**AGENDA FOR PEDALS MONTHLY MEETING: 7pm (NOT 7.30 p.m.!) on Monday 20 January 2014 at The Vat and Fiddle, 12-14 Queensbridge Road,** **Nottingham NG2 1NB**

**1. Welcome, and apologies for absence, and including brief introductions**

**2. Minutes of the previous Pedals Meeting (18 Nov 2013) and including checking for accuracy, and matters arising / update including**

- Proposed HS2 extension from Birmingham to Leeds: local public exhibition in Long Eaton (15-16 Nov. 2013) and likely impact on local cycle routes: my message of 15 Nov to Roger Geffen (CTC) and Tony Russell (Sustrans Engineering Manager)

- A453 M1-Clifton dualling plans - update re provision of a toucan crossing on the North side of the new Mill Hill Roundabout: message of 23 Dec from Jonathan Pizzey, Highways Agency

- Wilford Area 20mph proposals: response of 20 Nov from Jennifer Williams, Nottm City Council

- new cycle signage proposals: comments from Brian Goss to Keith Morgan, Nottm City Council

- Pedals comments on Nottm City Council Local Plan consultation: comments from Cllr. Jane Urquhart and Nick Ebbs (Blueprint Regeneration)  
- Nottm Ring Road Major Scheme: impact on cyclists: comments from Dr. David Davies, CEO of PACTS

- Space for Cyclists campaign and proposed lobbying local election candidates re cycling: comments from (Cllr) Steve Barber

- Promoting cycling in local schools including aspirations of Rushcliffe School to go for Sustrans ‘Gold Start’ status: message of 13 Dec from Dominic Sweeting, Sustrans

**3. Report on recent meetings / events by people who have attended on behalf of Pedals including**

- Greater Nottm Cycling Development Meeting of 25 Nov 2013 - notes from Gary S-W circulated on 3 Jan 2013   
**- Mon 25 Nov.** Canal & River Trust East Midlands Waterway Partnership Annual Public Meeting. Nottingham Princess

- East Midlands Trains Stakeholder Conference - Tuesday 26 November 2013

- 10 Dec Greater Nottingham Light Rapid Transit Advisory Committee: discussions on park and ride and bike and ride

- West Bridgford Local Traffic and Transport Group meeting of 11 Dec 2013: cycling issues raised and follow-up emails

- 12 Dec 2013 meeting at Trent Bridge House to discuss impact of the HS2 extension proposals on local rights of way

- Broxtowe Transport Group meeting, 16 Dec 2013

- Meeting of 7 Jan with Hilary Silvester, Nottm Civic Society, to discuss the erection of a plaque to commemorate Sir Frank Bowden, Raleigh Cycles pioneer  
**- Nottm Local Access Forum meeting of 8 Jan including update on new riverside path bridge at E end of Colwick Park**

4. **Finance and Membership (David Easley and Hilary Backhouse to report)**

- Including updates on membership renewals and new memberships  
- Possible further support for Pedals from the Experian Community Organisation support scheme, e.g. assisting Larry Neylon with developing new Pedals website.

**5. Forthcoming events / meetings**

**Pedals meetings including invitations to visiting speakers, review of the agenda layout, chairing future meetings and the need to contact The Vat and Fiddle for preparing (e.g. heating) the room.**- Speakers for meetings in February, April and November 2014.  
- Pedals Committee Roles, Members and standing down at the AGM (item tabled by Andrew Martin)  
- Andrew Martin’s proposal that some (2-4) Pedals members have a formal meeting with Nottingham CC within the next six months, to discuss outstanding issues and ongoing concerns.

**Pedals 25th birthday celebration events**:   
suggestions and approx. timing and organisations responsibilities

**Other meetings / events**

- Suggestions for Items for Greater Nottingham Cycling Development Group meeting on 27 Jan, and attendance

- 21-22 June 2014 Great Notts Bike Ride Terms and Conditions: messages of 9 and 10 Jan from Roland Backhouse and responses from Nick Emmonds of Perfect Motion

**6. Cycle facility and traffic management matters including**

-

- Sneinton Neighbourhood Planning – exchange of messages with Tom Hughes re Pedals involvement in the promotion of cycling in Sneinton

- Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St, Sherwood - Road Safety Scheme: message of 21 Dec from Andrew Martin

- Possible further NET extension to Kimberley etc. - some possible implications for cycling: my message of 8 Jan to Peter Briggs et al**.**- Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 60 proposed signing (Leicester – Nottingham)

- Dunkirk / Abbey St and Mansfield Rd / Forest Rd E junctions cycle safety schemes; drawings from Keith Morgan (City Council) circulated on 6 Jan: comments from Mara Ozolins and Larry Neylon etc.

-Improving cycle access across the new tram tracks at the junction of Queen's Dr and Castle Bridge Rd – message of 6 Jan from Keith Morgan

-new River Leen-side pathway work in Cinderhill from Church Lane to Wilkinson Street and north of David Lane (plan sent by Keith Morgan on 10 Jan)

- Meadow Lane Sneinton new rail bridge (replacing level crossing)

-Proposed HS2 and associated SS2 (Slow Speed 2) long-distance cycle route proposals - DfT appointment of consultants to carry out feasibility study my message of 6 Jan: draft Pedals response to HS2 Phase 2 consultation (due in by 31 Jan)

-Fourth Trent Crossing: draft article from Roland Backhouse (13 Jan) for discussion at Pedals meeting

-Nottm Post article (15 Jan) re Mapperley Plains cycling improvement controversy

1. **Miscellaneous items**

-Drivers perspective on poor cycling and cyclists: possible series of article for the Nottm Post: Comments of 11 Dec from Susan Young on message from David Easley  
-Invitation for Pedals to send a representative to meetings of the Nottinghamshire Local Access Forum

**HMcC BACKGROUND NOTES TO SUPPLEMENT THE AGENDA FOR THE PEDALS MEETING AGENDA ON MONDAY 20 JANUARY 2014**

**giving more detailed information on issues with which I have been involved on behalf of Pedals since our last monthly meeting and including extracts from some relevant emails.**
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**BACKGROUND NOTES**

1. **Apologies for absence from**Mara Ozolins, Roland and Hilary Backhouse.
2. **Minutes of the Pedals Meeting held at 7.30pm in the Vat & Fiddle Public House, Queens Bridge Road, Nottingham on Monday, 18th November, 2013.**

**Present:** Hugh McClintock, Susan Young, Arthur Williams, Andrew Martin, Peter Briggs, Steve Holland, Terry Scott, David Easley, Andrew Househam, David Miller, Jonathan Avis, Roland & Hilary Backhouse.

**Apologies** were received from: Roy Wilson, Thomas Madar.

**Minutes of October Meeting** were agreed.

**Matters Arising:**

**John Holmes** has agreed to speak at AGM. Susan and others considering possible routes for cycle after the meeting – further discussion in January.

Possibility of Dropbox: It was agreed to wait until Larry has completed the new version of the website before doing more on this.

Hugh has been drafting a response to the city-wide consultation on the local plan - local access forum request. Deadline is 2nd December. Hugh to send around for further comments.

Ilkeston station bridge – the campaign to ensure that this is open to cyclists as well as pedestrians now seems to be gaining momentum. This is another example of something that campaign groups are needed for.

**Report on recent meetings / events**

Hugh and Peter Briggs attended a meeting to look at cycle signs within the City. There is an awareness in the city that more needs to be done – a proposal discussed was use of numbered and colour-coded routes. **Hugh** has suggested that Keith Morgan from city contacts Leicester county or city councils. He will provide relevant contacts.

East Midlands Cycle Forum (EMCF) – Hugh and Roland reported back on the meeting in Leicester. There are some impressive things happening in Leicester – e.g. work on “connecting Leicester project”, e.g. changing the city’s ring road to make crossing it more easy; also large women’s cycle ride group and a great variety of other groups active in cycling.

Nottingham is probably next on list to host the annual EMCF meeting in Oct. 2014 – ideas for venue – Friends Meeting Ho. Canal House, Trent Bridge Inn. To be looked at again after Xmas. Need to consider cycle parking.

Meeting at Loxley Ho. regarding “Green Spaces and well-being”. Hugh raised need for better cycle and walking routes to parks and also need for better signing in parks.

Hugh also went to a consultation meeting on HS2. There is a plan for a long-distant cycle route – SS2. There could be good opportunities if cycle routes are considered in early stage of planning. Decision on alignment is due next year.

Cyclenation: meeting of reps – Steve H. attended; useful discussion on co-ordinating campaigns across the country – starting by lobbying for local elections in 2014 – proposed tagline of “Space for Cycling”. Plan to link groups through the Cyclenation website. Trying to plan ahead so that the campaign is in place before election time. Suggestion that we could highlight on Cyclenation site what to do about councils who do not implement good practice in street design. Another example discussed was recent police action in London regarding HGVs and cyclists – but emphasis did not show that HGVs are dangerous in Urban areas.

**Membership** – Hilary reported that there are now 19 people who have not renewed from last year. Various members at the meeting agreed to contact those on the list that they know. One-third of members have agreed to take newsletter as pdf.

**Finance** – David reported current accounts at a healthy level; It was agreed that in future those sending claims with receipts should keep a copy in case the claim is lost in post.

**Future Pedals Meeting plans:**

December – **Peter Os** to bring slides for a presentation of his cycling holidays – including Iceland, Mediterranean. Andrew to ask Peter to bring laptop and cable to connect to larger screen (HDMI).

Reminder from Jan. – new start time of 7pm.

Suggestions for future speakers – Paddy Tipping to discuss issues relating to police and road justice campaign.

28 April – **Hugh** to invite Dominic sweeting;

June – suggest Paddy Tipping (Police and Crime Commissioner) or EM Trains Cycling officer.

Suggestions for future themes of meeting – Ebikes; Trikes for disabled people – need wider distance between bollards;

**Other meetings/events:** Canal & River Trust – Hugh has submitted a response to the consultation, and will be attending the AGM on 25 Nov;

East Midlands Trains – Peter will be attending a meeting of stakeholders on 26 Nov. He will be following up what the plans are for Nottingham station. He wants to put forward importance of secure cycle parking; good signage; provision of pump and basic tools; some cyclists may want to leave a bike overnight in order to cycle within Nottingham. Another suggestion is to have contact details of roving cycle mechanics at the cycle parking hub. Also a Pedals noticeboard within the parking.

**Cycle Facilities/traffic management:**

Cycle parking near Theatre Royal tram stop. Issue of parking locations to be raised at CDG. Another related issue is the lack of parking due to Citycard bikes and Police decoy bikes taking spaces.

DoT think Cycling campaign.

Proposed 20mph schemes – there appears to be an illogical application of 30mph to Ruddington Lane;

Feedback on newsletter; Good articles and good layout. Good to have well-written contribution from Roland. More contributions needed from other members…

Request from Nigel Lee to support campaign relating to the forthcoming European elections organised by the Save Sherwood Forest campaign. It was agreed not to make this a priority as it is not within our normal area.

**Other Business:** Texting bike lock – interesting idea.

Susan raised the problem of cycle lights that are too bright and not dipped. Hugh suggested that Susan contacts the technical advisor for CTC, and Philip Darnton who has good contact with the bicycle trade.

History of Raleigh: plans to develop plaques and other markers of the history of cycle industry in Nottingham. A talk is planned for 1st December, organised by Julian Bentley.

Issue of road safety – importance of distractions in relation to causes of accidents. Suggestion to invite a speaker from Brake to a future meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm.

**Update on minutes of recent Pedals meetings and matters arising:**

**Proposed HS2 extension from Birmingham to Leeds: local public exhibition in Long Eaton (15-16 Nov. 2013) and likely impact on local cycle routes: my message of 15 Nov to Roger Geffen (CTC) and Tony Russell (Sustrans Engineering Manager):**

Roger

Tony

I went along today to one of the two local HS2 extensions proposals local consultation meetings for the Nottingham / Derby area, in Long Eaton, with a particular interest in helping to get more detailed knowledge of the proposed routes in the Notts / Derbs area of the proposed extension from Birmingham to Leeds and the likely impact of these on local rights of way and cycle routes, including Sustrans NCN Route 6 and Route 15, and the Erewash Valley Trail, developed in recent years  between the River Trent (Long Eaton and Attenborough) and Langley Mill, etc.  by a partnership of organisations including the two County Councils, Broxtowe and Erewash Borough Councils, and the Notts and Derbs Wildlife Trusts etc., with links to other routes such as the Nutbrook Trail and NCN67.

I also took the opportunity to try to find out if there was any reference, anywhere in the exhibition panels, to the proposed 'Slow Speed 2' cycle route to be developed alongside HS2 and for which, I gathered from a recent news report (in Local Transport Today) the DfT is soon to commission consultants to investigate. Not surprisingly there was not any such reference but I did take the opportunity to raise it with a couple of the officials staffing the event and ended up being referred to an official from the DfT. He knew about the general SS2 proposals and indeed said that someone had already earlier in the day raised this issue.

