HARROGATE DISTRICT CYCLE FORUM
MINUTES OF MEETING 2 February 2016

Present:
- Cllr Rebecca Burnett (RB) Chair – Cycle Champion
- Jo Armstrong (JA) Secretary/Cycle legacy officer
- Thomas Horner (TH) Transport Planner HBC
- Gia Margolis (GM) Wheel Easy
- Malcolm Margolis (MM) Harrogate Cycle Action Group
- Kevin Douglas (KD) Chair Harrogate Cycle Action
- Rupert Douglas (RD) SUSTRANS
- Martin Weeks (MW) Harrogate Cycle Action Group

Apologies:
- Cllr Don Mackenzie (DM) County Councillor
- John White (JW) NYCC Highways
- Aoife Healy (AH) Public Health
- Victoria Hutchinson (VH) NYCC Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Discussion points</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actions from last meeting</td>
<td><strong>HHS path maintenance</strong>&lt;br&gt;RB – School are responsible for the litter clearance and verges on the path, but report they are struggling to maintain in. NYCC are responsible for the surface maintenance. The school would like to ‘give’ the path to NYCC or HBC, neither authority want to take the responsibility for it as it would add to maintenance schedules when resources are already stretched.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;GM – Need to be mindful that this path will become an important part of the network with all the development happening in that area.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;KD – It is the school path so they have a responsibility to maintain it. Forum needs to keep an eye on this as we don’t want the path to ‘disappear’ during the construction work.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;GM – it is an important linking route that we can’t allow to fall into disrepair.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;MM – could SUSTRANS rangers get involved?</td>
<td>RD – ask volunteers if they could help clear the path</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community Schemes funding pot</strong>&lt;br&gt;Going to cabinet ASAP for final approval. This is for sustainable transport project, not just cycling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.0 Developer funded schemes | Tim Coin provided a list of developer funded schemes (attached).

RB – asked NYCC what input could the forum have. NYCC advised that forum could offer comment and suggestions on schemes as they are submitted.

TH – scheme details can be a bit sketchy

MW – need to ensure that developers are working to the same standard that JW has done.

RB – We can go back to NYCC with these comments.

KD – The timing of the scheme in Pannal - on the occupancy of the 50th dwelling is not a sensible approach. The infrastructure will already be in place, it would make much more sense for this work to be done when the development commences.

RB – We will send a message to NYCC stating our concerns. It should be done when the development starts and has to be part of the transport infrastructure.

RD – NYCC need to make sure that they link any developer schemes to existing or developing networks so routes join up. Experience shows us that developer led schemes don’t always link.

RB – HBC are introducing a new pre-app from April. Planners will request that developers speak to cycling and walking groups. If we can speak to developers earlier in the process it could help the situation.

RD – could developer funding pay for a traffic free link from Ripon to fountains abbey?

GM – Does the forum feel that communication between us and NYCC is adequate? The police station development allocated 35k for new cycle route and 25k for travel plan works in the locality.

Question:
- Has this money been spent?
- What has it been spent on?

MM – Will the communication between RB/TH and NYCC make all these issues clear?

TH – We can submit a joint letter on behalf of the

<p>| Send message to NYCC raising forum concerns | RB |
| RB to try to get some information | RB |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forum if members would prefer that.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KD – The LTP4 states that NYCC will work closely with established forums. We need someone at a senior level to work with us and drive sustainable transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB – The next step is to raise issues at a more senior level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD – we need to start pushing for commitments to be actioned. We need to have the senior officers at the forum meetings as operational staffs are not in a position to make changes or challenge thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW – we are looking at a whole culture change. Development officers need training on sustainable transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM – Need to start afresh, meet with David Bow and forget the past and move forward. Forum should speak the DM before asking for a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB to speak to DM then write formally as the chair of the forum to request a meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.0 Non NYCC schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme sheet attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheme 2 – follifoot underpass</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM – the £6500 funding held by Sustrans should not go to NYCC to sit in a black hole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD – do we know what’s happened to the £10 000 for concreting. TH to chase with Donna Hodgson at NYCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheme 5 – Killinghall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD – is there a timeframe for the decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheme 3 – Yorkshire showground</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH - Resurfacing where original A frame was located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM – Are we any closer to getting funding to get schemes started?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB – Beryl Burton (scheme 1) just finalising how much is required from each party (HBC and residents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH – Starbeck – Bilton (scheme 4) aiming for a May completion date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH contact Donna Hodgson at NYCC for an update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA to get update from estates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RD – Follifoot underpass should really be moving

GM – We need clarity on the underpass, has it been written up? what is happening. We need a representative from county to be present at forum to answer questions.

KD – we need to work up the tree at county to find the person who can give answers. JW leaving is going to be a big loss to the forum. We need to establish a new link with county.

TH – there is no reason why this scheme can’t be finished this year.

RD – Green Hammerton is not on the list

RB – They are happy to drive the project themselves.

RD – SUSTRANS have received an email from Caroline Bradley (BHS) re. Wetherby path, Harrogate side is not a sealed surface. This is HBC ownership.

