



STOCKPORT

METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

Stockport public Cycle User Group

Wednesday 17th February 2017

Stockport Town Hall

PRESENT

Ian Barker	(local cyclist)	Janet Bellingall	(local cyclist)
Nick Harris	(GMCC)	Kathy England	(TPT/Sustrans)
Charlie Hulme	(local cyclist)	Joanna Hulme	(local cyclist)
Don Naylor minutes)	(SMBC; Chair)	Nick Robinson	(SMBC;
Keith Rogers cyclist)	(local cyclist)	Peter Vickerman	(local
Edgar Ernstbrunner Greens)	(Ramblers)	Mike Padfield	(Stockport
Jim Court	(SCCC)	Sue Stevenson	(SMBC)
Emily Brough	(SMBC)	Andy Shaw	(SCCC)
Steve Essex cyclist)	(local cyclist)	Ian Tate	(local

APOLOGIES: Clare Forrest; Jonny Downing; Max Wild; Roger Hubbald; Jim Pritchett

1. **Sue Stevenson** introduced herself under her new title (**Head of Highways and Transportation**), and invited questions.

- 1.1. **Q:** What are timescales for TCAP 606 (Woodbank Park/Goyt Valley)?

SS: The scheme now has planning permission and a business case is being compiled for submission soon. Hope to be on site before the end of the year, with the bridge works tentatively scheduled for 2018.

- 1.2. **Q:** information requested regarding schools and active travel.

SS: has spoken with the Executive Members for Education and for Transport re working to improve road safety, reviewing travel plans and identifying funding for physical measures. The Road Safety Team is assessing priorities. A report, "Road Safety near schools" was taken to all Area Committees during November 2016 and is available here:

<http://democracy.stockport.gov.uk/documents/s104769/Road%20Safety%20near%20Schools%20Main%20Report.pdf>

- 1.3. **Q:** is there any point upgrading the Goyt Valley Bridleway (NCN 55) if the A6-M60 link road is in prospect?

SS: outlined the process and mentioned the A6 MARR as a comparable example. Unlikely to be on the ground before the mid - 2020s

- 1.4. **Q:** why was surfacing work due to start at Dark Lane this week?

SS: it is a maintenance issue therefore planning permission not required

Q: Why did Sustrans not receive notification of this work, including for any path closure?

ACTION 1 (DN) – see post-meeting note 1

Q: as not yet notified, can CUG members have full details of the work?

SS: Yes. Expressed surprise that notification had not been issued.

It was noted that diversion routes and signage should be organised along Dark Lane.

It was stated that equestrians are unhappy as they feel the surface will be unsuitable

- 1.5. **SS:** pointed out that a variety of surfacing materials will be used, all more or less equestrian suitable. Agricultural vehicles using the route affect choices, and if this produces excessive maintenance issues then the surfacing will have to be rethought.

This work links up with new infrastructure proposed on Otterspool Rd. Plans for this other scheme will be brought to the next sub group meeting (March 16th)

It was suggested that the Council road closure Twitter feed would be a useful place to mention work such as this. **ACTION 2 (NR)**

- 1.6. **Q:** is there a current report regarding the A6 to M60 link?

SS: there is a report for an outline business case, possibly around April/May.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting: read and agreed.

- 2.1. Dec '16 Action 1: King St West Toucan. Some signs on the drawing are still to be installed, worn cycle markings to be replaced, and discussions with the school to improve visibility on the corner with Mosely St in hand. It was suggested that a mirror could be useful, but there was doubt that this was an

approved/standard highway fitting. It was also noted that all the crossings on Mercian Way will be Toucans. See post-meeting note 2

Q: can we ensure that during construction work, that the view of the carriageway from the footway is not obscured? It was mentioned that a scheme on Hempshaw Lane had mesh barriers covered in signage, which may have prevented pedestrians and motorists from seeing each-other

2.2. **Dec '16 Action 2:** there is a protocol to replace stickered Sustrans route signs with metal plates as columns are replaced. It was noted that despite this, some signs have gone as columns have been replaced. Post-meeting note 3

2.3. **Dec '16 Action 3:** the issue has been passed on to the Road Safety Team as the situation has changed as the use of Abney Hall has changed (now a care home). Funding is an issue. Suggestions were made that extra signage be installed while a permanent solution is sought, and that an extra speed hump just inside the gate, in keeping with those that already exist on the drive be considered. **ACTION 3 (DN)** is to raise the view of the meeting that this problem is now more serious than when the CCAG1 scheme was originally constructed

3. Rights of Way Improvement Plan (RoWIP)

3.1. **EB** outlined process and progress of the RoWIP. Hard copies of the consultation (open until 17th March) are in all libraries. It is also available on-line via the Have Your Say pages on the SMBC website. There is a space for a *detailed* response.