He also said, understandably, that he expected however that no further work on the SS2 route would take place until the detailed route for the HS2 extension itself had been finalised, probably sometime next year.

That made me wonder how much interest CTC and Sustrans are taking in the SS2 proposal (as well as the impact on local routes) at this stage and how best to ensure that local campaign groups such as Pedals, the Derby Cycling Group and the Chesterfield Cycling Campaign in this area can coordinate our lobbying on this issue with your national efforts.

In terms of finding a possible detailed alignment for SS2 once the HS2 extension alignment has been finalised, I imagine that there will be quite a few detailed problems about just how to fit such a route alongside the new railway, both through crowded urban areas, and where the HS2 will run in tunnels (such as is proposed locally for about 3km to the south of Long Eaton underneath East Midlands Airport), or on bridges / viaducts and related questions about how such a route would connect to local routes, existing and proposed, as well as the general issue of how any new railside route would be affected by the security considerations which were clearly mentioned in the exhibition as a very important design factor.

In addition to the SS2 issue there is of course the general question of how best to coordinate our national, regional and local lobbying, to ensure not only that existing routes are not severed by the HS2 alignment but, wherever possible, that they are enhanced as an integral part of the general HS2 design, construction and landscaping work, which should provide a much better opportunity to improve the quality of such links than if such details are only dealt with as an afterthought.

As you no doubt know, detailed responses to this consultation do not need to be submitted until 31 January 2014, but it would be useful between now and then to know more about what involvement CTC and Sustrans are having generally in these plans, and how we locally can reflect that in our comments at this stage, to help flag up the general importance of these issues being properly addressed, while leaving to a later stage our more detailed comments on the likely impacts on routes in our local areas.

best wishes, Hugh

**….response of 15 Nov from Roger Geffen, CTC:**

Hugh

Many thanks for your email.

The HS2 Cycleway project is being run by Shane Snow at DfT.  He’s a trusted ‘ally’ and a genuine advocate for cycling within DfT.  I know he is keen for CTC and Sustrans to be involved, and we’re certainly keen to contribute as best we can.

Tenders for the ‘HS2 Cycleway’ feasibility study contract have been submitted. It hasn’t been awarded yet,  although Shane told me only earlier this week that a decision is expected soon.  Here is the Invitation to Tender document, setting out what the study is expected to deliver:

[http://www.government-online.net/goto/http://online.contractsfinder.businesslink.gov.uk/%7E/docs/DocumentDownloadHandler.ashx?noticeDocumentId=87969&fileId=578f6d77-9dd2-4ee7-8118-7d83ec78add4](http://www.government-online.net/goto/http:/online.contractsfinder.businesslink.gov.uk/%7E/docs/DocumentDownloadHandler.ashx?noticeDocumentId=87969&fileId=578f6d77-9dd2-4ee7-8118-7d83ec78add4)

Its alignment is anticipated to be within 3 miles of HS2, i.e. not necessarily alongside HS2 itself.  Within Greater London and the W Midlands conurbations, it is likely to involve dedicated high-quality cycling infrastructure.  Elsewhere it will largely be a signed route, but with dedicated infrastructure where it passes through larger settlements.  DfT also envisages that this will provide an opportunity to engage with local authorities and communities themselves along the HS2 corridor, so that the Cycleway can act as a catalyst for the development of local cycle networks in communities along the way.

Informally, DfT’s cycling team basically saw the Cycleway project as a way of securing some funding for cycling from the biggest project (both politically and financially) that DfT is committed to. Critics of HS2 will doubtless see it as a bit of cynical “cycle-washing” (i.e. the cycling equivalent of “green-washing”) of an unsound project.  However, if the HS2 is to go ahead, it’s no bad thing if cycling gets at least a small slice of the action.  And if HS2 eventually gets scaled back or dropped, but the Cycleway survives – well, that could potentially free up a hell of a lot more cash for yet more cycling investment!

Best wishes

**Roger Geffen**

Campaigns & Policy Director

CTC, the national cycling charity

Tel: 01483 238322

Switchboard: 0844 736 8450

Fax: 0844 736 8454

Web: [www.ctc.org.uk/campaigns](http://www.ctc.org.uk/campaigns)

CTC National Office

Parklands

Railton Road

Guildford

**…PS from Roger (15 Nov):**

Simon, Hugh

Would it be helpful if I relayed your comments on to Shane?

It strikes me that it would be useful to ask whoever undertakes the Cycleway contract to think about new or alternative routes for any existing routes that are planned to be taken over or severed by HS2 itself.  It may be that additional work is needed to identify where these problems are likely to arise, and to identify solutions.   If that in turn requires an extension to the Cycleway feasibility study, the HS2 project itself must presumably have a substantial budget set aside for various forms of land acquisition / compensation, that could surely be used to fund this.  In which case, the sooner Shane gets thinking about this, the better!

**Roger Geffen**

Campaigns & Policy Director

CTC, the national cycling charity

**….and message from Roger to Shane Snow, DfT (15 Nov):**

Shane

The attached email string includes messages re the HS2 from Hugh McClintock (of local campaign group Nottingham Pedals, he’s a retired cycling academic who was a key organiser of the Nottingham Velo City Conference c20 years ago) and Simon Geller (of Cycle Sheffield, he’s also secretary of Cyclenation).

They both flag up concerns that HS2 may result in erosion of existing cycle facilities in their areas.  Hugh is concerned about a threat to in the Nottingham area to Sustrans NCN Route 6 and Route 15, and the Erewash Valley Trail, while Simon is flagging up possible loss of part of the Trans Pennine Trail.

It therefore struck me that it might be worth asking whoever undertakes the HS2 Cycleway contract to think about new or alternative routes for any existing routes that are planned to be taken over or severed by HS2 itself – including crossing-points of HS2 as well as routes running along its proposed alignment.  It may be that additional work is needed to identify where these problems are likely to arise, and to identify solutions.   If that in turn requires an extension to the Cycleway feasibility study, the HS2 project itself must presumably have a substantial budget set aside for various forms of land acquisition / compensation, that could surely be used to fund this!

Worth considering?

Best wishes

**Roger Geffen**

Campaigns & Policy Director

CTC, the national cycling charity

**….response from Tony Russell, Sustrans Engineering Manager (18 Nov):**

Hugh

Our central contact person on this is Martyn Brunt, in our Birmingham office. I have copied him into this.

Regards

Tony

**…message of 20 Nov from Martyn Brunt, Sustrans**

Dear Hugh,

Thank you very much for your e-mail which Tony has forwarded to me.

"Slow Speed 2" (SS2), its route and its potential to deliver new routes/RoW

My main involvement with HS2 has been discussing the feasibility study for SS2 with the DfT. Currently the DfT is tendering for an organisation to carry out a detailed feasibility study of SS2 and they expect to appoint someone shortly (FYI Sustrans is not bidding to carry out this work). Unfortunately the person you spoke to who said that "no further work on the SS2 route would take place until the detailed route for the HS2 extension itself had been finalised" was misinformed because the feasibility study is not for a route which will run immediately alongside the HS2 line but one that will operate within a 3-mile corridor either side, seeking to link communities together along the way together with an unbroken trail of traffic free and "Dutch style segregated" paths between London and Manchester/Leeds via Birmingham. Stage one of the feasibility study covers London to Birmingham, with stage two (later next year) covering Birmingham to Manchester and Leeds. Its also worth noting that the SS2 programme is not part of the legal process for establishing HS2 so won't be able use any of the statutory powers associated with creating the rail route in order to create/improve cycling infrastructure. We counselled the DfT that we thought a series of high quality cycling/walking networks in the communities directly affected by the HS2 route was a better way to mitigate the impact the rail line is having rather than a single unbroken trail (that would be remote for considerable lengths and thus less well-used), and there is a reference in the feasibility study to the possible creation of a series of "mini Hollands" but HS2's clear preference is for a single, un-broken trail.

In terms of next steps regarding SS2, we're probably best to wait until someone is appointed to carry out the feasibility study. They will no doubt want to talk to us because, as the DfT knows, we hold a lot of information on route/network opportunities and have done quite a lot of our own analysis on where an SS2 route might go, which communities would most benefit from much-improved cycle infrastructure, and what impact the HS2 route might have on existing routes. I fully expect them to beat a path to our door and once we know who is doing the study we can consider how we want to engage with this programme. I'll keep you posted as I hear more.

The impact HS2 has on existing routes/RoW and its potential to enhance them

In terms of how best to coordinate our national, regional and local lobbying regarding HS2 and its specific alignment, I'm less close to our national and local policy position but I've copied my colleagues Jason Torrance (National Policy Director) and Matt Easter (Regional Director for East Midlands) who may be able to update you. Thank you for the information regarding the consultation deadline of 31 January 2014.

Many regards

Martyn

**Proposed HS2 and associated SS2 (Slow Speed 2) long-distance cycle route proposals - DfT appointment of consultants to carry out feasibility study my message of 6 Jan**

Further to our various exchanges of emails a few weeks ago about the current DfT consultation on the proposed HS2 'Y' extension from Birmingham to (Manchester and) Leeds and the announcement last September by the DfT of the proposal to include a long distance cycle route (SS2 - Slow Speed 2) alongside the new railway (or at least within 3-5km of it), I now attach a news item from the latest issue of Local Transport Today (no 637, 19.12.13-9.1.14, p24) about the recent DfT contract award for consultants to carry out a study of the feasibility of building a cycleway in the HS2 Corridor.

This gives more useful information in drawing up our various responses to the DfT HS2 consultation due to be submitted by the end of this month. We will be discussing the draft Pedals submission at our next monthly meeting, on Monday 20 January.

Hugh

**A453 M1-Clifton dualling plans - update re proposed provision of a toucan crossing on the north side of the new Mill Hill roundabout: my message of 17 Nov to Richard Hand, NET Extensions Project Team**Richard

I realise that it is now several months since I last raised with you the need which Pedals believes is very important for a toucan crossing on the north side of the new A453 roundabout to provide a safe link (across the road on the Clifton side) for cyclists and pedestrians between the shared path by the new NET Clifton terminus park and ride site and the older A453, west of the roundabout, which is of course being retained for non-motorised users and for local motor traffic to and from Barton Fabis and Thrumpton, etc.

If such a safe link is not provided it will make it much more dangerous for cyclists from those areas, on the old A453, to cycle safely to the new  NET terminus park and ride site on the edge of Clifton, including the Citycard secure bike parking and hire hub which is to be provided there. We consider that the provision of such a link is also very important in wider strategic terms, particularly as an integral part of the range of cycling provision planned by the Highways Agency as part of the wider A453 (M1 to Clifton) widening scheme, which also forms part of an extension of Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 15 across the south of the county between Aslockton / Bingham and East Midlands Airport etc., with good connections to other local cycle routes in the Greater Nottingham area, particularly in Clifton, Wilford and West Bridgford, and including the various cycle facilities planned along both of the two new NET extension routes.

It would therefore be very helpful please to know if there are now definite plans to include this vital safe link, coordinated by the NET extensions team, the HA and their A453 contractors, and the City and County Councils. If it would help at all, we would be very happy to meet with you and other interested parties to discuss this further.

best wishes

Hugh

for Pedals

**A453 M1-Clifton dualling plans - update re provision of a toucan crossing on the North side of the new Mill Hill Roundabout: message of 23 Dec from Jonathan Pizzey, Highways Agency:**

As Project Manager for the A453 widening scheme, I have been asked to provide an HA response to your e-mail of 17th November to Richard Hand at Nottingham City Council, re the potential to put a Toucan crossing on Mill Hill Roundabout.

We have corresponded on this in the past, and you are aware that there are no plans to provide any pedestrian/ cyclist crossing of the A453 at Mill Hill Roundabout.

Please find attached for your information, a copy of your original e-mail, and the letter response I have put in the post today. I have also included the e-mail explaining the HA's position on this, I sent to you in April 2012.

Yours, Jonathan Pizzey

**Jonathon Pizzey, Senior Project Manager**Highways Agency | The Cube | 199 Wharfside Street | Birmingham | B1 1RN  
**Tel**: +44 (0) 121 6788306 | **Mobile**: + 44 (0) 7827 357972  
Web: [http://www.highways.gov.uk](http://www.highways.gov.uk/)  
GTN: 6189 8306   
  
**…my message of 2 Jan in forwarding this email:**

Despite a hint several weeks ago from Richard Hand of the NET Project Team that it would be timely to make a fresh attempt to put the general case for this link, the answer from the Highways Agency seems as negative as ever, I regret to say, so I now see little chance to advance this in the near future, unless any of you have other ideas please!.  We could perhaps review this again at the next Cycling Development Group meeting, on 27 January, as well as at the Pedals meeting on 20th.

best wishes for the new year, Hugh

**…comments of 2 Jan from Julian Bentley:**

Hi Hugh  
If I had any ideas, I would put them forward.  These people aren’t interested in getting feedback/ input and any so called 'consultations' are just an exercise in box ticking rather than the policy forum they should be.  Even the city council (ring road lot) don't want to answer Cyclists concerns/ respond to input - the culture of fillibustering is all pervasive.  
  
