

HARROGATE DISTRICT CYCLE FORUM
MINUTES OF MEETING 24 April 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
Barrie Mason	(BM)	Assistant Director Highways & Transportation NYCC

Apologies:

Cllr Don Mackenzie	(DM)	County Councillor (Highways)
David Bowe	(DB)	Director Highways and Transportation NYCC
Aoife Healy	(AH)	Public Health
Victoria Hutchinson	(VH)	NYCC Highways

Agenda item	Discussion points	Actions	Lead
	Welcome to Barrie Mason, Assistant Director Highways and Transportation.		
1. NYCC Issues including travel plans and forthcoming schemes	<p>BM – Thanked group for invitation. NYCC recognise the importance of cycling, the problem is competing priorities for the funding. Priority for the council has to be maintenance and winter preparation. This is in response to the resident feedback.</p> <p>In terms of cycle infrastructure there are ways to access funding from external parties i.e. LSTF. NYCC has a good track record of attracting this funding.</p> <p>Developer funding has to be proportionate to the development and has to have clear links. NYCC need to ensure that unreasonable constraints aren't imposed on developers as we need to encourage growth.</p> <p>In instances where the group feel that NYCC don't go far enough then BM is happy to discuss.</p> <p>Third party funding – NYCC have been successful in getting LSTF funding, the revenue implications of submitting bids can be a challenge.</p>		

