

# STEERING GROUP MEETING FOR CYCLING DEMONSTRATION TOWN PROJECT

NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 26 MAY 2010

## COMMITTEE ROOM B, LANCASTER TOWN HALL

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Mike Hutchinson	(MHut)	CTC Lancaster
	Matt Hodges	(MHod)	CTC
	Dick Follows	(DF)	Dynamo
	John Leach	(JL)	Dynamo
	Tim Hamilton-Cox	(THC)	Dynamo
	Stephen Buchanan	(SB)	Furniture Matters
	Ken Brown	(KB)	County Councillor
	Alasdair Simpson	(AS)	Lancashire County Council
	John Whitelegg	(JW)	City Councillor
	Jon Barry	(JB)	Cabinet member with responsibility for cycling
	Eileen Blamire	(EB)	City Councillor
	Rachel Scott	(RS)	Environmental Management Team, LCC
	Gary Bowker	(GB)	Environmental Management Team, LCC
	Matt Moran	(MM)	Environmental Management Team, LCC
	Peter Loker	(PSL)	Corporate Director, Lancaster City Council
	Steph Lucas	(SL)	Notetaker, Lancaster City Council

Also attending: Andrew Hewitson, Policy Officer – Environment, Lancashire County Council

		ACTION
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Caroline Holden and Jim Robson (Lancashire County Council), Philip Longton and Jonathan Mills (Lancaster University), Peter Armstrong (PCT) and Ged McAllister (Lancaster City Council)</p> <p>Those present introduced themselves.</p>	
2.	<p><b>PRESENTATION ON JOINT LANCASHIRE LTP3</b></p> <p>PSL outlined the funding position of the CDT and said that we would be looking for support from the Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3).</p> <p>He then introduced Andrew Hewitson from Lancashire County Council who gave a presentation and overview of the Joint Lancashire (i.e. Lancashire County Council, Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council and Blackpool Council) LTP3. A copy of the presentation is <b>attached</b> to these notes.</p> <p>Consultation will start soon and will be available on the County's website. Lancaster city council's chief executive and planning officer will be contacted within the next couple of weeks in order to identify priorities.</p>	

	<p>AH took questions and agreed to take the comments and queries back to colleagues and where necessary would reply direct via email.</p> <p>PSL thanked AH for the presentation and suggested that the individual organisations of the Steering Group send their comments direct to the county council. PSL will check on the city council's internal consultation in respect of the LTP3.</p> <p>AH remained for the rest of the meeting.</p>	
3.	<p><b>NOTES OF MEETING HELD 02 MARCH 2010</b></p> <p>There were no amendments to the notes.</p>	
4.	<p><b>MATTERS ARISING</b></p> <p><b>Item 3 – Maintenance of Cycle Routes</b> - PSL reported he had asked that the issue of cycle routes be discussed at the county council task group. Linked into that, the city and county councils have an officer group on closer working regarding street scene, and winter maintenance will be discussed at that group.</p> <p>JB requested that this be kept on the agenda for a report back to the next meeting.</p> <p>PSL had not written to the LGA. JW urged that we write this week. He also advised that the DfT had set up a group which the LGA had been invited to attend.</p> <p><b>Item 4 – Progress/Achievements</b></p> <p><b>(a) Work Programme</b> - RS circulated a copy of 'Your District Council Matters' which included a pull out section on cycling and included a Lancaster City Centre Cycling map. JB thanked the team for doing this.</p> <p><b>(b) Smarter Choices Update</b> - RS had emailed the results from the travel survey.</p> <p><b>Item 6 – Cycling England</b> - The CE visit had been cancelled and we are still waiting for a new date to be arranged.</p> <p><b>Other Matters Arising:</b></p> <p>DF asked if the CDT Board had met since the last Steering Group meeting. PSL said there had been no reason for the Board to meet, as there had been no decisions to be made.</p> <p>DF asked if there were any other campaigns, apart from Your District Council Matters, to reinforce the new infrastructure. RS is looking at driver awareness. CE is putting information out re their RESPECT campaign. RS would welcome any ideas. GB said he was aware of the need for increased signage, particularly into and through the city centre. With regard to illegal parking etc, the Road Safety Group was the correct place to take these issues. JW suggested that information could be piggy-backed via workplace travel plans. MHod said that bus and taxi</p>	<p>PSL</p> <p>PSL</p> <p>All</p>

	<p>companies need targeting with information. RS urged that bad driving by company drivers should be reported to the company.</p>	
5.	<p><b>WORKPLACE UPDATE</b></p> <p>MMs update was circulated with the agenda. MM reported that with regard to circulating information on the new infrastructure etc, he already did this via the workplace colleagues and he was really pushing the big employers to put out information.</p> <p>MM reported that the city council's new cycle loan scheme would be on line within the next couple of weeks. SB asked about barriers preventing more employees cycling.</p> <p>JB asked about the workplace travel survey results and asked if there was any correlation yet with previous years. RS replied that there wasn't at present.</p>	
6.	<p><b>INFRASTRUCTURE UPDATE</b></p> <p>GB explained that the report circulated with the agenda was an update on the current work programme, together with aspirations for beyond 2011. The aspirations were all dependent on identifying funding. PSL said we needed to show Cycling England that we do have plans and aspirations to continue beyond 2011 should the funding be available.</p> <p>MHod was disappointed to see the toucan crossing at the end of Chapel Street is in the list of potential schemes for the future, due to lack of funding. He also commented that the extension to RLMP to Hornby and Wray was not only a leisure route. AS explained that there were cost and land ownership issues around this.</p> <p>THC asked what would be happening at Stonewell. GB explained that the scheme included reducing the road width, converting the pavements to shared use and upgrading the pelican crossing to a wide toucan crossing. A design is currently being drawn up. THC also asked about the possibility of the contraflow cycle lane at the top of Penny Street, becoming a two way cycle lane, but GB said there was not sufficient road width.</p>	
7.	<p><b>FUTURE OF PROJECT BEYOND 2011</b></p> <p>PSL explained that this was a standing item. Officers will be putting representations to Cycling England to try to look for continued funding. They would continue to work with the county council in respect of LTP3 and look for other funding. There was no established future beyond March 2011.</p> <p>JW reported that Merseyside LTP3 was more advanced than Lancashire's, and had concluded that one-third of expenditure needed to be on cycling, this was a significant shift. We needed to carry forward the momentum and be ready with ideas.</p>	

8.	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <p>RS reported that the new maps were now available. There would be an official opening of the Way or Roses on the 11 September and maps of this route would be available shortly. There is also to be a press ride of the route at the end of June.</p>	
9.	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>It was agreed that next meeting would be arranged for mid September.</p>	SL