I would favour the 'direct action' type of campaigning this seems to have more affect than appealing to the intelligence (??!) of these people.  E.g. myself and a number of others have been working on improving attendance at Nottingham's Critical Mass rides - and these have seen an increase in attendances - the hope is to get numbers up to the levels of Leicester's (I.e. Regular turnouts of 100-400 riders).  
Julian

**Wilford Area 20mph proposals: response of 20 Nov from Jennifer Williams**

Hello Hugh,

Thank you for your email and for your partial support regarding the 20mph proposals in the Wilford area.

The tramway has a different speed limit from highway/carriageway speed limits.  The section of Main Road from The Ferry Pub car park up to and including the Toll Bridge will no longer be classed as carriageway and will be a tramway with an adjacent shared path for pedestrians and cyclists.  The speed limit for the tramway over the Toll Bridge will be 50kph.  On the approaches to the Toll Bridge the speed will be 35kph.  I have attached a plan of the proposed layout for your information.

As stated in the consultation letter “A” and “B” roads are to be excluded from the 20mph proposals and as Ruddington Lane is classified as a “B” road it shall remain at 30mph.

If you require any more information please let me know.

Kind regards,

Jen

Jennifer Williams   
Senior Officer - Road Safety

Traffic & Safety

Development Department

Nottingham City Council

Loxley House

Station Street

Nottingham

NG2 3NG

Email: [jennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:ejennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

Tel: (0115) 8765229

Website: [www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk](http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

Facebook: [www.facebook.com/mynottingham](http://www.facebook.com/mynottingham)

Twitter: [www.twitter.com/mynottingham](http://www.twitter.com/mynottingham)

\*Please note I am in the office Tuesday to Friday and remote-work on Monday\*

**From:** Hugh McClintock [[mailto:hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com]](mailto:[mailto:hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com])   
**Sent:** 19 November 2013 12:32  
**To:** 20mph  
**Cc:** Francis Ashton; Chris Gardner; Arthur Williams; Roland Backhouse; David Litchfield; Dave Miller; Julian Bentley; Chris Carter; Gary Smerdon-White; Jane Urquhart (Cllr)  
**Subject:** Re: Wilford Area 20mph Speed Limit Proposals - Pedals comments

Jennifer

Thanks for consulting Pedals about these proposals which we in general support provided that actual speed levels after the introduction of the scheme are carefully monitored and that appropriate action is taken to reinforce the new measures should the intended speed reduction not be achieved.

At the same time we would like to object to the decision to exclude Ruddington Lane and Main Road (between Wilford village and the Toll Bridge) from the scheme on the grounds that these are roads that the new tram line will be using. In the case of Ruddington Lane the tram will only be crossing this road rather than running on it and in the case of Main Road we think it anyway unlikely that the trams will be running at more than 20mph, especially close to tramstops, so this exclusion seems quite unnecessary, and will undermine the potential general greater benefits of the scheme for vulnerable road users from these roads also being included.

best wishes

Hugh

for Pedals

**Proposed new cycle signage for Nottingham: message of 25 Nov from Brian Goss to Keith Morgan re numbered route signage;**

Hugh, Keith,

Following on from my suggestion of numbered/coloured cycle routes in the Nottingham area.

I think I read in some notes, that in principle the idea might gain traction. But the main problem is that any numbered route would need signing all at once to be of benefit and that resigning entire routes would be costly.

I wonder if the solution to this barrier, would be if we could get City & County councils to agree a cycle signage format which includes passive provision for future numbering?

This would simply be a case of specifying a margin of e.g. 150mm to the left of the text on all new/replacement cycle route signage.

I suppose to get widely adopted it would need the spec to be notified to all officers concerned and maybe also to approved sign suppliers, just to be sure.

Sorry I didn’t get this out before CDG, just something we discussed at a Sustrans ranger day on Saturday.

Best wishes, Brian

**…response from Keith to Brian of 30 Nov**  
Brian,

Thanks for the info. I am looking into options to number the routes. My current thoughts are to brand the corridors in line with the numbering given to the routes in the Action Plan. This would then allow us to sign and mark the routes, much the same way as London’s Cycle Super Highways.

I am currently pulling options together for internal agreement and I would be happy to meet and go through the proposals once they have been drawn up.

Thanks, Keith

**Nottm New Local Plan Land and Planning Policies Preferred Option Consultation - Response from Pedals (2 Dec: comments from Cllr. Jane Urquhart:**Hi Hugh,  
Thank you for this comprehensive response, its really helpful to have, and we will look carefully at all the issues raised.

Jane Urquhart

Cllr Sherwood Ward and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport

**…comments from Nick Ebbs, Blueprint** Regeneration (2 Dec):  
Thank you for your note Hugh. Your reference to Nottingham Waterside is appreciated as is your specific reference to the possibility of a bridge from Waterside to the Hook/ Lady Bay. We are keen to encourage this.

Nick Ebbs  
blueprint  
07966 256136  
twitter @nickigloo / facebook: BlueprintRegeneration  
  
[http://www.blueprintregeneration.com](http://www.blueprintregeneration.com/)   Blueprint (General Partner) Ltd, 48-50 St Mary’s Gate, Lace Market, Nottingham, NG1 1QA.  Registered in England 05340186  
[http://www.iglooregeneration.co.uk](http://www.iglooregeneration.co.uk/)   Igloo Regeneration Ltd, Hope Mill, 113 Pollard Street, Manchester M4 7JA. Registered in England 4057460

**Nottingham Ring Road Major: implications for cyclists: message of 20 Nov from Dr. David Davies, PACTS:**  
Hi Hugh

Thanks for sending the Pedals newsletter. The ring road is a classic dilemma – direct and convenient but mixing with fast/heavy traffic  or slower, interrupted and hazards at multiple crossing points. And pressure to use the latter. have you tried to get the Council to make the inside lane wider (14 feet/ 4.25m) as recommended in Cycle Friendly Infrastructure all those years ago?  Then cyclists could choose.

You may have seen my call for a London Cycling Safety Summit. No reply from Boris yet!   But the Transport Select Committee want to see me next Monday.

All the very best,

David G Davies

Executive Director, PACTS

[david.davies@pacts.org.uk](mailto:david.davies@pacts.org.uk)

**Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety**

Clutha House, 10 Storey’s Gate, Westminster, London SW1P 3AY

0207 222 7732

<http://www.pacts.org.uk/>     Twitter: [@pacts](http://twitter.com./pacts)

PACTS supports the **UN Decade of Action for Road Safety**

<http://www.decadeofaction.org/>

PS of 1 Dec:  
Hugh  
I'd suggest taking space from the outer lane(s), rather than increasing the overall width. I have heard that the managed Mways (now Smart Mways) schemes have shown that narrower lanes have (counterintuitively) reduced accidents.   
Best of luck, David.

**Follow-up to Space for Cyclists meeting in Birmingham in November: message of 8 Dec from Broxtowe Borough Councillor (and Pedals member) Steve Barber:**From today’s Local Government Information Unit: ***Pro-cycling candidates to receive support****Cycling activists are beginning political campaigns aimed at swaying votes in favour of cycling-friendly candidates in local elections. Potential councillors are being asked to make road safety pledges in return for support. The London Cycling Campaign (LCC) developed an online lobbying system as part of its Space for Cycling project and is working with cycling groups in areas such as* ***Newcastle****,* ***Manchester*** *and* ***Birmingham*** *to set up similar systems.*

*The Independent on Sunday, Page: 19*

P.S. Thanks for the support over the Ilkeston Station Bridge. It should go through soon under delegated powers now with the widened bridge, unless you have any other major objections you would like to raise.

However, I am anxious not to hold this up and so give someone somewhere the opportunity to pull the project.

Councillor Steve Barber

Town Hall

Foster Ave

Beeston

NG9 1AB

0115 922 5806:

**….my response to Steve of 8 Dec**Steve

Thanks for sending on this message about the developing national campaign to get support from cycling-friendly candidates in local elections. This follows an initiative of the London Cycling Campaign a few months ago which has aroused a lot of interest from several other local cycling campaign groups and was discussed at a 'Space for Cyclists' campaign special meeting in Birmingham last month, at which Steve Holland represented Pedals. We had a brief report from him at the  November Pedals meeting and agreed to discuss it further at our next monthly business meeting which is next month, on Monday 20 January.

Good news indeed about the Ilkeston station new bridge proposals.

best wishes, Hugh

…**message of 12 Jan from Simon Geller, Cyclenation Secretary re Space for Cycling Campaign** **25 Jan meeting in Sheffield**Space for Cycling is a campaign aimed at mobilising the cyclist vote and raising the profile of cycling preceding the local elections in May 2014 and the general elections in 2015.

Within London, the London Cycling Campaign’s ‘Space4cycling’ campaign is focussed on the London Borough elections in May 2014.  It aims to secure commitments from borough candidates to local measures to deliver Space4Cycling, including 20mph limits, traffic-calmed or traffic-free routes and greenways, routes to school, or dedicated space on main roads.

Outside London, we will be focussing not only on securing commitments to ‘Space4Cycling’ but also the ‘Funding4Cycling’ needed to deliver this.  It will involve pressing councils and councillors to commit to ‘Space4Cycling’, but also to work with cycle-friendly councils and councillors to secure funding for this from Government and the national political parties, as they prepare their manifestos for the 2015 elections.

Crucially though, ‘Space4Cycling’ is also a major opportunity to boost involvement in local cycle campaigning and campaign groups, and indeed to help new campaign groups to form in areas of the UK where these are currently lacking.  
  
If your group would like to get involved with these key campaign for 2014, please send someone along to Sheffield on the 25th to find out more.   
  
Please let [cyclesheffield@gmail.com](mailto:cyclesheffield@gmail.com) know if you're coming but we are not anticipating any capacity problems, so the more the merrier. CycleSheffield is putting on a Friday Night Ride special and a post-meet infrastructure safari for those who may want to make more of a weekend of it - contact Mick Nott,  <[mick.nott@googlemail.com](mailto:mick.nott@googlemail.com)> for more info.

**Promoting cycling at Rushcliffe School, West Bridgford: message of 13 Dec from Dominic Sweeting, Sustrans**

Hi Hugh

I have been meaning to get in touch sooner but you will be pleased to hear that I met with Phil Crompton and Anthony Flemming from Rushcliffe School on Monday to discuss working together. Both are very supportive of the work I am carrying out and keen to trial some of the ideasI have. Phil has a vision for the school to achieve the coveted Gold standard of the Sustrans Schools Mark, which is something to work towards over the next few years.

They are the 6th school to finally sign up and work with me to promote sustainable and active travel and first impressions are that they have the foundation to create some real change in the way students travel to school. **They join Emmanuel, Djanogly (11-14 centre), Big Wood, Bluecoat (Wollaton Park) and Fernwood School.**

Best regards

Dominic Sweeting

Sustrans Schools Officer

Nottingham City Council

Road Safety Education

Loxley House

Station Street

Nottingham

NG2 3NG

07919 013 395

01158 765 222

1. **Report of recent meetings:**

**Greater Nottm Cycling Development Meeting of 25 Nov 2013 - notes from Gary S-W circulated on 3 Jan 2013**

1. **Introductions and Apologies**

Apologies from Paul H, Matt E, Chris C, John C and Helen R (who will be covering health sector landscape at the next meeting). Matt E has appointed a new Network Development Manager Gwyneth McMinn who it was suggested we might invite if Matt was in agreement.

1. **Cycling Infrastructure Update**

The last report updated with additional information from Matt, Paul and Keith is attached.

1. **Cycle Trip Statistics and the implications of increases on thefts**

* Keith to provide statistics at next meeting.
* Meeting with Police Commissioner is arranged for January 13th (Matt, Keith and Gary attending)

1. **Progress on City Signing project**

In progress and Keith to update at our next meeting

1. **Pedals Discussion Items**

* Nottingham Station Secure Bike Compound expansion design imminent, discussions needed re Citycard Cycle Hire and then consultation with Pedals will start on the detailed plans and the proposal for a notice board.
* Orange Tree Junction cycle facility obstruction and lessons arising – present problems are temporary and Keith has changes in hand.
* Broad Marsh Redevelopment Proposals and the need as part of those plans to reinstate a direct link for cyclists between Carrington St and Listergate. BM developments are at early stages.
* Two-way cycling on one-way streets, especially in the Lace Market area. Keith is finalising plans for implementation 2014/15.
* HS2 Birmingham to Leeds extension proposals consultation: possible impact on local cycle routes and implications of the DfT's 'Slow Speed 2' associated cycle route plans. Many organisations are involved in such planning which is at a very early stage. Consultation meetings are ongoing.
* Local promotion of ebikes and trikes, including implications for design of local cycle infrastructure. These are considered important for older riders and need more promotion. There are concerns that larger bikes may not be catered for in Rights of Way plans and developments.

