



# STOCKPORT

METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

## **Stockport public Cycle User Group**

Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 6pm

Stockport Town Hall

### **PRESENT**

Geoff Abell (SMBC Councillor) **GA**  
Ian Barker (TPT ranger) **IB**  
Iain Bate (SMBC) **IBS**  
Dave Butler (GMCC) **DB**  
Kathy England (Sustrans) **KE**  
Steve Essex **SE**  
Jonathon Fingland (GMCC) **JF**  
Nick Harris (GMCC) **NH**  
Roger Hubbard (South Manchester CTC) **RH**  
Charlie Hulme (local cyclist) **CH**  
Joanna Hulme (local cyclist) **JH**  
Norman Lowndes (local cyclist) **NL**  
Don Naylor (SMBC)(chair) **DN**  
Iain Roberts (SMBC Councillor) **IR**  
Nick Robinson (SMBC) **NR**  
Andy Shaw (SCCC) **AS**  
Dominic Smith (TfGM) **DS**  
Sue Stevenson (SMBC) **SS**  
Ian Tate **IT**  
John Taylor (SMBC Councillor) **JT**

### **APOLOGIES**

Councillor Butler, Keith Rogers, Linda Rogers, John Brown, Edgar Ernstbrunner, Jim Pritchett, Anthony Horne, Max Wild

## **1. An Introduction to the Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign (GMCC)**

- 1.1 The GMCC is concerned with all aspects of cycling in and around Greater Manchester, and is involved in lobbying TfGM and local authorities on such matters as infrastructure design and provision as well as promoting cycling from a public health point of view, noting that it can help address issues from air pollution and congestion to unhealthy lifestyles.
- 1.2 Several specific policies were discussed including “Protected Space for Cycling” (see GMCC website <http://www.gmcc.org.uk/space-for-cycling-policy-6-asks/>) and “Unified Provision”
- 1.3 GMCC feel we should be promoting “Cycling rather than Cyclists”, and should encourage more public support for cycling via friends and families of cyclists lobbying political representatives. GMCC website: <http://www.gmcc.org.uk/>
- 1.4 It was noted that the recent Bike Life Report (<http://www.sustrans.org.uk/bike-life/greater-manchester>) indicated an increase in levels of cycling/interest in cycling
- 1.5 **IR** responded that cyclists have one of a number of perspectives and that there may be tensions between users (pedestrians/equestrians and cyclists), compromises on levels of provision, compromise between purpose (ie an end to end facility of medium quality or short high quality segments)
- 1.6 GMCC commented that new infrastructure should be for new cyclists and not just cater for existing experienced cyclists. Levels of safety need to be higher. There ensued a discussion of varying needs and infrastructure.
- 1.7 There was further comment that Bristol created space for cycling by identifying and mapping their network in advance, and engaging the community was a key strategy.

- 1.8 The Council is starting work on a new cycling strategy, which GMCC welcomed as a positive move. Consultation will be a key part of formulating this.
- 1.9 GMCC's final comment was that they are looking at more locality engagement with members, and that there were events that were purely social in nature as well as campaigning.

## 2. **A6MARR mitigation measures**

Presented by Sue Stevenson (SMBC) based on PDF mapping shown on screen.

- 2.1 There was a query about CUG input. SS welcomed input but pointed out that intensive local consultation was already in progress.
- 2.2 It was asked if the whole of High Lane was going to be a 20mph zone? **SS** replied that the zone will include all the residential areas except Windlehurst Rd, which will be traffic calmed. There is a good local reaction to this scheme.
- 2.3 Windlehurst Rd/A6 junction
- Some general questions about the need to enlarge the junction. **SS** stated that the decision was based on a capacity prediction. The value of the 'new dedicated lane' sign was recognised. **DS** (TfGM) suggested adding cycle logos to the 'left turning' lane to underscore that same message
- 2.4 A6 shared path

**Q:** How wide is it? SS felt that it will be 3m; some wondered whether it is going to be that wide at the E end, as the drawing was a little unclear.

