

STEERING GROUP MEETING FOR CYCLING DEMONSTRATION TOWN PROJECT

NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 03 JULY 2006

RECEPTION ROOM, LANCASTER TOWN HALL

PRESENT:

Alasdair Simpson	(AS)	Lancashire County Council
John Leach	(JL)	Dynamo
Donald Read (part)	(DR)	MBPCT
Dick Follows	(DF)	Dynamo
Mike Hutchinson	(MH)	CTC
Kathy Bashford	(KB)	Sustrans
Jonathan Sear	(JS)	Lancaster University
Paul Darlington	(PD)	Cycle Aid
Matt Hodges	(MH)	CTC
John Whitelegg (part)	(JW)	Sustainable Transport Advisor
Peter Loker	(PL)	Corporate Director (Community Services), LCC
Ron Eckersley	(RE)	Engineering Services, LCC
Gary Bowker	(BG)	Engineering Services, LCC
Rachel Scott	(RS)	Economic Development, LCC
Steph Lucas		Notetaker, LCC

		ACTION
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Jim Robson, Area Manager (North) Lancashire County Council Alison Page, Pedal Power Councillor Gina Dowding, Cabinet Member – Partnerships/Sustainability</p>	
2.	<p>MINUTES OF 05 JUNE 2006 MEETING</p> <p>JL pointed out the omission regarding discussion on Community Chest. It was agreed that “The meeting discussed the schemes submitted for the Community Chest. RS had prioritised the schemes which would go forward to the CDT Board for approval,” be added.</p> <p>It was further agreed that RS would email the Group with a copy of the prioritised schemes which went forward to the CDT Board.</p> <p>JL said that there was a discussion on where/when the Minutes of the Board meetings would be available to the Steering Group. JW suggested that when Steering Group minutes are circulated there should be a link to notify where/when Board minutes are available. PL agreed to ensure Board Minutes are published on the website and to notify Steering Group members when this has happened.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">RS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PSL</p>

<p>3.</p>	<p>MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>Police Bikes - JL asked for an update on the Police Bikes. RS reported that the Board had agreed to fund a further 2 bikes in the West End bringing the total to 8. Lancaster had got their bikes, Morecambe's bikes were on order and the West End bikes will take a little longer. The Board had asked for some kind of "sticker" to be displayed on the bikes and for miles/hours of use to be recorded for evaluation purposes. It was confirmed that the Media Group would be dealing with publicity</p> <p>Cycling on the Promenade - AS reported for information that the Broadway to Hest Bank part of the Promenade would need permission to convert it to a cycleway. This could be done by a Member decision by County Councillor Martin or it could go to Lancashire Locals meeting on 03 October for a decision. He will know next week what the process will be.</p> <p>PL reported that the proposed byelaw had been referred to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and was due to be referred back to Full Council meeting on 12 July, but to-date the DCLG had not come back to the Council's Legal Services. PL agreed to chase this up.</p> <p>DR told the Group of his involvement with the University Group who were researching into attitude and behavioural change which influence the uptake of walking and cycling. If Group members wished to have input they should contact DR direct.</p> <p>RS circulated the Cycling Media Monitoring Report for February to the end of June 2006.</p> <p>JL referred to JW's presentation and how this information could be used to help the Group. PL referred to the minutes where it was agreed that the Group focus on 3 or 4 strands. JW suggested that the Group look at this again in say September/October time when "best practice" had shown what works.</p> <p>RE reported that he had arranged a meeting with Network Rail and Virgin Trains to review train/cycle integration and provision at railway stations.</p>	<p>PL</p> <p>ALL</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>ROLE OF STEERING GROUP/FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS</p> <p>PL referred to the Terms of Reference agreed for the Group in February and the four main areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Internal Focus and Direction 2. External Partnerships 3. Monitoring and Evaluation 4. Dissemination of Information <p>PL to attach the Terms of Reference to these Minutes.</p> <p>Frequency of Meetings - PL suggested bi-monthly and that a schedule of dates for the coming year be produced together with a process for</p>	<p>PL</p>

	<p>production of minutes and agenda. Members to be invited to place items on the agenda and include notes or background papers. Board meetings would fit in with Steering Group meeting dates. All agreed.</p> <p>PL asked which would be the best day and time to meet. It was agreed that Fridays at 10.00 am was best. It was further agreed that 2 meetings be held at Lancaster and 2 meetings be held at Morecambe. Any rides to be arranged for the rise of these meeting. Any requests for rides to be made direct to GB.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>PL</p> <p>ALL</p>
5.	<p>TRAVEL PLANS</p> <p>School - KB circulated a list of schools who have Travel Plans – 47 out of 68 schools have approved Travel Plans. PL asked if Jane Swindlehurst from County could do a brief report for the group, it was noted that she is currently covering three areas of Lancashire. JW emphasised the importance of School Travel Plans and requested a spreadsheet be circulated to the Group with information on which schools have plans, what the schools are actually doing, e.g. cycle training, loans for bikes, how plans implemented, etc. KB to co-ordinate information for spreadsheet.</p> <p>MH commented that most schools concentrate on encouraging walking unless there are safe cycle routes. A grant of £5,000 is usually awarded to schools, which is often spent on cycle storage. KB was only working with Bike It Schools.</p> <p>DR agreed to invite his “Healthy Schools” colleague to the Group’s next meeting or ask her to produce a note on her work with schools.</p> <p>JL raised the issue of cycle training in schools and the fact that the County magazine, “Vision”, was advocating “Passport to Cycling”. AS explained that the difficulty with providing National Training Standards at non Bike it Schools was often that schools could not offer on-road training for safety reasons. Passport to Cycling scheme will become closer to the National Standard over the years.</p> <p>KB asked for ideas on how to deal with the position at Dallas Road where the Head Teacher was only able to issue 20 permits for children to cycle to school. After a discussion on this issue and more generally on how to encourage schools, it was agreed to encourage a pragmatic approach of issuing more permits than parking spaces.</p> <p>AS requested an update of what is happening at each Bike it School in next six months – KB to produce for next meeting.</p> <p>JL referred to recent Government announcement of an extra £5m per year over 3 years for a national cycling to school initiative. PL explained that the funding was for Cycling England to focus on encouraging younger people to cycle and they had been set a task of proposing how to allocate the funding.</p>	<p>KB</p> <p>DR</p> <p>KB</p>

