

# STEERING GROUP MEETING FOR CYCLING DEMONSTRATION TOWN PROJECT

**NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 16 MARCH 2007**

## COMMITTEE ROOM B, LANCASTER TOWN HALL

**PRESENT:**

Matt Hodges	(MHod)	CTC
Anna Redfearn	(AR)	Pedal Power
Paul Darlington	(PD)	Cycle Aid
Mike Hutchinson	(MHut)	CTC
Claire Drury	(CD)	North Lancashire Health
John Leach	(JL)	Dynamo
Kathy Bashford	(KB)	Sustrans
John Whitelegg	(JW)	Sustainable Transport Advisor
Alasdair Simpson	(AS)	Lancashire County Council
Rachel Scott	(RS)	Economic Development, LCC
Bee Harding	(BH)	Economic Development, LCC
Gary Bowker	(GB)	Engineering Section, LCC
Peter Loker	(PSL)	Corporate Director, LCC
Steph Lucas		Notetaker, LCC
David Lawson	(Guest)	Planning Service, LCC

		<b>ACTION</b>
1.	<p><b>PROMENADE BYELAW</b></p> <p>PSL announced that the DCLG had now agreed the Byelaws for the Promenade, which would not come into effect until the 08 April 2007.</p>	
2.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>Ron Eckersley, Engineering Section, LCC            Peter Scullion, Lancaster University            Jim Robson, Lancashire County Council</p>	
3.	<p><b>UPDATE ON CENTROS MILLER (CANAL CORRIDOR) PROPOSALS</b></p> <p>PSL introduced David Lawson, Forward Planning Manager, Planning Services. DL ran through how we got to where we are at the present and said that Planning Applications will be submitted around the end of April. Centros Miller have appointed Mayer Brown as their Transport consultants who would be taking into account the specifics of cycling provision.</p> <p>He listed the proposed cycle parking provision and improvements for cyclists so far for the scheme.</p> <p>MHod asked how, during the development, cycle access would be dealt with. He also asked that CCTV coverage of cycle parking areas be included.</p>	

	<p>PD asked that consideration be given to cycle parking being within 50 metres of shops.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that the total cycle parking figures were too low after allowing for employee parking for the proposed businesses, there was little left for public parking.</p> <p>PSL asked that the Steering Group be formally consulted on the applications when received.</p> <p>JW said that as the City Council is committed to the Cycling Demonstration Town objectives he was disappointed that this scheme does not wrap around CDT. He referred to good practice of cycling hub facilities. Concern was expressed that the scheme was not permeable to cyclists and he suggested the central open square might be a suitable site for a cycling hub.</p> <p>DL confirmed he would take the message forward that Lancaster is fully committed to the Cycling Demonstration Town objectives.</p> <p>AR requested that Edward Street should not be blocked off as it was necessary for the Ridge and Newton residential area, plus the Lansil/Caton Road corridor. She did not believe cycle parking in multi storey car parks is likely to be used and if better provision was not included in the development, i.e. cycle paths through the main concourse, then cyclists would probably ride it anyway. She agreed with JW that the proposal did not celebrate cycling.</p> <p>AS voiced concerns about the East-West and North-South cycle routes.</p> <p>JL suggested the need for cycle routes through the development so as not to create a “sterile area” and in addition Lancaster as a whole needs a comprehensive set of proposals.</p> <p>DL confirmed that the scheme would not be looked at in isolation and there would be an independent assessment of the transport side of things. AS suggested that assistance from the Cycling England Advisory Services should be sought.</p> <p>GB confirmed that Phoenix Street route would still go ahead. The first stages of the proposed gyratory work is due to go out to consultation and DL will be included in the consultation.</p> <p>MHod was a member of a County Council Liaison Panel which considers schemes from a Cyclists point of view. He was concerned that developer led schemes do not get appropriate consultation and are not looked at from a “cycle friendly audit”. DL confirmed that the County Council are always involved in consultations and AS reported on the County' procedure. PSL requested DL and AS take the message back that cycling needs to be a consideration in any application.</p> <p>PSL thanked DL.</p>	<p><b>DL/AS</b></p>
--	--	---------------------

4.	<p><b>MINUTES OF MEETING HELD 19 JANUARY 2007</b></p> <p>MHod made the correction to the sentence on page 3 under “Prioritisation of Routes” – he was in fact referring to the edge lane being too narrow to be a cycle lane.</p> <p>For information AS reported that the County Council Cabinet Member had suggested the inclusion of cycle paths and that they be funded by Heysham M6 Link and this will be passed to the road designers.</p>	
5.	<p><b>MATTERS ARISING</b></p> <p><b>20mph Zone (<i>under Matters Arising</i>)</b> - GB gave an update on the areas to introduce 20mph zones. He confirmed that no schools had been targeted within the current programme.</p> <p>JW requested that the report and decision from Lancashire Locals on a district wide 20mph speed limit be circulated to Steering Group members.</p> <p><b>Cycle Parking in Local Shopping Areas (<i>under Matters Arising</i>)</b> - GB reported that Property Services were working on a licence agreement with regard to siting cycle stands on private land, but this was only at an early draft stage.</p> <p>RS had written to B&amp;Q regarding the lack of cycle parking at the Lancaster store, but had not received a response.</p> <p>PD suggested that one way of encouraging private landowners is to look at an income stream for them, e.g from advertising on the stands.</p> <p>With regard to lack of bike stands in the Castle area, RS reported that the Manager of the Castle had agreed in principle to the provision of bike stands.</p> <p>AR asked if the City Council has considered providing covered cycle parking. GB explained that there was limited land available to provide covered parking but some consideration would be given in the Mayer Brown proposals.</p> <p><b>University Representative (<i>under Matters Arising</i>)</b> - PSL had raised this at the last meeting of the City Council/University/St Martin’s Liaison Group. The University had advised that Peter Scullion was their representative, but unfortunately he had not been able to make this meeting. St Martin’s are still to give a name for a representative.</p> <p>MHod had received a complaint that the University would not operate the <b>scheme for the tax free purchase of cycles</b> and asked if the City Council operates a scheme. PSL replied that staff surveys showed that interest free loans was the preferred option and a report on this was being considered by Management Team tomorrow.</p> <p><b>Item 5 - Prioritisation of Routes</b> - GB had drawn up the list of prioritised routes he would be suggesting to Cycle England. Once agreed, he will circulate the list to the Steering Group.</p>	<p>PSL</p> <p>PSL</p> <p>GB</p>