1. **Matters outstanding from previous meetings**

* Nottingham Cycling Ambition Grant Bid – The City are confident that the proposal is now understood by DfT and is recognised as being ready to commence when funding allows
* Closed Street Bike Ride – Pedals are considering for their 35th birthday
* Visible Bike Counters – GNTP provided a marketing proposal but ideal sites are likely to arouse concerns along the new tram corridors during construction
* Temporary surfacing around Broadgate – being resurfaced imminently
* Respect: Local Research Project – Sustrans will likely develop a proposal.

1. **Date of Next Meeting**

27th January 2pm at Loxley house

1. **AOB**

* Much as it is a good indicator of cycling interest existing racks in the city Centre are insufficient to take CityCard Bikes, Police decoys and Police security promotion bikes. Further stands are required in various places including outside the Royal Centre.
* There was concern that the report Jeremy offered on all A52 related HA schemes and issues from the Sherwin Island to Radcliffe had not been provided.

1. S**uggestions for future meetings**

* Cycle thefts – January
* Sustrans Network Development
* Safety and Infrastructure Research Project – N.B. 26/09/2013 they responded that the time was not yet right to give us feedback
* Cochrane Review Study of Cyclist Training – N.B. 26/09/2013 they responded that they had not decided on what they were intending to do

**Canal and Rivers Trust (East Midlands) Annual Public Meeting, 25 Nov:**Peter Briggs asked me to raise a point the issue of out of control dogs on canal towpaths and I managed to raise this in the course of a question on what the CRT’s approach is to the managing of (potential) user conflicts on canal paths and riverside paths.   
  
I also had the opportunity to talk informally to various people from the CRT etc. about Pedals perspective and some of the changes we would like to see, following up our recent detailed comments in response to their East Midlands Waterways Partnership Development Plan consultation last summer.

**Notes of 1 Dec from Peter Briggs on East Midlands Trains stakeholders' Conference, November 26th 2013**

1) Some time was given in the presentations to the successful outcome of the Nottingham station closure and to the increase in line speeds from this December which will knock about 6 minutes off the Nottingham London Journey.

2) A general mention was made of the increase in cycling and the way the Company was responding in providing cycling facilities at station , but nothing at all was said about Nottingham Station.

3) I spoke afterwards with the passenger director for EMT.  He assured me that he had received my email and that EMT would be actively engaged with stakeholders in the planning  of the cycle facility at the Station and that the reason this has not happened so far is because of the all other projects they are currently managing.  They expect to give full attention to Nottingham Station in the New Year.

**EMT Stakeholder Conference - Tuesday 26 November 2013 and subsequent message (23 Nov) from Peter Briggs to Emma Knight of EMT (Stagecoach Group Trains):**

Emma can you please being this information to the attention of those who can provide answers and let me know the outcome in due course.

Thanks

**Cycling issues**

Emma, thank you again for your invitation to this meeting.  As in previous years I have written to you beforehand about local cycling issues identified by Pedals (<www.pedals.org.uk>) and hope that these questions can be answered by the event or soon after.

We are delighted that significant investment has been provided for a Nottingham cycle hub. This year Pedals' priority is to seek involvement with EMT in the planning of the new cycle hub so that it both meets your own requirements (Ref: your own undated document *East Midlands Train Cycle Strategy)* and meets our additional priorities as detailed below:

1. All the research evidence available to us shows that people will use this resource provided it is *safe and secure.* And if it is *really* safe and secure then fewer cyclists will want to put their cycles on trains - which I am sure is of benefit to EMT*.* Can particular thought please be given to: lighting, access and in particular security monitoring. Good liaison with Police and the City Council is also essential to join up thinking in relation to security issues.
2. Sheffield stands need to be spaced (1 metre) so that if you want cyclists to use both sides then there is room for two cycles between then including width taken up by saddle bags etc.
3. We understand that cycle retailer facilities in Leeds have not been a commercial success. If a retailer is not around we would particularly welcome available tools - foot pumps, spanners and allen keys (attached by a chain!).
4. Charging points need to be considered for the increasing number of people using electric bicycles.
5. We note your specification for cycling maps and hope that the City Council will be provided with a locked notice board for a map.  Additionally we would like a locked notice board to be provided for Pedals where we can give cyclists local and timely information about cycling issues.
6. There needs to be mechanism for dealing with bikes that look abandoned (as opposed to those left overnight because of a train journey, or those bikes perhaps left there every night as a Nottingham base for the commute from the station to work and back.)
7. Signing is very important. We would like to work with you to ensure that signing is effective within the station and that it relates to signing provided by Nottingham City around the station. (Nottingham city is currently conducting a City-wide review of cycling signage).
8. Publicising the new resource will be important if it is going to be fully used.
9. We appreciate the offer of changing facilities but would want to give most emphasis on facilities to wash hands.

We have had discussions with Nottingham City Council (through the Nottingham Cycle development group) about the Station Cycle Hub, but nothing yet with EMT. Can you please put us in touch with the manager in charge of building this resource so that as consumers, we can help you build the best cycle hub in the country to date!.

On a quite different matter can you please fix Nottingham's station clock!

Many thanks, Peter Briggs

**….comments from Peter to Emma Knight re Nottingham Hub cycle centre expansion proposals:**

**East Midlands Trains Stakeholder Conference (26 Nov) Cycling issues – message of 24 Nov from Peter Briggs to Emma Knight, EMT**

Emma, thank you again for your invitation to this meeting.  As in previous years I have written to you beforehand about local cycling issues identified by Pedals (<www.pedals.org.uk>) and hope that these comments can be taken into account:-

We are delighted that significant investment has been provided for a Nottingham cycle hub. This year Pedals' priority is to seek involvement with EMT in the planning of the new cycle hub so that it both meets your own requirements (Ref: your own undated document *East Midlands Train Cycle Strategy)* and meets our additional priorities as detailed below:

1. All the research evidence available to us shows that people will use this resource provided it is *safe and secure.* And if it is *really* safe and secure then fewer cyclists will want to put their cycles on trains - which I am sure is of benefit to EMT*.* Can particular thought please be given to: lighting, access and in particular security monitoring. Good liaison with Police and the City Council is also essential to join up thinking in relation to security issues.
2. Sheffield stands need to be spaced (1 metre) so that if you want cyclists to use both sides then there is room for two cycles between then including width taken up by saddle bags etc.
3. We understand that cycle retailer facilities in Leeds have not been a commercial success. If a retailer is not around we would particularly welcome available tools - foot pumps, spanners and allen keys (attached by a chain!).
4. Charging points need to be considered for the increasing number of people using electric bicycles.Mil
5. We note your specification for cycling maps and hope that the City Council will be provided with a locked notice board for a map.  Additionally we would like a locked notice board to be provided for Pedals where we can give cyclists local and timely information about cycling issues.
6. There needs to be mechanism for dealing with bikes that look abandoned (as opposed to those left overnight because of a train journey, or those bikes perhaps left there every night as a Nottingham base for the commute from the station to work and back.)
7. Signing is very important. We would like to work with you to ensure that signing is effective within the station and that it relates to signing provided by Nottingham City around the station. (Nottingham city is currently conducting a City-wide review of cycling signage).
8. Publicising the new resource will be important if it is going to be fully used.
9. We appreciate the offer of changing facilities but would want to give most emphasis on facilities to wash hands.

We have had discussions with Nottingham City Council (through the Nottingham Cycle development group) about the Station Cycle Hub, but nothing yet with EMT. Can you please put us in touch with the manager in charge of building this resource so that as consumers, we can help you build the best cycle hub in the country to date!.

On a quite different matter can you please fix Nottingham's station clock!

Many thanks, Peter Briggs

**Greater Nottm Light Rapid Transit Advisory Committee meeting of 10 Dec 2013: Park and Ride and Bike and Ride**Among the items raised at this quarterly meeting were some figures on trends in use of park and ride sites in relation to NET Line One, especially at Hucknall. It seems that a recent trend has been for both for the average number of people per car to go down, often to only 1 per car, and also for more of the park and ride site users to be people who drive only 1-2 miles to the site, rather than several miles.

Tramlink Nottingham Consortium, who now operate the NET, are considering various strategies to address this change, mostly regarding bus services, but are also open to the idea I raised of encouraging more people who get the tram from to be encouraged to use bikes when they are only travelling quite short distances to get to the tram stop.

**West Bridgford Local Traffic and Transport Group meeting of 10 Dec 2013: cycling issues raised and follow-up emails:**

I raised these local cycling issues:-

* Providing tramside cycle paths including between Wilford Lane and Ruddington Lane on the Clifton NET route.
* Safety of cyclists crossing Loughborough Road (A60) between Chaworth Road and Northwold Avenue
* Safety of cyclists crossing Melton Road (A606) by Machin’s Lane, Edwalton and importance of improvements for promoting cycling at Rushcliffe School

**…message of 11 Dec to Paul Hillier, Notts CC: need for improving safety for cyclists on Loughborough Rd (A60) at its junction with Northwold Ave and Chaworth Rd (W Bridgford) and in accessing the new Wilford La Health Centre**

Paul   
Very glad to hear at last night's WB Local Traffic and Transport Group your clear acknowledgement of the need to improve the safety of cyclists when crossing Loughborough Road at its junction with Northwold Avenue and Chaworth Road and also that you think that there is some possibility of getting some funding from Sustrans to improve the situation, particularly in the wider context of the need for a series of measures to improve the safety of cyclists wishing to ride to the Health Centre on Wilford Lane.

If in due course you think it would be useful to arrange a site meeting to discuss this further I would be very happy to be involved and to encourage other interested parties to attend.

best wishes, Hugh  
  
**..and his reply of 12 Dec:**

Hi Hugh,

Thanks for the offer. I’m not sure that a site visit would necessarily yield any greater knowledge than that already in the possession of our designers but if, at the appropriate time, they believe that additional input would be valuable, I’ll certainly get back in touch.

Regards,

Paul Hillier

Principal Officer LTP and Travel Planning

Transport Planning & Programme Development Team

Nottinghamshire County Council

Tel: 0115 977 4866

**…Message of 11 Dec to Paul Hillier: problems for cyclists and in pedestrians in crossing Melton Rd near Machin's Lane**

Paul

Just a short note to follow up the issue I raised at yesterday evening's meeting of the West Bridgford Local Traffic and Transport Group about the  need for action to improve the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing Melton Road near Machin's Lane. This was raised as a problem by Phil Crompton and Robin Harrison when I met them in October to discuss possible measures to promote cycling at Rushcliffe School and several other people have since made clear their agreement that this is a problem. This includes John Quinton of the Edwalton Neighbourhood Council.

As I suggested at the meeting perhaps the next step would be to invite those people with a particular interest in this issue (and more detailed local knowledge than I have) to a site meeting to help agree the nature of the problem and possible ways of improving the situation.

best wishes

Hugh

for Pedals

**,,,,Message of 11 Dec to County Councillor Steve Calvert: development of proper safe and legal cycle paths - shared paths alongside the NET extension routes**Steve

You will remember when you came along to the Pedals meeting in October that one of the long list of issues we raised with you was the current position on whether or not the new paths to be developed alongside the two new tram routes would be properly signed and surfaced as safe and legal shared paths (or cycle paths) rather than just public footpaths, an issue on which there seemed to be a lot of uncertainty under the previous administration and in the various meetings we had with the NET Extensions Project Team etc. This is particularly important on the section of the new Clifton tram route between Wilford Lane and Ruddington Lane and on the Chilwell route between Chilwell and Toton. (In the case of the section of the Clifton route between Ruddington Lane and Road (Clifton), mostly in the City, this does seem already to be clearly agreed, we understand, thanks to the strong support of the City Council).

I did also raise this issue with you at the last West Bridgford Local Traffic and Transport Group and you said then that you would follow it up. I was hoping at last night's meeting of the TTG to find out what progress you had been able to make but, as you were unable to attend, thought I would now raise this again in an email. We would be very grateful please to know the latest position on this.

best wishes

Hugh

for Pedals

**Message of 11 Dec to Chris Carter, City Council: Improving cycle access across the new tram tracks at the junction of Queen's Dr and Castle Bridge Rd**Chris

Have there been any further developments please in considering the suggestion which I raised with you last year about taking advantage of the major changes to the layout at the junction of Castle Bridge Road and Queen's Drive by the new tram tracks to introduce a proper (toucan) crossing to provide a safer link between The Meadows etc. and the Castle Bridge Road / Castle Meadow area?

best wishes, Hugh

**Notes of the meeting held at Trent Bridge House on 12 December 2013 to discuss the local rights of way implications for Nottinghamshire of the plans to extend the HS2 High-Speed Railway (Phase 2) from Birmingham to Leeds (and Manchester)**

**Present:**Mary Mills, Chair, Nottinghamshire Local Access Forum  
Neil Lewis, Nottinghamshire County Council Countryside and Rights of Way Section Team Leader  
Diane Moore, Chair, Nottingham Local Access Forum (NLAF)  
Michael Bird, Warwickshire Ramblers Association Rights of Way Recording Officer (Speaker) (MB)  
Chris Thompson, Nottinghamshire RA  
Alex Staniforth, Nottinghamshire RA and Nottinghamshire LAF  
Jim Morris, Nottinghamshire RA  
Peter Hiley, Vice-Chair, Nottinghamshire LAF  
Dennis Reeson, Nottinghamshire LAF  
Cathy?, Nottinghamshire LAF and NFU  
Hugh McClintock, Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) and NLAF  
Peter Briggs, Pedals

**Apologies for absence:**John Lee, Rights of Way Officer, Nottingham City Council and NLAF

**Presentation by Michael Bird of the Warwickshire Ramblers’ Association on to HS2 phase 1 (London Euston to Birmingham proposed high speed line)**

Most of the first half of the meeting was devoted to the presentation by Michael Bird from Warwickshire RA on his experience in discussing rights of way issues with HS2 Ltd. in relation to the first phase of HS2 from London Euston to Birmingham and Litchfield near the fork in the ‘Y’ from which phase 2 would extend to Manchester and Leeds.

