

CYCLE USER GROUP
WEDNESDAY 16th MARCH 2011
MINUTES

Attendees: Richard Clark, Road Safety Manager, SMBC (Chair)
Don Naylor, Cycling Officer, SMBC
Sue Stevenson, Transportation Policy & Programmes Manager, SMBC
Chris Maidment, Assistant Policy Officer, SMBC
Jim Critchley, Planning, Stakeholder and Approvals Manager, GMPTE
Norman Lowndes, Cyclist
Sandy Broadhurst, Friends of Fallowfield Loop
Janet Bellingall, Cyclist
Merlin Evans, Cycle Stockport
Roy Bradshaw, CTC
Joanna Hulme, Cyclist
Charlie Hulme, Cyclist
Cllr Stuart Bodsworth, SMBC
Keiran McMahon, Disability Stockport / Transport Access Forum
Nathan Messer, Cyclist [Sustrans Ranger]
Kathy England, Cyclist [Sustrans Ranger]
Pete Abel, Manchester Love Your Bike Campaign
Ian Tate, Manchester Cycle Forum
Janet Cuff, Cyclist and RA
Steven Eddleston, Manchester Met Uni
Vincent Griffith, Manchester Met Uni
Daniel Hyde, Manchester Met Uni
Lauren Wright, Manchester Met Uni

Apologies: Ernest Nama, Senior Rights of Way Officer, SMBC
Lucy Sutcliffe, Bike It Officer
Edgar Ernstbrunner

Part 1		
Item	Issue	Action
1.0	Trans Pennine Trail and Metrolink [see post-meeting note]	
1.1	<p>Jim Critchley, GMPTE, gave a short presentation with an overview of the Metrolink construction and the plans for East Didsbury stop and the TPT more specifically.</p> <p>Key issues for the Didsbury Village site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TPT will run along the north edge of the track / cutting. The route will be roughly between 300mm and 1m above the track, separated, probably (subject to ongoing design), by a small post & wire fence. ▪ Insufficient width under Sandhurst Road means the TPT is proposed go up & over the bridge, via steps. ▪ There will be a groove / wheeling ramp for pushing cycles, and an alternative route for wheelchairs and pushchairs etc (no more than 400m longer than the 	

<p>1.2</p>	<p>original route).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The section between Sandhurst Road and Parrs Wood Road is approx. 200m in length, 2m wide, with no passing points. The remainder of the Trail within the Metrolink corridor is proposed to be 3m wide (subject to outcome of discussions with adjoining land owner at one point) <p>A number of concerns were raised by attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have other options been considered? <i>GMPTTE response: Yes, there are other feasible options but they do not represent value for money.</i> ▪ Other options elsewhere (ramps, retaining walls etc) have been introduced at much smaller costs. Have costs been presented to Manchester City Council [MCC]? <i>GMPTTE: Costs confirmed to MCC: £3.4m for construction alone of ramps, £850k for steps & equivalent footway.</i> ▪ Has a signalling option been considered (allowing other users under the bridge when trams aren't present)? <i>GMPTTE: Not sure, will check.</i> ▪ Is this the only stepped point in the plans? <i>GMPTTE: Yes, this is the only part of the Trail within the Metrolink corridor where steps have been incorporated into the design</i> ▪ Riders from the continent will expect similar conditions. <i>GMPTTE: Steps etc already exist elsewhere on the TPT.</i> ▪ The alternative route includes unsuitable roads – do the costs include necessary safety features? <i>GMPTTE: On-street sections exist elsewhere on TPT. [CUG response: Existing flaws should not be used to justify new flaws being created.]</i> ▪ Where will horse riders be directed? <i>This section of TPT is already indicated on the TPT maps as not being a route for horses.</i> ▪ Disability law states that new works can't reduce accessibility. Has a legal assessment been carried out and can we see the Design Access Statement and the Equality Impact Assessment? <i>GMPTTE: Plans meet DDA requirements but can pass any challenges to legal team and will look into providing the other docs. Planning permission not required.</i> ▪ The option is unfit for purpose, unsatisfactory and should be reviewed. Why aren't CUG views being taken on board? <i>GMPTTE: A design solution has been chosen which is considered to be appropriate. The alternative solution of ramps which has been suggested would mean substantial redesign / delay costs. Finer detail of alternative route still to be decided.</i> ▪ Users weren't consulted early enough to have any input into proposals and were told initially that the alternative 	<p>JC</p> <p>JC</p>
------------	--	---------------------

	<p>route was temporary; that the TPT would be reinstated. No consultation has taken place on these plans. <i>GMPTTE: Concerns of cyclists & other users have been taken into account and significant investment has been made to cater for them.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have the issues discussed today been raised by MCC? <i>GMPTTE: Yes, similar discussions took place.</i> 	
1.3	<p>Pete Abel has submitted a resolution [below] stating that the plans degrade the TPT and demanding the access is protected. This is supported by those present.</p> <p>It was asked whether Stockport Engineers could produce a costing for a compliant option. This will be requested but the information and resources may not be available.</p>	RC
1.4	<p>Green Pastures site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can improvements to underpass / link be included in order to attract tram users from Heaton Mersey? <i>GMPTTE: This is not in the scope / budget of the plans.</i> 	
1.5	Thanks were offered to RC for arranging this discussion.	