A report will go to Area Committees w/c 6th March to establish Councillors' views. After 17th March, responses will be collated to produce a network assessment and develop a draft RoWIP. This will then be consulted upon between 8th May and 31st July. CUG members were urged to take part in this process.

3.2. **Q:** many people will wish to have more of the RoW network open to cycling. Will there be a way to achieve this?

EB: the desire for this will be balanced against opposition.

Q: where does the resistance to cycling come from?

EB: other network users

It was noted that there are other forums (eg the Public Rights of Way Forum) which cyclists can attend to get their views across

The Local Access Forum (LAF) is being relaunched, which could also be a good place to raise these issues. <https://www.stockport.gov.uk/stockport-local-access-forum>

It was requested that the LAF and other forums hold meetings in the evenings
ACTION 4 (NR)

3.3. **Q:** what is a Local Access Forum?

A: LAFs advise decision making organisations (such as local authorities) about making improvements to public access for outdoor recreation and sustainable travel.

LAFs can set their own priorities depending on local issues. They also respond to consultations and draft policy documents. When making recommendations, LAF members need to consider land use, as well as the need to conserve flora, fauna, geological and physical features. (from www.gov.uk)

3.4. The questionnaire was complimented: is the Council looking to expand, change the use or alter the condition of the RoW network?

EB: depending on the response, we could include all of the above.

Q: it is nice to have a plan, but how will it be funded?

EB: need a realistic level of expectation and imagination. The assessment will set goals, but the plan will be about stabilising while moving on where possible.

Q: is RoWIP the right place to raise specific issues?

EB: trying to work planning into the RoWIP and also encourage planners to engage

Q: are neighbouring Boroughs also doing this?

EB: Yes – at different phases, dependent on original start date.

4. TCAP and Growth Fund

4.1. **TCAP:** the business case for phase 2 has been submitted to TfGM

This has also been useful in updating the TfGM cycle map, on-line only for now in Stockport's case

Q: would it be possible to put a cycling layer on the Stockport online map

A: Possibly, if resources permit

5. TPT

- 5.1. The Highways England Scheme across the M60 at Lancashire Hill was outlined. The scheme has been approved, and could be beginning construction during in March
- 5.2. Brief updates from the TPT Exec, and volunteer perspectives were shared

6. CCAG2/Cycle parking

- 6.1. Supplementary funding for cycle parking is available. A covered cycle shelter at Bramhall High School is being considered, and sites for street parking being assessed. *Suggestions for locations welcome.* Adopted highway is a key criterion.

Q: is there an expectation of an increase in cycle use as a result of the scheme?
A: we are not sure. Levels of use at schools used to be assessed as part of the travel plan process but this is no longer done.
- 6.2. **CCAG2:** formal planning process will commence soon. Some details will change-the route out of Bramhall Park now involves a path from the small car park to the Bramhall Park Rd bridge
- 6.3. It was noted that steps with a wheeling ramp will not be accessible to non-standard bikes or trailers (or wheelchairs)
- 6.4. CUG members will be notified when the planning application becomes public, and a request to bring latest plans to a CUG meeting followed up **ACTION 5 (DN)**

7. Any Other Business.

- 7.1. Any suggestions for a future guest speaker?
- 7.2. Terms of reference of the CUG to be discussed at April meeting
- 7.3. Women on Wheels: TfGM has designated this to be during March as Women on Wheels month, with two organised days in Stockport:
 - 7.3.1. March 11th Tandem Café/Woodson's Cycles/Cera Cycloan Bike Day at CeraCycloan on Hillgate. Dr Bike and rides led by female ride leaders (aimed at novices) ending at Tandem Café.
 - 7.3.2. March 25th: Cale Green Primary cycle morning. Similar to the event on the 11th.

Both these events are bookable via Eventbrite.

- 7.4. Cheadle Hulme station Bike Hub is not yet open. Apparently there are problems due to a change of franchise leading to no clear chain of responsibility.

Post-meeting notes

- 1) Diversion notice published Feb 21st ; it was felt that the route will be kept open for non-motorised users, but cycling officers will try and circulate notification of any actual closure as far in advance as possible
- 2) An example of a mirror on the highway in New Mills, Derbyshire, was shared after the meeting. Stockport Council highway engineers re-affirmed this is a non-standard arrangement requiring DfT permission
- 3) This concern was passed on to the engineers involved in the Chestergate TCAP scheme, currently under construction