Their area of interest included all of ‘historic Warwickshire’, i.e. the present county plus Coventry and Solihull, now under separate local authorities. Coventry City Council and Warwickshire CC are opposed to HS2 whereas Birmingham City Council and Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council are in support.

HS2 was being promoted through a Hybrid Bill in Parliament rather than using normal planning procedures.

He said that it was important to appreciate that the HS2 proposals basically involved a straight line with long trains and capable of taking 18 trains an hour in each direction. With design speeds of 250mph (400km/), possibly now to be reduced to 230mph (370 km/h) and a minimum bend radius of about 4 miles (6km) it would mostly cut through landscape features rather than following natural contours. The importance of protecting the landscape through which it passed was therefore relatively less though there was likely to be extensive mitigation planting.

The RA had estimated that the first phase of HS2 would severe about 200 Public Rights of Way, mostly public footpaths, and would extend through 22 different Local Access Forum areas.

HS2 Ltd. was a Government owned company, an arm of the Department for Transport. For phase 2 there are 2 HS2 Design Teams and also 3 major Contractors, including Arup, Capita and Atkins and also various subcontractors. The area of Phase 1 included 9 Community Forums, 3 Major Local Authorities, 19 Parish Councils and 6 local RA groups. Few shared any commonality however with the result that sometimes there were representatives of 2 Design Teams at meetings.

The involvement of Warwickshire RA with the HS2 plans started with an exchange of letters in February 2011 between the CEO of HS2 Ltd and the then CEO of the RA. In response to the RA HS2 Ltd said that the matter of the impact on local rights of way would be addressed within the promised ‘Appraisal of Sustainability’. This said that 27 footpaths would be affected in Warwickshire (not 49 as Warks RA had suggested), 4 Bridleways, 4 E-Roads and 2 Byways. HS2 Ltd produced strip maps for the proposed route, based on 6” to the mile OS maps, and these noted vertical sections and chainage (distance in km from Euston, a very useful way of showing exact locations and, he said, more useful than OS map grid references), and showed cuttings and embankments which might be deep or tall enough to allow underpasses (subways) or overbridges to be more easily included.

Warks RA then had to mark public footpaths on these strip maps, which they did using free software available from pdfill.com or paint.net. As well as doing this they noticed that E-roads (unclassified) were not included on the definitive map. By including all the crossings of the proposed route they contributed to the production of a database. This included the status of each link, the parish, the OS map reference, whether the link was over a cutting or an embankment, a description of the link (area), the distance to the nearest crossing point, and any other comments.

HS2 Ltd then organised a series of Local Roadshows (similar to those recently held in this area for the second phase, e.g. as in Long Eaton in November 2013). At these maps were shown which included the contours of each section.

Coventry City Council, opposed to HS2, diverted one of their Rights of Way team to HS2 work which was helpful but also meant they had less capacity for other rights of way work, e.g. in processing claims.

MB remarked that it was very important to keep in touch with general HS2 developments, including announcement and discussions in Parliament, and that he found that the regular emails from WordPress.com were very helpful in doing this, if you signed up to receive these.

One of their fears about the implementation of HS2 was that though rights of way would be reinstated this might only be to a minimum standard with HS2 Ltd arguing that it was up to local authorities to do a good job. However, this fear had not been realised, at least going by experience so far.

Local RA groups were not invited to the local Community Forums as the view of their former CEO, Alison Munroe, was that these were not an appropriate forum to discuss rights of way issues. Local LAFs however were invited. Community Forums have an independent Chair (such as the local MP if available). However, experience has shown that a wide variety of very specific local concerns are raised at these meetings with many very critical comments and this has confirmed that it best to raise detailed rights of way issues elsewhere, e.g. at LAFs,

HS2 Ltd had their first meeting with the Warks LAF in July 2012, with representatives of several parts of the company (including their Area Manager and Stakeholder Manager), Highways and Transport Planning staff, and contractors. HS2 have been good at producing maps and other information for these meetings.

HS2 Ltd have developed their own Rights of Way Methodology which has included a survey of usage of local path across the proposed route. This was carried out in August-September 2012, at weekends, and included links which were not (yet at least) official public rights of way. This was despite their surveyors (temporary staff) sometimes having problems in finding these links, e.g. if they were overgrown. Warks RA feared that the results of this survey, presented at the second meeting with LAFs, might be used to argue for the closure of some rights of way, on grounds of lack of usage, but there have in fact been no signs of this!

The results of these surveys also included information on the height of bridges and underpasses, as well as the existence of any shared farm access accommodation bridges, and general connectivity of paths.

The information from this survey was included (for Solihull) by HS2’s Birmingham Metropolitan Design Team, put on to aerial photographs, and showed the potential for minor (but useful) realignment of paths.

Because of the change from the original HS2 plans to include far more tunnels and cuttings it seems that HS2 now have far more surplus soil to dispose of so the plans have been revised to increase the general height of the route alignment and to increase the potential for bunds and embankments some of which may now be able more easily include underpasses or overbridges.

More bunds are anyway being included to help reduce the impact of the route (in terms of noise and landscape etc) on local communities and (isolated) properties. These wider plans need to be taken into account in discussing local rights of way issues, and possible realignment of paths, as do the detailed plans for dealing with water and drainage, and the provision of improved /’motorised’ tracks / roads to help service the routes and drainage features etc.

The width of the HS2 route varies depending on the nature of the land through which it passes but typically is 22 metres (between fences) in open country. This allows for a distance of 5 metres between the centres of tracks. The distance between catenary masts is 11.5m. Access roads were originally to be provided on both sides of the route but now will be only on one side and the 22m distance allows for this. The overall width has to be wider when there are embankments with 1 or 2 slopes, and this might make it easier to provide underpasses. These would typically be 4.5m wide and 4.25m high. HS2 have made clear that they are reluctant to provider underpasses on less high embankments.

Footbridges will be more acceptable in deep cuttings where there can run straight across, without access ramps.

Sometimes it will be appropriate to use (farm access) overbridges, e.g. if they have verges of at least 1.5m in width, with 5m wide roads. However there had been some recent talk of ‘green footbridges’ with denser planting to improve connectivity for wildlife.

Also important to take into account are the detailed of where sections where the track would run in cuttings, and any noise bunds to protect the cuttings and sections with retained cuttings, easily bridged, and using existing retaining walls as done in several locations in Kent alongside HS1 (and the parallel M20 motorway).

Where there were tunnels it would seem a good idea to route paths across their portals but there was a need to watch out for ‘porous portals’, where there could be major potential problems of the air resistance created when trains entered the tunnels. To mitigate this it might be necessary to construct perforated retaining walls extending for about 100m away from the portal.

Rights of way issues should also be taken into account in plans for mitigation planting which would be extensive, especially on embankments.

In June and July 2013 HS2 Ltd finally published their draft Environmental Statement, a very very detailed document and only available online and therefore requiring much downloading and zooming in and out! They also then published their Map Book, including revised detailed strip (1:5,000 scale) maps, showing the overall land take of HS2, not just the route, but also woodland, planting, noise bunds and balancing ponds, as well as tracks whose surfaces were to be improved for motor vehicle service access. They now often propose that footpaths should be diverted around this landtake area.

Overall Warks RA found most of the rights of way plans quite acceptable, in 54 out of 59 cases and with an average of 3 rights of way crossings per mile of route now to be included. At the same time they suggested several possible improvements, many, they appreciated, outside the scope of the HS2 plans but providing useful opportunities for the local authorities to take further.

**Questions and discussion.**

MB was thanked very warmly for his very useful detailed presentation which aroused a lot of interest and comments both during the presentation and subsequently. Among the other points raised were:-

* Whether or not sites for (temporary) construction camps / plant and vehicle stores were shown on the detailed maps
* What changes there had been since the initial HS2 plans, e.g. in the height of the proposed route, and how this affected local rights of way issues and other aspects such as drainage.
* What further changes were likely, e.g. in the plans for the route in Notts where it seems that the currently proposed alignment was the only serious route on offer. We needed to know this before we made detailed comments, e.g. on possible specific arrangements for each crossing of the route.
* Whether or not HS2 Ltd had any standard design drawings for particular types of crossing.
* The value of doing detailed usage surveys of affected paths and what use these were or might be put to.
* Whether or not plans for the proposed SS2 (Slow Speed 2) long distance cycle route alongside HS2 had been discussed. These apparently had not, in phase 1, though were now being promoted by the DfT and their consultants, following the announcement in September 2013 in the House of Commons debate on Cycling. These apparently related to a route within 3-5km of the HS2 route itself.
* Whether information was available on how long certain paths would be stopped up during construction and what alternative routes were available, and also the cost of arranging such diversions, including ones for horseriders.
* What should be done to ensure a coordinated regional response to the current consultation, especially in view of the proposed route in this area following through the edge of the county, close to Derbyshire. Neil Lewis said they had already been some discussions with Derbyshire and Derby LAF, particularly with regard to the substantial rights of way network close to the HS2 route on the county boundary and including the Erewash Valley Trail which would be greatly affected, especially in the Long Eaton to Stanton Gate area. It seemed that only a small section, of about 400m, would run within the Nottingham city area, however, between Strelley and Nuthall.

**Conclusion:**

Neil Lewis proposed to Mary Mills and other Nottinghamshire LAF members that they agree on a general response to the current HS2 phase 2 consultation at their next meeting, on 28 January 2014.

Diane Moore said that the Nottingham LAF might do the same at their next meeting, on 8 January 2014.

**PS. We need to send in the Pedals response to this latest consultation by 31 January, via** [**www.hs2.org.uk**](http://www.hs2.org.uk)

**Broxtowe Transport Group meeting, 16 Dec 2013**

I gather that Peter Brigg was unable to attend for health reasons but he raised several points in an email ahead of the meeting, particularly with regard to the ‘bridal path’ riverside path signing saga.

I will send the minutes when I have them.

**..message of 4 Dec 2013 by Peter Briggs to Andy Pooley, Broxtowe BC, suggesting these agenda items:**

1. The ‘no bridal’ path by the bungalow along the big track just beyond Attenborough nature reserve.  The legality of this sign is still not resolved.  It has been suggested that this matter might best be progressed by elected members so can I please bring it to the attention of County Council and Borough Councillor Stan Heptinstall.
2. HS2 –  There are a number of cycling issues and access issues emerging in relation to cyclists and pedestrians. Can we please discuss Broxtowe’s current approach to the current HS2 proposals.
3. We would still like an alternative signposted route for cyclists away from Chilwell High Road and hope that this can be supported.

**…..comments made before the meeting to Peter Briggs by Brian Goss and Adrian Juffs:**

Adrian,

I agree. There is quite a bit of signage in the area already, only exception being at Chilwell Rd end which will likely get sorted with Tram commissioning. So we could sell this as a nil cost mini task to change 2 red & black no cycling signs to blue shared path signs on existing poles, so we don’t need to get into detailed discussions/arguments about routes.

Whilst it looks like it used to be a road, it currently only has footpath status, but given it’s council adopted land  & there’s no likelihood of conflict, then a permissive path would suffice with no need to change to bridleway.

Cheers, Brian

**From:** Adrian Juffs [[mailto:adrian.juffs@gmail.com]](mailto:[mailto:adrian.juffs@gmail.com])   
**Sent:** 04 December 2013 23:05  
**To:** <[home@briangoss.eu](mailto:home@briangoss.eu)>  
**Cc:** Peter Briggs; Adrian Juffs; Gary Smerdon-White; Andrew Martin; Hugh McClintock  
**Subject:** Re: Broxtowe Transport Sub Group Meeting 16th December - cycling issues

Brian

I use the Wilmot cut through maybe 3 or so times a week (where it makes more sense to do so in my route than using the High Rd), and also do so from time to time when leading a ride group (leisure and less confident cyclists).  This being the case before and since the tram works, though occasionally the tram work is influencing my decision to use it a little more currently.