Part 2		
Item	Issue	Action
2.0	Apologies, minutes of previous meeting, matters arising	
2.1	Previous minutes agreed as accurate.	
2.2	<p>Matters arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A6 junction (Town Hall) – Final details still to be completed. Signage for cyclists should now be clear, can share results of stage 3 audit assessing risk. ▪ RSS feeds: CH has made progress with the Council's On-line Communications Manager regarding automation and shared details of his website. ▪ Warren St: some stands have now gone, others need bringing back from the road. DN will mark out new stands. ▪ Bike It - locks: Little progress, investigation needed. ▪ LTP3: The Local Implementation Plan (LIP) went to the Exec the previous night (15th). It will be linked from the Council site & LTP3 pages and will be reviewed in a year's time. ▪ Bike It: LS has continued to produce a newsletter which DN will circulate. She has been working at St Winifred's and sustaining other previous projects. ▪ Bikeability: Accreditation obtained, aiming to train 1,600 children (double current levels). Only one other GM Authority is accredited. Looking into training adults in the future, as takes place in Manchester. 	RC DN
3.0	Rights of Way Issues and Connect2	

3.1	Second meeting with MCC has taken place re: Bridleway. Stockport MBC has submitted the relevant information for making the joint bridleway order with Manchester City Council – an update on this is now awaited. The contractor has now fixed the TPT issue at Burnage Rugby Club. Potholes on Northumberland Rd have been repaired.	
3.2	Connect 2: SS is the lead now that David Brown [formerly Sustainable Transport Manager] is taking voluntary redundancy. After slow progress last year, discussions are taking place with Sustrans to push forward. NB: Connect 2 is the route & core network, not just the bridge. Including aspirational elements of Connect 2 in the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) bid: see section 5.	
4.0	Traffic Services developments	
4.1	Major changes are taking place, particularly due to the cut in capital budget, resulting in a loss of staff. The budget was published online but not to the level of detail of job roles that are being lost.	
4.2	Circulating the internal ‘family tree’ is probably not advisable – best to contact the Council through the contact centre or by the email addresses published on the website team pages.	
5.0	Local Sustainable Transport Fund	
5.1	Including aspirational elements of Connect 2 in the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) bid is complicated: authorities are currently writing own bids having been given only 3 weeks notice and GMPTE will decide which to include in £50m joint bid. Local Authorities can also submit individual £5m bids in mid April, or June for next year. Both must be 60% revenue, 40% capital, i.e. include hard and soft measures. Otterspool Road will be included in Stockport’s submission under the ‘Cycle to work’ heading. The individual bid will be based around access to district centres and any good ideas are welcomed.	
6.0	Any Other Business	
6.1	Events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bike & Scoot Week is actually 3 weeks: 9th – 27th May. ▪ Woodbank Family Bike Ride – Sunday June 12th ▪ Olympic Open Weekend – Bramhall Park, July 22nd to 24th 	
6.2	Bramhall Green: Technically cycling on a zebra crossing is not allowed. Experimental ideas could possibly be considered at Bramhall Park Olympic Legacy Event in July.	

6.3	The next CUG sub-group meeting will take place on Wednesday 13 th April 2011. The next CUG meeting will take place on Thursday 19 th May 2011.	
-----	---	--

Resolution tabled by Manchester Friends of the Earth for discussion at the Cycle Forum.

"This Cycle Forum is seriously concerned that the current Metrolink proposals to introduce sets of steps into the Trans Pennine Trail in the vicinity of Sandhurst Road, Didsbury will seriously degrade access to the Trans Pennine Trail for both visitors and local residents of Stockport and Manchester.

This cycle forum demands that Stockport Council work with GMPTE/Metrolink and Manchester City Council to ensure that the Trans Pennine Trail continues to offer 'access for all' to encourage more people to walk and cycle on the Trans Pennine Trail for recreational, utility or commuting journeys."

Post-meeting note

The issue of TPT access at Sandhurst Rd was discussed at a GMITA committee meeting on March 25th; representatives of user groups were able to contribute to the discussions.