councillor (Economic Development and Regeneration) – part meeting **IR**
 Stuart Bodsworth, Executive Councillor and Cycling Champion – part meeting **SB**
 Don Naylor, Cycling Officer, SMBC **DN**
 Charlie Hulme, cyclist **CH**
 Joanna Hulme, cyclist **JH**
 Kathy England, TPT Sustrans Ranger **KE**
 Merlin Evans, Cycle Stockport **ME**
 Keith Rogers **KR**
 Darren Allgood, Macclesfield Mountain Biking **DA**
 Mike Roberts CTC (Macclesfield) **MR**
 Mike Beanland, Poynton Pedallers **MB**
 Janet Bellingall **JB**
 Jim Court, Stockport Community Cycling Club (SCCC) **JiC**
 Joan Bennett, CTC & Sustrans **JBe**
 Nathan Messer, Sustrans Ranger **NM**
 Roy Bradshaw, CTC **RB**
 Stuart Johnson, Cycle Stockport **SJ**
 Ian Tate, Love Your Bike **IT**

Apologies:

Ernest Nama, Senior Public Rights of Way (PRoW) officer, SMBC **EN**
 Edgar Ernstbrunner **EE**
 Norman Lowndes, cyclist **NL**
 Janet Cuff, Ramblers and cyclist **JaC**
 Miranda Galloway **MG**
 Dave Swindells **DS**

Item	Issue	Action
1.0	Apologies, previous minutes and matters arising	
1.1	Apologies were received from: Edgar Ernstbrunner, Janet Cuff, Miranda Galloway, Norman Lowndes and Dave Swindells	
1.2	The minutes from November 14 th 2012 were agreed to be accurate	
1.3	<u>Matters arising from the November meeting</u> 1.0 The group was further reminded that the current consultation window for the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road closes on January 25th 2.2 See Item 2, below 3.2 Preliminary design work is now underway – more cycle parking ideas, in particular, are welcome 3.3 See Item 4, below	
1.4	A further discussion ensued on aspects of the proposed Relief Road	
1.5	CH and RB voiced concern in relation to PRoW upgrades from footpath to bridleway, including the surface material used – there may be aspects that would not be ideal for cycling. IR responded that this approach would be likelier to deliver more usable links on budget, and so would represent the best future-proofed approach.	

1.6	IT and CH expressed views that the delivery of SEMMMS seems to be very car-orientated, with little focus outside the ‘geographical envelope’ of the proposed Relief Road, and does nothing to deliver an ‘enjoyable cycle route out to the hills’. IR and SB commented that considerable SEMMMS-funded work for other modes has already been undertaken; nevertheless, the current consultation concerns a major piece of infrastructure, and so will have a higher public profile.	
1.7	ME had seen a reference to a predicted increase in road deaths as a consequence of the proposed scheme, and asked for further information on this	RC / DN
1.8	RB was unsure of the effectiveness, generally, of cross-boundary working between neighbouring Local Authorities. IR responded by noting that Stockport had approached Manchester City Council (MCC) at the time of bidding for Cycle Safety funding, regarding measures along the A34 corridor. MCC, although interested, had other locations felt to be more of a priority in the context of Cycle Safety	DN
1.9	RB asked if Stockport Council is able to pass on concern relating to the ‘Airport Orbital’ cycle route. Not everyone present agreed that there are particular problems with this route, but DN suggested that individuals may wish to raise such concerns at the Manchester Cycle Forum, and that a copy of these minutes will be forwarded to the MCC officer cycling representative.	
2.0	Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) and other Rights of Way issues	
2.1	It was reported to the meeting that RC, DN and EN have discussed and agreed an outline procedure for changing the status of a PRoW to enable the promotion of cycling along it.	
2.2	KE had already undertaken considerable research to identify Kings Reach landowners (in the context of that section of the TPT), with findings now passed on to DN for SMBC actioning. It was discussed and agreed that this takes precedent over any similar project, including Cow La or Bradshaw Hall La	DN
2.3	Further discussion took place on the suitability for horses of part of this link if its status changed to that of bridleway. From a cycling perspective, it was understood that this status offers a more permanent solution in comparison to a permissive route for cycling	
2.4	KE shared information from Manchester City Council that the section of the TPT alongside the nearly-completed East Didsbury Metrolink stop is expected to re-open at the same time as the commencement of tram running.	
2.5	Surfacing improvements are continuing along the Tiviot Way to Brinnington tunnel section; KE has submitted an annual condition survey to the TPT office in Barnsley	
3.0	Cycle Parking proposals (Town Centre, Grand Central and Hazel Grove station)	
3.1	<u>Grand Central</u> Two meetings additional to CUG have been held, involving IR, KE, DN, Pete Abel, Sue Stevenson, RC, and representatives for SMBC Regeneration and for the developer. The meeting was happy for this working group to continue to report back.	
3.2	The ‘footprint’ of the space available for any cycle store is now defined; this level of change came about via the planning process. Lockers and changing facilities are under consideration, but the availability of water within the multi-storey car park (and so the cycle storage area) is unlikely.	
3.3	DN raised the likelihood of a layout involving a combination of Sheffield stands and 2-	