I agree it is a useful cycling link, and I too see very little pedestrian use and have never experienced any issue/conflict where there is.  It is likely that the post-tram cycling facilities on the High Rd will actually make the link even more useful if all else remains pretty much as it is now. That said, I recall that there were thoughts of some development for the adjacent area which might increase motorised traffic.

I've not found the fencing to be much more than a minor inconvenience. Ideally it would be removed completely or maybe changed to a chicane of the type now in the Nature Reserve, but I'd be very happy if all that might be achieved for now were simply a change to blue shared use signs.

Adrian

On 4 Dec 2013, at 20:33, "Hugh McClintock" <[hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com](mailto:hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com)> wrote:

Brian   
Thanks for your comments and suggestions.  
  
On the first matter, the riverside 'Bridal path' by Barton Ferry Cottages, the clear advice at the last but one CDG meeting in September from Paul Hillier at the County Council was that the only way now to progress this was to get the support of the local County Councillor so that the Rights of Way section give it much more priority. As it is we know that they have been particularly hard pressed since they were singled out for disproportionate cuts about 2-3 years ago under the previous administration, and also they are now, I understand, due to lose one further member of staff under the latest proposed cutbacks. By all accounts they are swamped with a very long list basic tasks and outstanding issues countywide and things like this will only get to the top of the pile if there is strong political pressure. I did remind Peter about this recently but don't think he has followed it up again. You might perhaps now like to discuss it with him

As regards the second matter, the upgrading of the Wilmot Lane path was looked at closely early last year in the context of the wish to find some alternative route for cyclists wishing to avoid cycling on narrow roads with tram tracks. However, there was quite a bit of doubt by several people as to whether or not the whole route would really be attractive enough to entice more than a fairly small number of cyclists, and particularly once we had got various improvements to the layout of the road with the tram, e.g. cycle lanes at the back of the nearby (High Road) tram stop. So the whole idea of finding an alternative route was then dropped. Again you might perhaps find it useful to discuss this issue with Peter, and also with Adrian Juffs and Steve Barber.  
best wishes, Hugh

**From:** Brian [<mailto:home@briangoss.eu>]   
**Sent:** 04 December 2013 19:59  
**To:** 'Hugh McClintock'; 'Peter Briggs'  
**Subject:** RE: Transport Sub Group Meeting 16th December

Hugh, Peter,

1)      Going back to Barton ferry cottages bridleway status/ lack of.

Do we know how much evidence the rights of way people have? Or for how many years someone would have to have been using the route for it to count as evidence? Just thinking I could email Herve & ask if any of the cycling club guys have used it historically as a bridleway & would be prepared to write a note the RoW officers.  I can email Steve Carr to Nudge RoW, but I thought it would be worth checking there is enough evidence on our side of argument first. NB NCC have just create 5 new footpaths on Toton sidings after lobbying from Residents & Cllr Richard Jackson. Might explain the lack of action on Trent path.

2)      Footpath from Wilmot Lane- Wilmot Lane/Barrydale Ave. In view of the Tram impact on Chilwell High Rd, is there a case for flagging this up again for conversion to shared path (every bit counts..). Loc for google maps is 52.921375,-1.219547 It’s a short section & not heavily used by walkers or cyclists (never seen anyone else use it). But it is a potential linking route to the cycle route along Queens Rd (currently NCN6). As a minimum the work to upgrade it to shared path would simply be: (1) change 2 round no cycle signs to blue cycle + pedestrian shared path signs. (2) Cut off fencing across path down to ground level. I could do the sign change as a Sustrans ranger task If the council would provide the 2 blue signs. Cutting the barrier fence to ground level is also a very quick job (but probably not one the council would let me do).  Would it be appropriate to flag this up at the Broxtowe meeting, or more appropriate for a future meeting with County Highways?

 Cheers, Brian

**…PS of 12 Dec from Brian to Peter Briggs:**Hi Peter,

Sorry another thought for the Broxtowe transport group, if there is time in AOB is regards dangerous junctions... A few that I’m aware of:

1. Crossroads between Marlborough Road & Abbey Road. There have been quite a few crashes here involving cars in the last few years, not sure if all get reported. Vehicles travel quite fast coming down Marlborough Rd so vehicles crossing on Abbey Rd don’t see them or don’t realise how fast they are. Might be safer either by switching priorities (cars can’t go fast on Abbey Rd anyway due to parked cars both sides), or mini roundabout so all vehicles have to slow, or 20mph limit. Route also popular with cyclists getting to & from Uni.
2. Junctions of Fellows Rd/Denison St/Clinton St/Middleton St with Wollaton Rd are all quite dangerous, as cars are parked on SW side of Wollaton Rd near junctions, so there is not enough visibility to see if it’s safe to pull out.

Many, many thanks, Brian

**Meeting of 7 Jan 2014 with Hilary Silvester, Nottm Civic Society, to discuss the erection of a plaque to commemorate Sir Frank Bowden, Raleigh Cycles pioneer: my message of 7 Jan to Julian Bentley**Julian

I had a very useful meeting this morning about this with Hilary Silvester and gave her lots of suggestions for contacts, both local and national, who I thought would be interested in supporting this event in some way. I suggested that she start with Philip Darnton, former Raleigh Cycles CEO, former Chair of Cycling England, and (still) President of the Bicycle Association and President of Cyclenation, as well as with several people at CTC HQ including Gordon Seabright (CEO), Chris Juden (Technical Director and who worked for Raleigh about 35 years ago) and Roger Geffen, National Policy and Campaigns Manager.

Hilary's idea is to organise a plaque unveiling ceremony, with representatives of any interested organisations, sometime in late June-ish, to tie in with publicity for Bike Week around then and also the run up the Yorkshire launch of this year's Tour de France.

As well as following up my suggested contacts one thing she soon wants to give more thought to is just where the plaque should be erected, e.g. the exact site on Raleigh Street where, we believe Sir Frank first founded his bike factory, after he arrived in Nottingham from Hong Kong. She is going to do more research on that and I suggested that one person who might be able to help was the person you had along to speak on the history of Raleigh in late November, at the talk which I was in the end unable to get to. Could you please therefore let me have his contact details.

I also wondered whether you might be at all interested in the idea of arranging another of your themed rides to tie in with the event and the unveiling of the plaque? Let me know if you think you might perhaps be interested.

I will put this on the agenda for the next Pedals meeting, on 20th, to see what other ideas people have.

Thanks and best wishes

Hugh

**…comments from Susan Young (7 Jan):**Hi  
Themed ride definitely - lots of press contact etc.  Suitable timing  for a picnic afterwards on Jubilee Campus?

Possibly a date for local school children to get involved? There are a few where those who have done Bikeability could have a suitable cycle ride. Need to get some Ridewise support by request for instructors to possibly lead a children’s ride but care to keep it a Pedals event.

Could be a major event and something for Pedals 35 anniversary year.  
Susan

**8 Jan Nottingham Local Access Forum meeting**

Late last year I was sounded out about my willingness to take over as **Chair of NLAF** in place of Diane Moore who has been Chair for the last 3 years and, in the absence of other candidates, was then elected to this role at our meeting on 8 Jan. This will help Pedals develop closer working links with other groups and with John Lee, the City Council Rights of Way officer who services the Forum.

Good news at the meeting about the **new foot/cycle bridge at the east end of Colwick Park** which we have discussed several times since I joined the Forum as the cycling rep, in place of Roger Codling, two years ago. The bridge should now be installed in the first half of March, another important link on the improved Trent north bank riverside path.

More information on the work of NLAF can be found on the City Council website at:  
<http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/rightsofway>

1. **Finance and Membership Matters**  
   including:  
   **update on membership**

**Possible further support for Pedals from the Experian Community Organisation support scheme, e.g. to help Larry Neylon with work on the new Pedals website:**

**….message of 12 Jan from Larry Neylon to Barbara Strang, Experian:**  
Hi Barbara,

Thanks for the offer of looking at some assistance with the job of developing a new website for Pedals.

The reason we need to develop a new website is that the existing site doesn’t work very in the latest web browsers, doesn’t work on Mobiles, and is quite difficult to maintain.

I did start the task of developing a new site 18 months ago, but haven’t had the time to finish this development, and it maybe that we need to start again.

The main tasks I could do with assistance are:

1. Assess the new development site to check that it still works across multiple devices (mobile, tablet, etc) and to confirm whether it will be fit for purpose.
2. If the new development site is judged to not be fit for purpose, then locate suitable alternative WordPress themes available on the internet and test them.
3. Once the new site has been developed (by myself) assistance with the Data Migration from the existing site of content, news, images, etc.  Any knowledge of WordPress would be most useful.
4. Site testing and snagging.

The new development site is at <http://pedalsnew.freeiz.com/> and the current live website is at <http://pedals.org.uk/> .

Let me know if you need more information on any of the tasks.

Regards, Larry

1. **Forthcoming meetings / events**

**Future Pedals meetings**

**17 Feb discussions with Alistair Mclean, City Council re traffic signal timing issues and cyclists**We need some discussion now about the particular issues we want to raise with Alistair in February. Ones I am already aware of include:-

* Timing of lights and toucan crossings and layout arrangements
* Timing of traffic signals more generally including possible ‘green wave ’for cyclists
* Possible introduction of Danish style ‘Cycle Barometer’, as also now being introduced in Cambridge.
* What else?

Dominic Sweeting’s discussion on promoting cycling at Nottingham schools will be in April.

Paddy Tipping has agreed to come but cannot make it until our meeting next November.

**Pedals 25th birthday celebration events.**

Ideas suggested so far include:-

* Ride organised by Julian Bentley with help from Susan Young
* Sir Frank Bowden plaque unveiling ride (with Nottingham Civic Society), late June: Julian Bentley is prepared to lead this
* Special meal
* Hosting next EMCF meeting (September / October)

I suggest that we should now give a bit more thought to these and any other ideas, particularly with regard to rough timing, location/venue and who will be taking responsibility for organising each one.

**Other forthcoming meetings:**

**Items for Greater Nottingham Cycling Development Group meeting on 27 Jan**

* Update on Nottingham Station secure bike compound expansion
* Update on plans for HS2 extension to Leeds and associated SS2 (Slow Speed 2) long-distance cycle route

**Street view for Bikes proposals, including comments of 2 Jan from Gar S-W on possible local relevance of this idea from San Francisco, etc.**Dutch start-up [Cyclodeo](http://cyclodeo.com/) has just released a new collection of geo-tagged bike route videos covering the city of San Francisco. The route videos build on an existing database that includes Eindhoven, Amsterdam, Copenhagen, and New York City.

The 92 videos in the San Francisco [collection](http://cyclodeo.com/#/cities/sanfrancisco%20) offer virtual bike rides through areas like the Golden Gate Bridge, Market Street, and much more.   
Hi  
I think these are really interesting and useful for both cycling and the visitor sector – could be really useful to promote such rides as part of the Citycard Hire offering out of the Hubs and tourist venues/centres.

Also David Hobday was considering something like this to take students between all the NTU campus (especially to get them to realise how easy it is to get out to Clifton). Julian must have a library of such videos by now.

There could be some kudos in being the first UK City as well.

I wonder if we should ‘unlock our city’ and encourage local cyclist sourced geo-tagged bike ride videos. We could ensure we get some of the important ones like Big Track, Erewash Trail, Beeston to City, an art trail (Contemporary, Castle, NAE, Djanogly) etc to get us started.

Could be quite a low cost but effective approach with a bit more thought.

Gary

**Pedals Committee Roles, Members and standing down at the AGM (item tabled by Andrew Martin)  
  
  
Andrew Martin’s proposal that some (2-4) Pedals members have a formal meeting with Nottingham CC within the next six months, to discuss outstanding issues and ongoing concerns.**

**Other forthcoming meetings:**

**Andrew Martin wants to draw attention to these two CTC meetings:-**

* AGM of the CTC East Midlands, 14:00 on Saturday 25th of January at the ICC/YMCA on Mansfield Road.
* CTC AGM and National Dinner, Saturday 10th May in Glasgow.

**21-22 June 2014 Great Notts Bike Ride Terms and Conditions: message of 9 Jan from Roland Backhouse and response from Nick Emmonds of Perfect Motion**

Hugh,

Perhaps you could pass this on to other pedals members.

I have just registered for the Nottingham! Cycle live event in June. The terms require participants to agree to the laws of the State of California. I think that is not right for an event held in the UK. I sent the following email to the organisers. Others might want to raise similar objections.

Cheers, Roland

I have just registered for the cycle live event. Somewhat reluctantly I agreed to the terms and conditions. I agreed because I do not expect them to be relevant. What I object to is agreeing that the applicable laws should be those of the State of California. For an event held in the UK where in practice 100% of the participants will not be familiar with US laws, it think this is entirely inappropriate

**….response from Nick Emmonds, Perfect Motion (9 Jan)**

Dear Roland,

Thank you for your email regarding the terms and conditions that you have accepted while registering for the Great Notts Bike Ride.

