

Meeting Minutes of: West Berkshire Cycle Forum
held on: Thursday 4th June 2020
(via Zoom conference call)

Chair: Cllr Stephen Ardagh-Walter (SAW) – Council Member for Thatcham

Attendees: Cllr Steve Masters (SM) – Council Member for Speen
Cllr Andy Moore (AM) – Council Member for Newbury Central
Cheryl Evans (CE) - WBC Traffic & Road Safety Officer
Caroline Lane (CL) – SPOKES Chair / WBC Cycling Co-ordinator
Cllr Martha Vickers (MV) – Council member for Newbury
Cllr Tony Vickers (TV) – Council member for Wash Common
Angela McMahon (AMc) – SPOKES / Sustrans Ranger
Josh Kerry (JK) - WBC Highways Officer (minutes of meeting)
Neil Taylor (NT) – Newbury Road Club

Apologies: Elaine Cox – WBC Rights Of Way Officer

| | <u>Action</u> |
|--|---------------|
| <p>1. Apologies</p> | |
| <p>2. Welcome, introductions</p> | |
| <p>3. Notes of previous meeting & matters arising</p> <p>SAW reviewed minutes of the last meeting – which were passed without comment. There was further discussion on e-scooters and CE explained that although trials were in place we were a long way off from introducing anything in West Berkshire.</p> | |
| <p>4. Emergency Active Travel Fund: Covid-19 Response</p> <p>JK summarised the WBC bid for Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 whereby DfT have allocated a further £495,000 of funding in addition to the £124k for temporary measures in the first phase. There were lots of requests and these were scored according to criteria such as deliverability (the DfT again put emphasis on rapid implementation of schemes and all funding to be spent this financial year), strategic fit, cost and how well each matched the roadspace reallocation aims. West Berks have bid for the entire amount and have identified and designed five schemes to be funded. We expect to hear whether we are successful in September.</p> | |

Action

TV asked if the scheme on Andover Road would require further civils work to construct more parking bays for residents. JK to look into this further but it appeared that a lot of the vehicles parked on the road had off-street parking. Consultation required but likely the number of additional parking spaces will be relative to the number of properties that don't have driveways.

JK

AM asked whether the contra-flow cycle lane on Argyle Road was still to be implemented and JK confirmed that it was and the Traffic Regulation Order had been made.

AMc asked whether Royal Avenue would be closed as part of the "School Streets" scheme; i.e. closing off roads at certain times outside schools to encourage walking and cycling. CE said that currently it was unlikely and that the closure will only be for Curtis Road.

NT asked whether bicycles would still be allowed on Station Road and JK confirmed that the closure only applied to motorised vehicles.

SM request for additional enforcement where new parking restrictions have been implemented, i.e. Kiln Road and where mandatory cycle lanes are being introduced. JK to follow up with WBC parking to ensure that the new measures are enforced.

JK

Permanent counting sites were also to be installed at various sites.

5. Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

JK gave an update on the LCWIP. The stakeholder workshop was well attended with 23 participants via a zoom conference call. There has been lots of feedback, both using the online whiteboard "Miro" (which can be viewed via the web link but unfortunately unable to edit https://miro.com/app/board/o9J_kp2PKFA=/) however it is not too late and please send any comments or suggestions via email.

WSP have collated the feedback from the workshop event and used the data and local knowledge to identify key corridors for active travel. The next step is to map these corridors to routes on the ground and they will be working with WBC officers to undertake route audits over the course of the next few weeks to analyse existing infrastructure and opportunities for improvements. The results of their audit will be fed back to stakeholders for comment.

There was a lot of interest from stakeholders regarding recreational routes as well as utility cycling. This will therefore be given more attention in the LCWIP looking at leisure routes. TV requested that access to the commons be considered (Bucklebury, Greenham and Snelmore). NT echoed the importance of a route across Greenham

Common, both as leisure and utility route for access to the business park, looked at previously but not followed up due to some resistance from the Commoners but suggested that this would not be insurmountable. The route would travel from Greenham up New Hill past St Mary's Church.

6. Recreational Routes

WBC receives lots of requests for new recreational routes, especially since the construction of the Hermitage Railway Path. JK to set up a guide to be used by those parties interested in investigating a new route (i.e. individuals, organisations, members or parish councils) to be able to do the groundwork themselves prior to contacting the council. The land registry searches, liaising with landowners, preliminary site investigation, feasibility study and identification/ application to funding sources can be very demanding on officer time. Similar to how West Berkshire Spokes laid the groundwork for the Hermitage Railway Path this could be carried out in the first instance to establish whether a route is first possible, before pitching to the council.

JK

7. Local Transport Note 1/20 – New Cycle Infrastructure Design Standards

JK drew attention to the new cycle design guidance issued by the DfT. Previously there were no set UK standards for cycling infrastructure and this situation is perhaps to blame for some of the inadequate infrastructure that historically has been constructed, usually as an afterthought, on UK highways.

DfT have suggested that future funding will only be awarded to schemes that meet the design standards. This was the case for the Emergency Active Travel Fund which specifically asked for applications to reference which standards would be used in the proposals.

LTN1/20 can be found here:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/906344/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf

TV suggested that the new standards be used for new developments and cited the case of Sandleford.

8. AOB

SAW suggested that the Cycle Forum terms of reference were updated to cover the scenario that happened at the previous cycle

| | <u>Action</u> |
|---|---------------------------|
| <p>forum whereby the meeting nearly was cancelled due to sickness of chair and no replacement. TV found a copy of the existing terms and sent to JK; DV to circulate with minutes for review by forum members and add election to the agenda for next meeting. Next meeting a Vice Chair is to be nominated and voted in by the forum members.</p> | <p>JK / DV</p> |
| <p>AMc requested that the missing cycle route signage be replaced in Calcot – JK to order ASAP and update AMc with progress.</p> | <p>JK</p> |
| <p>SM asked if there were any future pots of funding for additional cycling infrastructure which were being considered for future bids. JK to liaise with Transport Policy / Environment Delivery team to look into.</p> | <p>JK</p> |
| <p>TV asked whether there was to be a change in the standards for maintenance of cycle routes given the renewed emphasis and DfT funding. JK putting together a list of locations where overgrowth is obstructing cycle routes so that they receive more frequent maintenance. Locations where vegetation is causing a nuisance to be considered and a list to be put together with the help of forum members next meeting.</p> | <p>JK/ All</p> |
| <p>Next Meeting:</p> <p>Wednesday 14th October 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time: 17:30 – 19:00 - Venue: TBC | |