	<p>NYCC have put a bid in to the Transition fund. Due to tight timeframes consultation prior to submission was difficult. The transition fund will focus on work to establish cycle priorities and strategy which will inform a bid into the access fund. NYCC should find out in the next couple of weeks if the bid is successful.</p> <p>Mouchel have come on board as consultants in place of Jacobs now that the Jacobs contract has come to the end of its duration.</p> <p>NYCC need to manage expectations, there is limited council funding for cycling improvement schemes so external funding needs to be sought; however, we also need to be mindful of the NYCC contribution funders will require.</p> <p>RB – If unsuccessful with the transition fund, is there still an option to bid for the access fund?</p> <p>BM – we should hear the outcome of the transition bid in the next couple of weeks; we can look at plan B at that stage if necessary.</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <p>MM - Accept that maintenance is a priority as roads are in a terrible state. The problem is without leadership trying to incite change and get people out of cars the pressure on the road network will only increase. Without the infrastructure change and investment in cycle ways people won't get out of their cars.</p> <p>BM – 22% of the Cat. 4 Network is in need of maintenance. NYCC have invested 15 million of council funds into the maintenance programme and have been successful in securing government funds to assist. NYCC look at key routes between centres, this could benefit cycling as this network is quieter and more suitable for cycling.</p> <p>NYCC don't always treat 'worse first' as treating a road before the damage sets in prolongs the life of the road and is more cost effective.</p> <p>MW – Appreciate the need for road maintenance, however, it seems that big urban areas such as Scarborough and Harrogate have such heavy traffic we have to try to encourage a modal shift. The NYCC strategy is written based on rural areas with little consideration for urban areas.</p> <p>MW – Would some projects be better funded via</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>CIL as opposed to section 106?</p> <p>BM – Section 106 is becoming more restricted however, if you don't get the CIL 123 list right then you are stuck. It relies on you having a good knowledge of the local plan and the deliverability of the local plan. You can be more reactive with 106 money.</p> <p>RB – Section 106 will fit better for us at the moment as we are in a reactive situation. The idea is to have a strategy and local plan so we would move to CIL when we are in that position.</p> <p>MW – How much does the transition bid bring existing work together?</p> <p>BM – A big part of the bid is around working with partners.</p> <p>KD – Big problem is engagement at policy level, is there a plan for a county wide cycle forum. We have to react to things at the moment, as opposed to discussing it. Will there be a strategy or is that dependent on the outcome of the transition bid?</p> <p>BM – The bid is around NYCCs recognition of the need to engage and use work that has already been done. There are no plans at this stage to create a county wide forum.</p> <p>KD – Not looking at new engagement but we need to make the channels of communication better, it has to be raised now as we want to be involved instead of reacting.</p> <p>BM – NYCC did carry out normal consultation and LTP4 was changed as a result of the consultation. The consultation was mainly web based.</p> <p>KD – Hoping cycle champion will lead on getting county wide responses.</p> <p>BM – Unfortunately cycle funding is having to compete with other projects that are seen as more of a priority.</p> <p>KD – It's about getting the agenda right, then referring to that agenda before any decisions are made. There are some significant developments happening in Harrogate but we can't see any significant cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>BM – focus is on targeted, sometimes smaller infrastructure changes that can still deliver quite a</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>significant benefit. Need to be mindful of what and how much we are asking developers to invest, unless there is severe impact it is unreasonable to ask developers to pay. There is a risk that NYCC are seen as anti-development and developers go elsewhere.</p> <p>KD – Could BM circulate any successful developer led/contribution schemes to group</p> <p>MW – Judgement of ‘reasonable’ is different between rural and urban areas.</p> <p>RD – Definitely a feeling that opportunities are being lost with bigger developments. Appears to be a disconnect between area officers, local knowledge and enthusiasm. It would be interesting to see an example of a big project funded through developer funding.</p> <p>GM – Great Opportunity for forum to have BM present. LTP4 – group felt that the cycling element was lacking and basically had to be rewritten, which members of the forum did. The NYCC website is still showing the draft prior to the re-write. DfT might look unfavourably on some of the wording in that draft. GM also questions whether pushing developers would really put them off.</p> <p>GM – lots of authorities would love to have access to the expertise and knowledge around the table (cycle forum), all of whom are volunteers. Yet as a forum we struggle to communicate with officers at NYCC. The forum has done a lot of preparatory work which could help NYCC. When BM attends developer meetings, who is there that has the vision of the aspirational plan that Harrogate has?</p> <p>GM – Any bid submitted needs to show the level of voluntary support available.</p> <p>BM – Will look into why area 6 is not responding to forum members, and thanked group for all volunteering. Website will be checked and updated if required.</p> <p>RD – 24 million DfT funding together with the 15 million from NYCC to be spent on rural roads, SUSTRANS would like to look at how the funding will benefit cyclists.</p> <p>BM – NYCC want to look at how cyclists can be supported through this funding. Promotion of the routes, not investment in actual infrastructure.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>RD – Inexpensive options are available so would need to be investigated. Could be as simple as painting in a cycle lane.</p> <p>BM – Would need to look at projects on a case by case basis.</p> <p>RD – Take Follifoot underpass as an example of a relatively simple scheme, yet it still has not happened.</p> <p>BM – Should be in a position to agree that scheme in the next couple of days.</p> <p>RD – DfT funding for Sustrans to consult on projects in North Yorkshire – particularly around the economic benefit.</p> <p>RB - Thanked BM for attending the meeting. If BM or DB would be available for future meetings it would be appreciated.</p> <p>Group Thanked BM.</p>		
<p>2. Transition Fund Bid</p>	<p>TH - Suggests that it is a stop gap between LSTF and access fund. Hopefully the prep work for the local plan will be able to be used.</p> <p>RD – East Riding haven't had LSTF funding and they are looking at applying for the access fund. Suggest that Harrogate look at access fund regardless of what happens with the transition fund.</p> <p>GM – Following JW resignation, who from County will sit on the forum? –</p> <p><i>Update from VH. Someone from the Area 6 Highways office will attend so the forum has a representative from NYCC with the appropriate local highways knowledge of the Harrogate area. VH may be able to attend forum meetings on occasion, for example to discuss bids for funding, however won't be able to attend every meeting</i></p> <p>MW – Will the new NYCC cycle champion attend forums?</p> <p>KD – The champion needs to be someone from Harrogate or Scarborough.</p> <p>RD – Harrogate has done a lot of work and is ahead. It would be an easy win for NYCC to use</p>		