The bit you are referring to that includes the California reference is the Active.com waiver.  Active is the entry system that we use and this waiver is in there to indemnify them against any liability to do with the event itself.

Active are a global platform based out of the United States and their waiver is generic across the world for people using their platform.

The terms and conditions of the event itself were above this on the registration page and you were asked to accept these separately.  All of these are specific to the event itself.

I hope that clarifies things for you, but please feel free to come back to me if you require anything further.

Best, Nik

**…..further message from Roland to Nik Emmonds (9 Jan)**

Dear Nik,  
(Second time.  Just noticed that you copied your email to several others.)  
  
I do not accept this as a satisfactory response.  
  
First, I cannot accept that any aspect of the terms and conditions for an event in the UK should be subject to Californian law, irrespective of what it relates to.    
  
Second, your email has identified a confusing aspect of the website that until now I had not properly appreciated.  When I completed the form, I read the terms and conditions and accepted them.  So I was rather surprised when I got a message that I had not done so.  (I would add that I was also annoyed when my credit card information was deleted and I had to enter it again.) It appears from your email that there are two sets of terms and conditions and I had failed to read the second set.   Even one set of terms and conditions is unnecessary and two is definitely unacceptable.   
  
I am not an expert on the law but I would expect common sense to prevail.  Common sense tells me that I will be culpable if I behave maliciously and the organisers will be culpable if they behave negligently, irrespective of whether or not I have been induced to sign away my rights.  Common sense also tells me that participation in an event in the UK is governed by UK law from beginning to end, and that includes the registration process.   
Yours sincerely, Roland Backhouse

**…further response from Nik Emmonds to Roland (10 Jan):**Dear Roland,

I’d like to preface what comes below by saying that in an ideal world I’d agree with you on the whole California thing.  It’s not ideal and since your email I have raised this with the company that provides our entry system who have assured me that in planned further updates, a localised waiver will be applied.

However, as mentioned previously, **NO** part of the event (Cycle Live Nottingham, Great Notts Bike Ride etc) is subject to anything under California laws.  Active are the booking agent who are responsible for your financial transaction and that is it.  They are no different to a Ticketmaster, See Tickets, Tessitura etc.  All of the companies I have just mentioned have a similar waiver which lets the consumer know that the event they are booking for (whether that be a music gig, live sport, theatre etc) are no responsibility of theirs and as such, once your transaction is complete, it’s over to the event organisers.  As I prefaced though, it would be better if they had a UK specific waiver.

Moving on to your second point, there is one set of terms and conditions for the event and a waiver for the entry system.  May be semantics but they are different.  In terms of your card details being deleted, I appreciate that is frustrating, but at the same time, it is for your security.  You wouldn’t want your financial details left on a page.  It is the same principle that all major financial firms adopt with their online banking and various other products, to protect the customer.

As for terms and conditions being unnecessary, I only wish that was the case.  If common sense would protect us in court then we’d all be much happier.  Sadly, that isn’t the case and thus having these is entirely necessary.  Without them, we’d be left open to all sorts of frivolous complaints no matter if they were our fault or not.  I’m sure as a keen cyclist you have witnessed people who have complete disregard for the Highway Code, and to their own safety in not wearing helmets or using lights.  There are also some people who ride without due care and attention and if something happens to them, it’s the car or the event organisers that they blame.

On the flip side, there will be event organisers out there who fail to take the necessary steps to ensure that the event is safe for all of their participants.  That is always our first priority and will remain so.

So in summary, I agree with your point on the California thing not being ideal and hope that by 2015 we will have that localised waiver in place to avoid any confusion.

Best, Nik

**6. Cycle facility and traffic management matters**

**Sneinton Neighbourhood Planning and possible Pedals involvement; message from Tom Hughes (12 Dec)**Hi Hugh.

I'm contacting you about the potential Neighbourhood Plan that is brewing in Sneinton.  This is a link to the background of the 'Sneinton Vision' project which was backed by CABE and OPUN last year, and resulted in a 'Sneinton Neighbourhood Design Vision':

<http://www.sneinton-alchemy.com/WhatWeDo/sneinton-vision>

Sneinton Alchemy is now being supported by Locality and Planning with People to put together NP area and forum proposals - that will probably happen sometime around Feb/March next year. There will need to be further funding bids to take it beyond that.

Alchemy has put out a consultation on the draft NP boundary:

<http://www.sneinton-alchemy.com/WhatWeDo/sneinton-vision/neighbourhoodplanboundary>

If you have a moment I'd be very interested to hear what you think.

I've seen from other NPs that the forum often includes representatives from local Uni's which have planning depts. I believe that you are now retired from UofN but wondered if you would be able to put me in touch with someone there? It would be great to also have Pedals represented in terms of sustainable transport...

If the Forum  (min 21 people) does get approved and the NP development gets off the ground, there would be something like one meeting a month I imagine, and not necessarily all 21 members at that but involved via email. There may be more potential for e.g. research/student projects too.

I'd be happy to meet/phone to have a chat about it, or please just take a look and let me know what you think.

Best regards, Tom Hughes

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Tom Hughes, Director

On behalf

Sneinton Alchemy CIC

[www.sneinton-alchemy.com](http://www.sneinton-alchemy.com)

07751958003

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**…..my reply to Tom Hughes (12 Dec):**Tom

Thanks for this which I was interested to hear about and which I will mention at the next Pedals business meeting, on 20 January.

I am sure that Pedals would like to have some involvement in this initiative and the Forum that we are always short of people to come along to meetings so would not like to guarantee that. We might get someone to come along to occasional meetings or at least to be responsible for liaison between you and Pedals (a job that I could perhaps do, if no one else shows interest).

I have indeed been retired from Nottm Uni for some time now (7 years!) and there has not been any planning presence there for several years, unfortunately so I cannot help you with that!

It occurs to me that you might find it useful to see a copy of the detailed comments which Pedals recently submitted in response to the City Council's latest Local Plan consultation and I will send these to you shortly.

Best wishes, Hugh

**Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St, Sherwood - Road Safety Scheme: message of 21 Dec from Andrew Martin:**Dear Hugh  
Perhaps we can discuss this matter at our January meeting? Larry, you are another Pedals member who lives in Sherwood; perhaps you could email Hugh and myself with any comments before the next Pedals meeting.  
  
Thanks Jen for your response following the consultation. You state 'the behaviour of individual cyclists and their level of confidence will depend on (do you mean determine?) how an ASL is accessed and used by cyclists.' I would add that perhaps the very people (less confident) who might benefit from the perceived safety of an ASL on a wider road would in this location be at risk of conflict with oncoming traffic whilst cycling past the stationary line of vehicles.  
  
Jen, I would like to see statistics for cyclists' use of Nottingham roads with ASL's and analysis of how people access and use ASL's.  
  
Finally, I am interested to know whether you and Keith would use an ASL located at a junction of a narrow road such as Winchester Street?  
Regards, Andrew  
---------------------------- Original Message ----------------------------  
Subject: RE: Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St - Road Safety Scheme  
From: "Jennifer Williams" <[Jennifer.Williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:Jennifer.Williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)>  
Date: Tue, December 17, 2013 5:05 pm  
To: "'andrew@veggies.org.uk'" <[andrew@veggies.org.uk](mailto:andrew@veggies.org.uk)>  
Cc: "Keith Morgan" <[Keith.Morgan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:Keith.Morgan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)>  
--------------------------------------------------------------------------  
  
Andrew,  
Thank you for your email and for attending the consultation event at Sherwood Library on Friday 6th December.  
  
Regarding your request to not having an ASL at Winchester St/ Mansfield Rd we have looked into the matter further. Nottingham City Council has been implementing ASLs at junctions as we believe that the benefits of an ASL without a feeder lane outweigh having no ASL at all.  
  
As you are aware it is generally accepted that ASLs are normally beneficial to cyclists for many reasons including: making car drivers more aware of cyclists, help turning cyclists to position themselves correctly and give cyclists some priority over motor vehicles. The behaviour of individual cyclists and their level of confidence will depend on how an ASL is accessed and used by cyclists.  
  
Other options for cyclists have been investigated for Winchester Street. There was an option to put in a shared pedestrian and cycle facility on the north west side of Winchester Street but again this was dismissed at the footway has an inadequate width. It is recommended to have a width of 3m so pedestrians and cyclists can share the space comfortably and this footway is not wide enough.  
  
Another option that was dismissed was to have cycle logos at the junction mouths of all minor junctions which join the Winchester St/ Sherwood Vl/ Mapperley Rs route, however, due to the narrow width and twists and turns within the gradient it was viewed that the road may look "cluttered" and could be confusing to road users.  
  
The proposed alterations to the Road Safety scheme are to simplify the road layout and make the road safer for all road users.  
  
Our Transport Strategy team is currently reviewing city-wide Cycle Route Signing and as part of this the routes (including potential alternative routes to Winchester Street/ Sherwood Vale/ Mapperley Rise) will be reviewed within the city.  
  
If you need more information please let me know.  
Kind regards, Jen  
Jennifer Williams  
Senior Officer - Road Safety  
Traffic & Safety  
Development Department  
Nottingham City Council  
Loxley House  
Station Street  
Nottingham  
NG2 3NG  
  
Email: [jennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk<mailto:ejennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:jennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk%3cmailto:ejennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)>  
Tel: (0115) 8765229  
Website: www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk<http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk>  
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/mynottingham<http://www.facebook.com/mynottingham](http://www.facebook.com/mynottingham%3chttp:/www.facebook.com/mynottingham)>  
Twitter: [www.twitter.com/mynottingham<http://www.twitter.com/mynottingham](http://www.twitter.com/mynottingham%3chttp:/www.twitter.com/mynottingham)>  
  
\*Please note I am in the office Tuesday to Friday and remote-work on Monday\*  
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
From: Andrew [[mailto:andrew@veggies.org.uk]](mailto:[mailto:andrew@veggies.org.uk])  
Sent: 04 December 2013 23:17  
To: Hugh McClintock  
Cc: Jennifer Williams; Arthur Williams; Andrew Martin; Richard Cooper; Larry Neylon; Keith Morgan  
Subject: RE: Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St - Road Safety Scheme  
  
Thanks Hugh and Jennifer for comments so far. I would like to emphasise the reality (from experience of trying to use ASLs in Nottingham and elsewhere) that an 'ASL at the junction of Winchester St and Mansfield Rd' will be of use to cyclists ONLY if there is the means to safely and conveniently access it alongside stationary traffic. I hope scarce public funds are not used to create a 'facility' which cannot be properly used (see Haydn Road junction with Hucknall Road, Nottingham Road junction with Perry Road, to name only two).  
  
I shall anyway attend the consultation event at Sherwood Library this Friday.  
Best wishes, Andrew  
Chair, Nottingham Pedals  
  
  
On Tue, December 3, 2013 12:34 pm, Hugh McClintock wrote:  
> Jennifer  
 Thanks for doing this.  
> best wishes, Hugh  
>  
From: Jennifer Williams [[mailto:Jennifer.Williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk]](mailto:[mailto:Jennifer.Williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk])  
> Sent: 02 December 2013 18:36  
> To: 'Hugh McClintock'  
> Subject: RE: Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St - Road Safety  
> Scheme  
>  
> Hello Hugh,  
> Thank you for your email. I have emailed my colleague in Transport Strategy regarding cycle signing an alternative route to Winchester Street. I have also emailed our Traffic Signals team regarding the request for an ASL at the junction of Winchester St and Mansfield Rd. As soon as I have this information I shall pass it on to you.  
Kind regards, Jen  
> Jennifer Williams  
> Senior Officer - Road Safety  
> Traffic & Safety  
> Development Department  
> Nottingham City Council  
> Loxley House  
> Station Street  
> Nottingham NG2 3NG  
> Email: [jennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:jennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)  
> <<mailto:ejennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk>>  
> Tel: (0115) 8765229  
>  
From: Hugh McClintock [[mailto:hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com]](mailto:[mailto:hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com])  
> Sent: 30 November 2013 15:32  
> To: Jennifer Williams  
> Subject: FW: Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St - Road Safety Scheme  
>  
> Jennifer  
> Some comments from local Pedals member Richard Cooper,  
> Hugh  
>  
> To: Hugh McClintock; Andrew Martin; Larry Neylon  
> Subject: Re: Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St - Road Safety  
> Scheme  
>  
> Hi Hugh,  
> One or two quick comments...  
>  
> Morley Avenue (first left going down Mapperley Rise) offers a better, quieter route into Sherwood, Carrington, town and Forest Fields etc. via Private Road. This would be good if it were signposted.  
>  
> Similarly Sherwood Rise offers an easier route up towards Mapperley shops. A sign left from the junction with Winchester St. would offer that. These signs may already be there - I don't usually look out for signs!  
>  
> I think there are already signs at Mansfield Street - if not there should be - an avoiding route for Mansfield Road.  
>  
> On street parking already makes it tricky going down Winchester Street, it is narrow and consequently there is no room for a 'safety gap' along there.  
> However, the measures should improve safety by making drivers more aware generally.  
>  
> Could there be an ASL at the Mansfield Road end? That would mean the possibility of going straight on is easier (it is a good route into quieter roads in Sherwood).  
> Richard  
>  
From: Hugh McClintock <<mailto:hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com>>  
> Sent: Friday, November 22, 2013 3:07 PM  
> To: Andrew Martin <<mailto:andrew@veggies.org.uk>> ; Larry Neylon  
> <<mailto:lneylon@ntlworld.com>> ; Richard Cooper  
> <<mailto:rssncooper@ntlworld.com>>  
>  
> Subject: FW: Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St - Road Safety Scheme  
> Please let me know if you think this needs any Pedals comments and, if so, what those should be.  
Thanks, Hugh  
>  
From: Jennifer Williams [[mailto:Jennifer.Williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk]](mailto:[mailto:Jennifer.Williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk])  
> <<mailto:%5bmailto:Jennifer.Williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk%5d>>  
> Sent: 22 November 2013 10:57  
> Subject: Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St - Road Safety Scheme  
>  
> Dear All,  
> Please find attached the formal consultation letter and plan for the proposed Road Safety scheme along Winchester St/ Sherwood Vl / Mapperley Rs (TMP7061).  
  
