**SHEFFIELD CYCLE FORUM**

**Sheffield Town Hall**

**DRAFT NOTES of meeting held**

**Thursday 21 November, 2019 at 5pm**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ITEM** | **NOTES** | **ACTION** |
| **1.** | **Attendance and apologies** | Mike Lupton (Ride for Eric), Paul Walton (Sheffield CTC), Lee Thompson (Sustrans), Angela Walker (Heeley Development Trust/Recycle Bikes), David Walters(Sheffield resident), Rob Wormald (Sheffield CC), Dexter Johnstone (Cycle Sheffield), Cllr Ruth Mersereau, Greg Challis, Paul Sullivan, Matt Reynolds (Transport Planning, Sheffield Council), Cllr Richard Shaw, Cllr Peter Price, Simon Geller (Sustrans volunteer), Ian Wadey  Apologies for absence had been received from Peter Marsh. |  |
| **2.** | **Notes of the Cycle Forum held 19.09.19 and matters arising** | The notes of the meeting held on 19 September were agreed as a correct record.  Matters arising: concerning the future potential for joint meetings, Cllr Peter Price (PP) reported that the Local Access Forum is happy to pursue; the issue was not discussed at the Walking Forum although he anticipated there would be opportunities to share issues. |  |
| **3.** | **Q&A with Transport Planning and Infrastructure Manager Matt Reynolds** | Matt Reynolds (MR) introduced himself, having previously worked as Transport Manager in Rotherham where he acknowledged there was less focus on cycling. Sheffield, by contrast, was more pro-active, for example in design concepts.  There was also recognition in the Transport Strategy that it was no longer possible or desirable to keep providing more highway space for cars.  As such both the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) and Climate Emergency required a change of approach and greater priority on travelling by sustainable means.  The Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) offered different funding opportunities, not just capital to build infrastructure but also revenue led functions, to deliver awareness raising and training.  Questions from Forum Members were responded to by MR as follows   1. How would Sheffield standards align with Sheffield City Region (SCR) Active Travel Commissioner’s? 2. Cycle infrastructure would be designed to the best standard possible and, if that was compromised too much, then we may not be in a position to meet the required outputs. Locally the purse strings would be held by SCR although the DfT’s Webtag economic appraisal remained skewed toward conventional highway schemes, so it was important to also capture such as public health benefits.   Q) How does expansion of the inner ring road fit with the commitment to more cycling?  A) Future investment will not be in expanding provision for car journeys. There remains a need for the IRR, but to function in a different way, taking into account feeder routes with increased priorities for crossing movements by pedestrians and cyclists.  Q) What is to be done about lack of enforcement around vehicle speeds and “close passes”?  A) MR agreed to raise close pass and lack of speed enforcement at the South Yorkshire Safer Roads Partnership (SYSRP).  Q) South Yorkshire Police (SYP) seem reluctant to become pro-active on close pass compared to West Midlands Police who pursue speeding enforcement via consultation with local authorities, communities, cycling groups etc.  A) Dame Sarah Storey and Pete Zanzoterra from Sheffield City Region Active Travel had met with the SYP Chief Constable and the Police Commissioner. SYP were not prepared to commit resources but would speak to other Chief Constables about submission of video footage as evidence. SCR would supply a draft of their Active Travel Implementation Plan and contact them again in the New Year  Q) Current cycle infrastructure doesn’t meet the required standard. Where would the uplift come from?  A) The Transforming Cities Fund gives us the opportunity to build cycle infrastructure to the required safe standard, but we also need to look at how we upgrade the existing facilities, where possible, as part of this or other programmes  Q) What about future plans and the budget for cycling?  A) The Integrated Transport “block” of the Local Transport Plan was approx. £2m. This had to cover not only improvements to the whole cycle network, but also wider access related programmes.  The other source was the Sustainable Transport Access Fund (STAF) which it was hoped will continue next year.  The Council was reliant on competitive external funding bids and any monies would come with conditions in order to ensure that the required benefits were captured.  Q) What can be done to offer more favourable traffic signal timings for pedestrians and cyclists?  A) This function sits with Network Management and signal timings can be changed to be more responsive and so on to pedestrians and cyclists, although consideration also needs to be given to progress of public transport.  Q) What proposals were being developed to deal with tram track safety?  A) The safety budget was allocated on the basis of “worst first” locations based on safety statistics and tram tracks did not feature in these as near misses are not recorded. Paul Sullivan (PS) added that the most problematic locations had been identified but there was no funding available to design solutions. The ideal solution was to provide segregated infrastructure away from the tracks. | **ACTION 3): MR to pursue close pass reporting and speed enforce**  **-ment with SYSRP** |