	<p>Workplace - RS reported that interviews for Workplace Cycling Officer had taken place and a candidate selected, but still awaiting references, but hopefully would be in post in August.</p> <p>JW asked if it was possible to provide a spreadsheet of workplaces and what travel plans were in place, together with targets. RS explained the difficulty of producing this information and there was no monitoring/enforcement procedures in place. She went on to say that although some companies do not have a Workplace Travel Plan, they were actually doing good work. DR said that there was now a Workplace Health person in post who could possibly help.</p> <p>JW referred to "Residential Travel Plans" which seem to be poorly developed. He agreed to produce a note on what CDT can reasonably do on Work Place Travel Plans which would be fed into the work of the Workplace Cycling Officer.</p> <p>JS reported that along with Pedal Power there would be one day a week promotion at the University to encourage students to cycle. As the next meeting of this Group would not be until September, he asked how he could obtain funding for this promotion in time for the new academic year He was advised to circulate his proposal to the Steering Group via email for their comments and then submit his proposals to the 23 August Board meeting.</p> <p>Following discussion around planning conditions limiting parking spaces, and including more specifics, i.e. number of bike stands to be provided, together with enforcement/monitoring of the conditions, PL suggested that a Planner be invited to a future meeting.</p>	<p>JW</p> <p>JS</p> <p>PL</p>
6.	<p>LANCASTER CENTRE HIGHWAY JUNCTION PROPOSAL</p> <p>JL asked for the gyratory system to be discussed and how CDT could demonstrate how to solve the problems. GB said that a meeting had been arranged with AS, Capita and Cycling England and the gyratory system was on the agenda on how best to move forward. GB to feedback to group.</p>	<p>GB</p>
7.	<p>BOUNDARY SIGNS/SIGNING STRATEGY</p> <p>GB circulated copies of the boundary signs (10 for Lancaster and 4 for Morecambe) together with a list of locations. The group discussed the size of lettering and use of the colour green on the signs. The siting of the sign on the A6 south of Lancaster was discussed. AS advised that County would need to approve the signs.</p> <p>GB circulated photos of proposed signing. Agreed that GB would check with the Access Officer for advice on colour/background etc. The Group agreed to the signs in principle, unless the Access Officer had any objections. Discussion on whether to include times or distance on the signs. GB to check regulations and if permitted use miles and if shorter measurement needed use metres. It was noted that County need to approve the signs for the Cycleway.</p>	<p>GB</p>

	<p>GB circulated photos of Panels which could be placed at key entry points, instead of the suggested Cycling England "Arches". GB asked if the meeting agreed in principle to the Panels and if so details of content could be agreed later. The cost of each Panel was £2,500. After discussion it was agreed to leave a decision for now as not a priority and look at promoting cycle routes through other media campaigns.</p>	GB
8.	<p>GRITTING</p> <p>JL reported that there is a policy for gritting roads, but not cycle tracks. AS said County had a policy decision not to grit cycle tracks, but there is a policy to try to make the cycle tracks safer by applying a surface dressing. It was agreed this will be raised at the CDT Group meeting to see if other areas have problems/answers.</p> <p>As the area around Millennium Bridge is a busy pedestrian route as well as cycle route, it was queried if this could be a special case. GB said that pedestrian routes are not gritted unless there are two consecutive days of icing.</p>	GB
9.	<p>CYCLE AWARENESS</p> <p>JL raised this issue. RS had a brochure from PTRC which has 10 modules. She had emailed the co-ordinator for further information, but was still awaiting a reply. RS to chase this up. AS confirmed he had booked some of the modules for County.</p> <p>PL reported that the Communications Group were working on this. He suggested we target City Council Members and staff first, once we have more details. MH suggested we invite County Councillors as well.</p>	RS RS
10.	<p>CYCLE ROUTES TO THE UNIVERSITY</p> <p>Ward Member had asked for this to be considered. JS's briefing note was circulated. Prior to this meeting there had been a ride to look at the University routes. It was agreed that the preferred route was the Haverbreaks route. GB confirmed that consultation was still ongoing until end of July.</p> <p>JS requested that GB try to get information to him by mid August for inclusion in the Student Information Packs.</p>	GB/JS
11	<p>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on Friday 15 September 2006 at 10.00 am in Lancaster Town Hall.</p> <p><i>[The Council Chamber at Lancaster Town Hall was subsequently reserved for the meeting]</i></p>	ALL