	<p>tier stands, with the need for an emphasis on quality products and ease of use / accessibility. The group remains unconvinced on the desirability of using 2-tier stands (including some models being heavy), and wishes to see as much emphasis as possible put on the use of Sheffield stands. The option of wall rails was also suggested.</p>	
3.4	<p>SMBC Regeneration has emphasised that opportunities for further cycle facilities, including access to showers can be expected to feature in later stages of the wider grand central development.</p>	
3.5	<p><u>Hazel Grove</u> The group agreed the strong desirability of having anything provided here to be as compatible as possible with the other proposed cycle stores, for ease of use by local cyclists. This would require dialogue between all involved parties: Northern Rail, SMBC, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) and CUG representatives.</p>	
3.6	<p>It is understood that an initial proposal is for the Hazel Grove facility to closely resemble those now available at many Merseyrail stations; RC also circulated photos of the installation at Stoke station, and commented on practicalities of using the upper-level racks.</p>	
3.7	<p>KR commented that the TfGM Bicycle Locker User Club (BLUC) lockers are another option currently available. DN believed that usage of these lockers continues to be low, possibly on account of various aspects that make them relatively complex to use.</p>	
3.8	<p><u>Town Centre</u> Nothing had changed since the last meeting, with a proposed location near the eastern end of Bridgefield St.</p>	
4.0	<p>Bids for cycle funding</p>	
4.1	<p><u>Cycle safety fund.</u> DN updated the group, confirming that a bid had been submitted to the DfT via Sustrans on Nov 30th. Proposed measures for Manchester Rd (Cheadle to Parrs Wood, B5095) were added to the package, entailing a proposal to extend the 30mph limit northwards from Cheadle.</p>	
4.2	<p>Responding to IT, DN repeated that a more comprehensive option to make the entire road would not gain general support, including that of the Police.</p>	
4.3	<p>IT requested that this view be re-visited, and that the additional effect of ad hoc parking in the vicinity of the playing fields be taken into account</p>	DN / RC
4.4	<p>For reference to a further funding submission, see Post-meeting note 1</p>	
5.0	<p>Disley to Poynton cycle route proposal; Peak District Travel Survey results</p>	
5.1	<p>JBe introduced herself, including in her role as a Sustrans Ranger (for NCN route 68), and the issue for which a solution is being sought: the high degree of severance between Disley and Poynton for those wishing to undertake car-free journeys.</p>	
5.2	<p>JBe and MB circulated plans showing a potential cycle link between the two communities, passing through Lyme Park and connecting with the Middlewood Way, and invited comment from the group. SJ and others remarked that similar alternatives exist where gradients may not be as challenging.</p>	
5.3	<p>JBe felt that next steps are likely to include seeking support from Disley Parish and Poynton Town Councils. With regard to the stance that the National Trust might adopt,</p>	

	KR referred to the case of Erdigg Hall near Wrexham – a National Trust property which has cycle routes within its parkland.	
5.4	The fact that Sarah Storey is a Disley resident was felt to be potentially useful with progressing the proposal. It was agreed to circulate JBe’s information with meeting minutes	DN
5.5	Copies of the Peak District Travel Survey were circulated, and the particular reference to the carriage of bikes on buses noted. See Post-meeting note 2	
6.0	Other scheme updates, including Stockport Council / TfGM cycling developments	
6.1	Possible changes to the structure of adult cycle training available via TfGM’s commuter cycling project will be further discussed with District cycle reps on Jan 31st, including a review of how Learn to Ride may be incorporated in the programme.	
6.2	MR noted that the CTC Cycle Digest also refers to a recent Learn to Ride guide	
6.3	A new edition of the Greater Manchester cycle maps will be published during the spring	
6.4	There was discussion around recent changes to the layout of New Moor Lane, including to the section of path used by pedestrians and cyclists, which connects with the A6. Although the length of this path has been shortened, there was a general view that it would function satisfactorily as shared (rather than segregated) use. It was understood that the ‘pinchpoint’ on the actual corner with the A6 cannot be resolved as part of the current scheme.	
7.0	Any other business	
7.1	JiC advised the group that SCCC has concerns over the misuse of some smart-phone apps, which are able to identify cyclists’ homes through the sharing of route or ride information. Whilst this is unlikely to be a problem uniquely affecting cyclists, people may wish to take some precautions.	
7.2	<u>Future CUG dates</u> Sub group: April 10 th and June 13 th CUG: May 16 th and July 10 th	

Post-meeting notes

- 1) In response to an invitation from Sustrans / the DfT, an additional ‘Connections to the Trans Pennine Trail: East Didsbury Metrolink stop to Edgeley’ outline bid was submitted during Dec 2012. It was announced in late Jan 2013 that £80k of funding had been successfully achieved.
- 2) On January 30th, the Government announced a further £42m investment in cycling: ‘Cycle City Ambition Grants’, and an element covering National Parks