| **4.** | **Transforming Cities Fund (TCF Tranche 2b)** | The TCF bid was due to be submitted by SCR next week, with Sheffield’s “high” ask being £85m and “low” £50m of the £220m total.  Sheffield had the highest proposed proportion for active travel of the four South Yorkshire districts.  Five active travel areas had been identified for the bid – Lower Don Valley, south west (Nether Edge), Housing Zone North (Neepsend and Burngreave) City Centre and Meadowhall – Tinsley – Magna, to connect to Rotherham’s proposals.  The work would need to be complete within three years of the announcement by DfT in March 2020.  It was proposed that any scheme would be designed on the basis of the “sustainable safety” principles outlined in the Sheffield Transport Strategy. |  |
| **5.** | **Cycle Sheffield Matters**   1. Division Street – next steps 2. Cycle hangers 3. Maintenance of cycle tracks 4. Repair of flood damage on NCN/TPT 5. Engagement with South Yorkshire Police 6. Meadowhall Cycle Hub | a) Division Street – closure on 19/20 October, SCC officer meeting to be arranged to review.  b) Cycle hangars – there is no current policy on provision of “street lockers” for bikes or available funding. It will require a consistent approach across the city although it may be possible to consider a pilot as part of TCF.  Empire road – a survey of 38 houses had shown that 11 out of 12 who cycled were interested in the concept.  c) Damage to NCN/TPT following climate event had resulted in temporary closure of much of the Five Weirs Walk. It was confirmed that some of this may be covered by the Streets Ahead Amey contract.  d) Responding to Dexter Johnstone regarding maintenance of the TCF future cycle network, this will be adopted highway, thus included in the Amey Streets Ahead contract.  e) SCR had met with SYP as reported to the Forum earlier.  f) Meadowhall Cycle Hub – working with TPT and Russell’s Bike Shed this was currently limited to 20 spaces but with scope to expand e.g. mezzanine at station. Meadowhall shopping centre will be developing a larger hub nearby.  . | **ACTION 5b): Ian Wadey to send details of survey on Empire Road / cycle hangars to Transport Planning**  **ACTION 5c): Simon Geller to send FWW details of flood damage** |
| **6.** | **Any other business** | 1. Cllr RM asked if Amey criteria for depth of potholes requiring filling could change. 2. Responding to Angela Walker it was confirmed that the City Centre cycle hub was still proposed to go ahead. 3. MR outlined the latest on the Future High Streets Fund. Proposals included examining the potential to link up with any proposed TCF proposed cycle routes through the city centre. 4. Lee Thompson (Sustrans) reported on potential funding opportunities via the Climate Action Fund. £100m had been allocated over next year for place based organisations.   Bids had been invited on a partnership basis with a series of goals e.g. recycling, active travel, sustainability. Sustrans was not applying but would work with others .e.g. school/healthy streets and would be interested in considering improved access on to TCF corridors.  PZ was meeting with interested parties the following week.  There was also potential to work with Stockbridge Town Council and the Towns Fund around the proposed Upper Don Valley trail. Mapping had shown the requirement for NCN 627 access at Oughtibridge and Stocksbridge and potential to extend to NCN 62 at Langsett.  Finally, the Healthy Foundation Shaping Places fund gave local authorities the chance to bid for £100k p.a. for three years for environmental improvements, active travel routes etc.   1. On STAF funding, MR confirmed that this had not been signed off yet by Ministers but it was proposed to continue the current programmes as and when they do. PS said it may be able to add some other elements. It would likely involve an extension of the current contract as opposed to a new tender. 2. AW requested an update on cycle counter numbers at the next meeting. | **ACTION 5a): Check pothole depth criteria change with SCC Highways Maintenance**  **ACTION 5f): PS to update on cycle counter numbers at next Forum** |
| **7.** | **Dates of future meetings** | 16 January 2020  19 March 2020 |  |