GM – Can we add it to the list of small schemes?

TH – Danger of losing money on commuter routes would prefer it to be a back-up plan.

RB – Bilton lane car parking. Members want the car park extending. Cllrs want to put money in, Bilton conservation want to see the car park extending. RB looking at permissions but forum won’t be putting money into the project.

TH – Investment into the Bilton lane car park will encourage more cars.

MW – Put signs up indicating that there is ample parking at both Ripley and Asda (Dragon road car park).

MM – Forum should make a point to Cllrs that the plan to extend the Bilton car park is not supported.

3.0 LTP4 update

KD – What was the HBC response to LTP4

RB – Felt that it should have mentioned Ripon. Not as in depth as it should be.

KD – Disappointed, it states that NYCC are not prepared to do any work on schemes that don’t
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.0 | Vision and Objectives | Report circulated to group (attached)  
KD – is everyone happy with report?  
Group all happy. |
| 4.0 | Road safety data | KD – data shows that cycling fatalities are increasing. Forum need to talk to road safety team at NYCC and public health about this trend.  
MW – We need data on cyclist miles, is there more incidence of accidents with cyclists with higher mileage.  
Invite Honor Byford to forum meeting  
KD – There is an opportunity for NYCC to put speed limits on some rural roads |
| 5.0 | Events and Activities | No Big Bike bash this year. TdY coming through district so HBC will be supporting activity on the route.  
JA – could we organise something low key to celebrate the close of National Bike week, Possibly co-ordinate a series of club led rides. Bikeability programmes for those needed to improve skills.  
HBC – launching a small grants pot for people to bid for projects that will support activity on the TdY route 2016. |
| 6.0 | NYCC staff changes | JW has left NYCC. Replacement unknown at the moment. RB to find out who is taking over from JW.  
Cycle forum would like to thank JW for all the hard work he has done for the group and cycling in Harrogate. |
| 7.0 | Maintenance responsibilities on | TH- presented coded map to group (attached). |
| Network                                                                 | TH – there are some incomplete areas on the map i.e. Ripley.  
| RB – areas of responsibility for each section needs to be clearly visible with contact details for each area.  
| TH – pdf can go on website, with street names.  
| RB - can group check the map and respond to TH with any changes.  
| RD - Could SUSTRANS be mentioned for the efforts maintaining the routes, and to ask for new volunteers?  
| Group to send comments to TH | RD to send info to TH | ALL  
| RD to Group | ALL  

| 9.0 Cardale to Knaresborough cycleway study | MW – JW has managed to achieve a lot of segregated cycle way. Majority of east bound is segregated and west bound is stacked. Preference would be to have it the other way. There may be a valid reason for doing it this way but would be good to check.  
| RD – Parking can be an issue, Leeds-Bradford city connect have put ‘no parking’ signs up, which are enforced by parking officers.  
| RB – parking on route is a concern, there may be opportunities to look at adding additional parking.  
| RD - the detailed work needed will be onerous and will require lots of consultation, who is doing that and how will it be funded?  
| RB - the next step will be justification work – is it worth investing the money.  
| TH – The aim has been to get buy in from NYCC, next step is benefit cost to ratio, then look for funding.  
| GM – Is there any indication of support from NYCC  
| TH – It would be difficult for NYCC not to support as there is very little impact on parking and highway.  
| RB – The cost benefit is important and will hopefully show the few negatives are outweighed by the many positives.  
| RD – what are the other benefits? It would be good  
| | | RD
to get an independent study.

TH – Access needed to Harrogate traffic model which sits with Jacobs. The next stage can be done by anyone, as long as the modelling is done by Jacobs.

KD – Disappointed that the feasibility study is 2 months late and that is went to NYCC senior management before coming back to RB as the client.

TH – Need to check costing as Avenue – Knaresborough seems very high.

KD – Looking at an investment of 5 million, is that going to be seen as a good investment?. We have to factor in Economic growth, health and congestions.

TH – Initially we were talking about 1.5 million. Detailed costings needed from JW (NYCC).

RB – Any comments on the study?

KD – It is a technical solution, nothing more. The next piece of work is key. HB need to be close to this.

GM – Knaresborough end doesn’t show the link to the Beryl Burton link.

MM – In the meantime can we make the a cycle way at the end of Knaresborough road?. This could be the first phase, it would only need a segregated curb

MW - Glued segregation could be used.

10.0

AOB

GM - What is the mechanism for speaking to LEP about funding?

RB – Go through Richard Cooper

RD – Trying to organise discussions with James Gilroy (sustainable transport lead for LEP). There may be some DfT funded time for SUSTRANS to work with LEPS. There might be an opportunity to get a change in mind-set and demonstrate economic benefit.

RD – 2 people group know now working on Leeds – Bradford scheme. Might be an opportunity for RD to set visit up
group to go and learn from the Leeds-Bradford scheme.

RD – Pegasus crossing at Ripley (A61), Honor and Donna at county waiting instruction to do the work.

GM – If no one from county is able to attend the meeting can we ask that a report is sent in advance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of next meeting</th>
<th>Doodle poll will be distributed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>