There was also some concern around how close to HGVs a cyclist may be if passing another cyclist in the opposite direction. **DS** (TfGM) shared that 3m is well above the absolute 2.5m design guide minimum for a 2-way cycle path. He also stated that there are infrastructure examples where the carriageway width has been set, and then all the remaining space is used for walking and cycling.

**Q:** How would a west-bound cyclist access the path from the A6 carriageway? There have been discussions re providing a crossing, with a further suggestion of creating an access via the Middlewood Way (MWW) road tunnel.

There was a suggestion that we level out the 'roller coaster' ride created by driveway access points

It is intended to improve access to the MWW from the NW corner of the A6 bridge

**Q:** Can the link be extended further towards High Lane? **SS** commented that options are being looked at-we aspire to connect to Windlehurst Rd

At various points during the meeting, including within this agenda item, there were concerns expressed relating to the limitations of shared-use paths

**SS** asked for comments within the next few weeks.

## 2.5 Threaphurst Lane Quiet Lane scheme

There was some questioning of the general principle and, once understood, querying whether this was an appropriate application of it

The words 'rat run' were mentioned. **SS** outlined some of the options rejected by the local community, particularly various types of traffic calming. GMP are unwilling to endorse a 20mph zone *without* traffic calming. They would like the zone to be self-enforcing, as they do not wish to enforce it.

Reasons for this part of the scheme were queried. **SS** stated that the road has no footways but is used by pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists.

There was comment around the exact way that farmers are moving livestock along all stretches

There was a suggestion that Torkington Rd was more of a problem. **SS** agreed that there were issues and stated that measures would be implemented, but pointed out that one of the farms runs a business with a high level of HGV traffic so it wouldn't be straightforward.

## 2.6 Gillbent Rd (Cheadle Hulme)

This scheme is out to consultation-comments welcome

It was asked whether there is going to be any facility for pedestrians crossing Stanley Rd. **SS** replied that there is nothing currently in the scheme but comments are welcome.

More refs to 'the shortcomings' of shared use paths

More refs to the 'hazards' of numerous driveways and the several side roads

**Q:** Where is the continuity at Stanley Rd? There was a comment that the half width layby doesn't properly provide a solution

The benefits to nearby schools of the proposals, particularly the toucan were noted – this seemed to be accepted

**Q:** will traffic would increase in Hazel Grove? **SS** said possibly, but as a result of increased housing/population in Cheshire East and Derbyshire, not because of this scheme.

### 3 **CCAG and TfGM updates-Dominic Smith (PowerPoint presentation)**

- 3.1 There was mention that the route maps for the new cycleways missed an opportunity by failing to highlight many of the links/destinations from the new routes. **DS** responded that there is now a new Lead for active travel at TfGM, who is working on developing a network plan with a more strategic approach.
- 3.2 The issue of the Abney Hall entrance on Manchester Rd was again raised, stating that it is unsafe. There are continuing SMBC internal discussions about this issue.
- 3.3 It was raised that the Ladybrook Valley is a rural environment-one of a number of Landscape Character Areas in Stockport. This designation may make it unsuitable for development by CCAG2. How does TfGM reconcile its plans with this designation? **SS** this scheme is subject to planning approval which will balance the merits of development with the character of the area.  
**Q:** will there be a working area beyond the actual scheme footprint? **SS** yes, but the land will be reinstated  
**Q:** will there be independent ecological assessment? **SS** there are statutory consultees for these schemes
- 3.4 The Ashton Canal has speed humps along the towpath. Can they be removed? **DS** due to the mix of users and the constrained geometry the speed humps are there to encourage safe riding in certain areas.  
It was noted that the Regent's Canal (London) has no humps, and that there were few problems there.

### 4 **AoB**

Is there an update on Didsbury Rd? Action from last minutes not yet completed.

5 **Agenda items not considered:**

- a. Last meeting minutes and matters arising
- b. TCAP and Growth Fund Updates

6 **Meeting closed 8pm. Next meetings: Thurs 17<sup>th</sup> November (sub group) Thurs 8<sup>th</sup> December (full meeting)**