6.	<p><b>BIKE IT UPDATE</b></p> <p>KB gave an oral update including training which was happening in all schools apart from Westgate and Dallas Road. Pedal Power were doing most of the training. At this point RS updated the meeting regarding accreditation of schemes/trainers and advised that Bikeability will start in April. A meeting is to be organised with all involved in school training to share experience. AR confirmed that Pedal Power are moving on to get accreditation.</p> <p>KB gave updates on cycle stores; sale of flags from flag it competition; Inna Tubba shows to Bike It Schools; and cycle around the world project which is doing well.</p>	
7.	<p><b>POSSIBLE EXTENSION OF CYCLE TRACK</b></p> <p>AS was producing a report to the Lancashire Locals on the Caton-Wray Cycle Track extension. He ran through the potential problems, including obtaining the necessary land. He also listed the advantages and benefits to the extension. He concluded that there were two options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not to go ahead with the scheme at present</li> <li>2. To go ahead with the scheme, but recognising that Compulsory Purchase may be needed and funding was a major issue</li> </ol> <p>AS asked for the Group's comments.</p> <p>MHut and MHod both suggested that there would be an additional benefit to Road Safety as the A683 is a very busy road and this extension would provide a safer route for cyclists.</p> <p>JW referred to Rural Utility Cycling and the need to be more proactive in this area and would therefore support the option to go ahead with the extension and suggested that the Steering Group supports the extension.</p> <p>JL referred to the rise in school bus fares in rural areas and we should encourage the use of cycling to schools.</p>	
8.	<p><b>DYNAMO'S REPORT – ACTIONS REQUIRED TO MAKE PROGRESS</b></p> <p><b>Signage on Towpath</b> - in particular "some unhelpful signage, Cyclists dismount". GB explained there were 4 such signs and these were advisory and were in locations for safety reasons. GB agreed to look at the state of the cobbled/setted area near the White Cross.</p> <p>JL reported that youths congregate under the canal bridges and broken glass is often a result. Discussed providing facilities for young people to go in the evenings.</p> <p>With regard to recent attacks on the cyclepath, it was felt the message that this is a safe route was not being put across. RS/GB had met several times with the Police regarding the recent attacks. GB had also looked at visibility on the cycle path and arranged for vegetation to be cut back as necessary. It was confirmed that Police are patrolling the path. RS to talk to Police Press Officer regarding releasing something positive.</p>	<p><b>GB</b></p> <p><b>RS</b></p>

	<p>AS suggested a photograph of the PCSO's on the cycle path. AR said that their training includes safety tips.</p> <p>JL said that CDT need to get message across to companies about what they need to be doing to enable and encourage staff to cycle and/or use public transport. CD said that this would be useful for Health Authority.</p> <p>JW said that this was a Travel Plan issue and required high level commitment from the Chief Executive or similar to work with other Chief Executives to promote employee cycling to support the work being done by the Travel Plan Co-ordinator.</p> <p>With regard to St Martins and University, PSL felt best route would be through the City Council/University/St Martin Liaison Group, and he had already given two presentations on CDT to the Group. With regard to PCT, he has regular contact with Frank Atherton who supports this approach. CD stressed the need to work with Hospital Trust and Health Trust as two separate organisations.</p> <p><b>Traffic Counts</b> - Concern expressed that "cyclists" do not appear to be counted as transport in traffic counts. AS confirmed that if it is a manual count cyclists are included, but if it is an automatic count they would probably not be counted. There was a request that County ensure that cyclists are included.</p> <p>As part of the Mayer Brown consultation, MHod had requested that improvements should not disrupt total traffic flow, i.e. including cyclists.</p>	<p><b>BH</b></p> <p><b>AS</b></p>
9.	<p><b>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>JL requested that the next meeting needed to be more structured to assist officers implement and deliver increased cycling rates. AS suggested the next meeting should discuss review and evaluation.</p> <p>PSL reported that the CDT Board had now agreed to meet quarterly and that their next meeting was 05 June, it was therefore agreed that the next meeting would be held at Lancaster Town Hall at 10.00 am on Friday 20 July and that it would concentrate on evaluation.</p>	<p><b>PSL</b></p>