	Harrogate as an example of good work.		
3. Harrogate to Knaresborough Cycleway update	<p>TH – We have not had a response from NYCC on the points raised at the last meeting.</p> <p>TH – Been working the numbers through the DfT appraisal spreadsheet Harrogate to Cardale Park looks from the initial analysis to be able to achieve a positive cost benefit ratio but the other sections appear to be struggling to justify the costs. Further information to be provided in due course.</p> <p>MW – Costs did seem extremely high. TH – Plan to check all cost as JW costs did appear very high. MW – Suspect that JW played safe and included utility costs which won't necessarily be needed.</p> <p>RB – Need to form a sub-group to discuss next steps.</p> <p>RD – LEP are asking for economic benefit of the scheme.</p> <p>TH – need to look at other benefits i.e. health</p> <p>GM – Are we still planning on doing a section at a time?</p> <p>TH – Probably worth progressing as 2 sections due to the developments in bluecoat, money might become available through CIL. It is the Knaresborough route that is costly.</p> <p>RB – The question was put to Donna if we could progress the Knaresborough road section by simply painting the lines in.</p> <p>RD – A joint letter from the DfT and DoH has gone to the LEPs, with this in mind we need to be exploiting the health benefits.</p>		
4. Smaller Transport Schemes Draft Appraisal framework	<p>Group agreed that the scheme list looks good.</p> <p>TH – Formal approval from RB required</p> <p>RB – Could forum members contact TH with any groups they feel should be included on the list for applying for funding.</p> <p>TH – will draft a letter but it can't go out until after the elections.</p>		

5. AOB	<p>Road safety</p> <p>RB & KD met with the Police officer responsible for cycle safety. Discussed road safety and that any code for cycling on smaller roads would need to be endorsed by the police.</p> <p>KD – we need the police to go further than simply putting a sign up. Any campaign has to look at both cyclists and drivers.</p> <p>RD – We need to engage British Cycling as a key player.</p> <p>RB – As a way forward we should speak to Tim Madgwick and Honor Byford.</p> <p>KD – There has been a huge upsurge in cycling and road safety need to keep up. There is a piece of work needed in this area, around awareness of communities and other road users.</p> <p>Off street parking surplus funds</p> <p>RB – Informally consulted on off street parking surplus and what this could be used for. Most goes on concessionary fares, however, a portion should be put towards sustainable transport. Ideally infrastructure in Harrogate, and air quality schemes at Bond end in Knaresborough.</p> <p>Some schemes highlighted across county include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kex Gill realignment • Improvements A59 • Scarborough/Whitby Park and Ride <p>Bilton Lane</p> <p>Enough residents willing to put money into the scheme for a full resurface.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50k from NYCC • 15k from HBC • 15k from residents <p>County are writing to residents to give advice on the process. Donna from NYCC leading on the project.</p>	JA to invite Honor Byford to next meeting.	JA

	<p>Police Station</p> <p>Following the relocation of the police station developer money was allocated in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35k Improvements • 25k Community related travel plans <p>TH to chase the 25k. GM to forward the original email to TH.</p> <p>Follifoot underpass</p> <p>RD – If NYCC give HBC 10k for concreting, what happens next? What is the process?</p> <p>TH – need to get 3-5 quotes for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specification for approaches • Drainage • Link to concrete • Surfacing that can accommodate horses <p>MW – what is the procurement limit? If the work is below the threshold could it go to SUSTRANS?</p> <p>DfT cycle investment strategy</p> <p>KD – Road shows in May, will the council do a response</p> <p>TH – Yes, forum could also respond.</p> <p>Other Business</p> <p>GM – when would it be appropriate to discuss the Dunlopillo site and Leeds road?</p> <p>TH- we will schedule a meeting to discuss the projects, including dunlopillo and bluecoat developments.</p> <p>RD - ANOB working on a family friendly route between Ripon and Fountains Abbey. We need to look at the network in Ripon and connecting routes.</p> <p>GM – could ANOB apply to RB's fund?</p> <p>RD – Feasibility won't be done until 2017 so they're not ready yet.</p>	<p>TH to check with procurement</p> <p>TH to organise meeting date</p>	<p>TH</p> <p>TH</p>
--	--	--	---------------------

	<p>JA – Bike library is now operational. Library is located at veloheads and the donation station is at Resurrection bikes.</p> <p>Programme of events will be coming out shortly to include programmed led rides, bikeability training and bike maintenance workshops.</p>		
6.0 Date of next meeting	Doodle poll to be circulated	Doodle pool	JA