> Please contact me if you need any more information.  
> Kind regards, Jen  
> Jennifer Williams  
> Senior Officer - Road Safety, Traffic & Safety  
> Development Department  
> Nottingham City Council  
> Loxley House, Station Street  
> Nottingham  
> NG2 3NG  
> Email: <<mailto:ejennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk>>  
> [jennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:jennifer.williams@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)  
> Tel: (0115) 8765229  
> \*Please note I am in the office Tuesday to Friday and remote-work on Monday\*

**Formal Consultation: TMP7061 Winchester St, Sherwood - Road Safety Scheme - Comments of 21 Dec from Larry Neylon:**

Hi Andrew,

I really can’t see any point in an ASL actually on Winchester Street at all.  I used to commute to Porchester Road from Sherwood and would never use Winchester Street.  It’s way too steep in the middle and is too narrow given how busy it is.  I can’t see how you could improve that for cyclists, so I think any possible money would be better spent on improving the signposting through Woodthorpe Park, and possibly signposting the Private Road / Morley Ave route that I used to commute on.

Also given how few cyclists I’ve seen over the years using Winchester St, if you were going to have ASLs at that Mansfield Road / Winchester Street junction, they’d be much more useful being actually on the Mansfield Road.

Cheers, Larry.

**possible further NET extension to Kimberley etc. - some possible implications for cycling: my message of 8 Jan to Peter Briggs et al.**We need to keep a close eye on the increasing interest in the plans for a further NET extension, to Kimberley, giving, I suggest, general support, in view of the possibility for promoting combined bike and tram trips in from the Kimberley - Eastwood area if the tram development is combined with plans for improved local cycle routes in that area including some associated with possible new housing plans.

At the same time a particular point of possible concern is where such a new tram line would pass under the M1, as I think they still propose to use the former railway underbridge between Hempshill Vale and Watnall which has been used for a multi-user path for several years now and there may be inadequate room for a cycle path alongside the tram under the motorway

I took about 23 years to get this path developed from when it was first proposed, by Pedals and John Grimshaw (former CEO of Sustrans) in the early 1980s (as part of a route connecting Nottingham and Derby via the Bennerley Viaduct etc) and we would now not want to lose it! Incidentally, though little (other) progress has been made on the Notts side in developing this through route a lot has been made on the other former railway stretch, between Ilkeston and Derby, linking to the Nutbrook Trail (and the Erewash Valley Trail) as well as several other (Sustrans and other|) routes in the Derby area.

Peter, you might perhaps wish to raise this issue at the next Broxtowe Transport Group meeting. I should mention that these points were also raised with Kentag about two years ago in Watnall, attended by Steve Barber, Matt Easter, Andy Wickham and me. I recall that this took place fairly soon after the go-ahead for the current two extension lines.

Hugh

# Could Nottingham's tram be extended further? By [Nottingham Post](http://www.nottinghampost.com/people/Nottingham%20Post/profile.html)  |  Posted: January 08, 2014 By Bryan Henesey

NOTTS' controversial tram system should be extended to Kimberley, a Government planning inspector has said.

Phase two of the tram is currently being built and will serve Clifton, Beeston and Toton via Nottingham city centre.

The £570m project has caused major disruption to traffic and [businesseshttp://images.intellitxt.com/ast/adTypes/icon1.png](http://www.nottinghampost.com/NEW-TRAM-LINE-CARDS/story-20413330-detail/story.html) but should be completed by the end of this year.  
  
Now, Mrs KA Ellison, of the Government's Planning Inspectorate, has said that a proposed phase three – which would extend the network to Kimberley – "should be regarded as both desirable and enjoying reasonable prospects of being brought forward".  
  
**….comments of 8 Jan from (Broxtowe Borough Councillor) Steve Barber:**I walked the route with a consulting railway engineer and in his opinion there is adequate clearance for a tramway and cycle/footway as well as the stream. The tramway could be segregated.

However, I fully agree that this is something we need to watch very closely and I would consider it unacceptable to lose that through cycleway.  
Steve  
  
**….comments of 8 Jan from Matt Easter, Sustrans:**  
Hi Hugh (and all)

From a Sustrans point of view we remain supportive of plans to extend the tram to Kimberley.  However, in a similar vein to Hugh I will be pressing for any next tram phase to also enhance provision for cyclists on the west side of Nottingham, connecting existing communities or any new housing developments.  I therefore will also raise concerns at the appropriate time about locations where the tram could either have a negative impact on existing provision or be a blockage rather than a catalyst for future potential cycle network improvements.

Sustrans still has aspirations to see improved routes developed that allow cyclists to get more easily and directly from Nottingham to Kimberley and Ilkeston and onto Derby. This includes the need for us to look at ways of utilising Bennerley viaduct-something the heritage lottery were previously fairly keen on and Local Authorities not unsupportive of.  There was a meeting at Attenborough last summer to look at routes comprising a potential Broxtowe loop though I’m not sure where discussions got to regarding this.

We also have to bear in mind HS2 and its impacts on all other transport schemes existing or proposed, though current work is just underway by consultants to look at possibilities for a ‘slow speed’ cycle route that could enhance cycling provision for settlements within 3 miles of the proposed HS2 route. There are certainly routes that could be improved in the longer term on the back of HS2 should any of this come to fruition notwithstanding peoples particular views on the impact and viability or otherwise of HS2 and its likelihood to be built.

Regards, Matt

Matthew Easter

East Midlands Regional Director

Sustrans

Suite 302

2 King St

Nottingham

NG1 2AS

0115 853 2949

07787 289292

**….comments of 8 Jan from Steve Fisher, Broxtowe Borough Council:**

Hi Hugh

Currently this route is on our proposed Broxtowe Country Trail so certainly it would be very awkward for us if this connection is lost as there are no easy alternatives.

We are aware of the potential to bring Bennerley Viaduct back into use and have an interest not just because this is an important access route but also as we own land nearby on the Nottingham Canal Local Nature Reserve. Please keep us in the picture on this and we will help if we can. Our resources are very limited but being aware from an early stage might give us a better chance of supporting the partnership in some way.

Regards

Steve

**Possible Sustrans NCN Route 50 continuation between N of Leicester (Watermead Park - Cossington) and (South) Nottingham - W Bridgford; my message of 15 Dec to Chris Thompson (Sustrans Ranger, Seagrave, Leicestershire)**Chris

Thanks for your message and the attached further messages about this possible extension of Sustrans NCN Route 50) north of the now completed and very impressive Sustrans Connect 2 Project in Watermead Park area north of Leicester to extend via quietish roads etc. towards West Bridgford and Nottingham. I was wondering what had happened to these ideas since our earlier exchange of messages a year or two ago and am very glad to hear that you and your (Sustrans Ranger) colleagues are very keen to pursue this further, in liaison with other interested organisations.

You ask about contacts at 'Nottingham Council' by which I assume you mean Nottinghamshire County Council as the Local Highway Authority for all of Nottinghamshire (including Rushcliffe Borough Council) outside the City of Nottingham. I suggest that the most appropriate person to approach at the County Council is Cllr. Steve Calvert, who since his election in May as a local County Councillor for West Bridgford, has also been Vice-Chair (Policy) of the Transport and Highways Committee. The new administration since May has been much keener to support cycling, I am glad to say, but at the same time they have very severe funding problems which may well mean that finding money for even fairly small schemes, such as signing of quiet roads, is now very hard to find, at least in the near future. However I do think it would still be very useful to take this up.

As regards the best way to connect such a route into West Bridgford and Nottingham this will need some very careful further detailed consideration, I suggest, and perhaps involving two main links, i.e. :-

a) via Rushcliffe Country Park, Ruddington, and the shared path north of there under the A52T (Ruddington Lane) towards Compton Acres and Wilford (Nottingham) which, we very much hope, with new tramside path developments, will soon continue as a legal and safe cycle path / shared path all the way to the centre of Nottingham (and Nottingham Station with its soon to be expanded secure bike compound), via Wilford Bridge and The Meadows, etc., as well as to improved links to and from Clifton. Such a route would also connect very easily to the considerable network of paths on both sides of the River Trent, and to The Big Track route, a now much improved 9-mile canal and riverside loop between Trent Bridge and Beeston Lock, with connections west to and from the Erewash Valley Trail, etc.

b) via Keyworth, Plumtree and Tollerton towards the east (Gamston) side of West Bridgford, making use of the existing cycle facility across the A606 at Tollerton and the toucan crossing of the A52T between Gamston and Bassingfield, to the east of West Bridgford. (Controversial proposed major housing developments in the Tollerton area now to go ahead in some form are also likely to be very relevant to plans for further cycling provision in this area, to which your plans could perhaps be related)

Another possible link, in effect a variation of a) Ruddington and the south (Sharp Hill) and south-east (Edwalton) sides of West Bridgford, making use, with upgrading, of the existing subway under the A52T at Sharp Hill, immediately to the north of Landmere Lane, Ruddington.  For many years Pedals has been trying to get the Highways Agency to upgrade this wide subway (so far designated only as a public footpath) and to use it as the centrepiece of a route between Ruddington and Edwalton / West Bridgford. We are now trying to work with other organisations to increase this pressure, especially with the proposed plans for major housing development in the Sharp Hill - Melton Road - Edwalton area, which include a spine cycleway-footway across the development between the subway and Boundary Road, West Bridgford, near Rushcliffe School and Leisure Centre, and with connections to the 'Green Line', a former railway path which leads further towards the town centre of West Bridgford.  These other organisations now include Rushcliffe School, whose Head Teacher, Phil Crompton, is himself as keen cyclist and now very keen to work with Sustrans, the County Council and Pedals etc. to develop considerably further the already very substantial cycling developments they have been making in the last few years. The school has an extensive catchment area including Ruddington.

I hope these further ideas are useful. Please continue to keep me and Pedals in general informed of further developments. Meanwhile I will report on this at the next Pedals business meeting, in January.

best wishes for Christmas and the new year

Hugh

**From:** Chris Thompson [mailto:chris-thompson-22trees@hotmail.co.uk  
**Sent:** 13 December 2013 18:36  
**To:** Hugh McClintock  
**Subject:** Fw: --Route 50 continuation !

Hugh

Below info regards route 50-- for your information.

James is Patrick’s successor, it looks like we need to get the go-ahead from the Nottingham Council for signage, you may know the contact?

Steve is the Ranger co-coordinator the Leicestershire Sustrans group, please feel free to contact if you can give some details of Nottingham personnel.  
Regards Chris Thompson

**From:** [Mel and Steve](mailto:melandsteveweb@googlemail.com)

**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 9:34 AM

**To:** [Chris Thompson](mailto:chris-thompson-22trees@hotmail.co.uk)

**Subject:** Re: Agenda Item----Route 50 continuation !

Hi Chris,  
We discussed this proposal at some length. James feels that there will be little cost implication as no modifications are needed to the route, just signing as you say.

He says that he has been told by Leicestershire CC that they will only approve it if he contacts and clears the route with Nottingham Council. James has, until now, got no-where with Nottingham Council but now a new person has taken over the relevant department so he said that he will try again and seems a bit more hopeful.

Our discussion will be minuted (Andrew is taking care of this for me) and I will include your idea in the reply back to Sustrans mapping, who will, no doubt, pass it back to James.

Hope this is OK. I'll of course let you have more information if I get it.  
Best wishes, Steve

On Thu, Dec 12, 2013 at 5:33 PM, Chris Thompson <[chris-thompson-22trees@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:chris-thompson-22trees@hotmail.co.uk)> wrote:

HI Steve

As far as I am aware there have been no cost estimates for signing this route to Nottingham, Patrick Davis may have left some proposals/costs on File.

I Know the route if you need clarification, James has also seen it on my map, but is not familiar with the area so will not remember detail.

James would also have access to any records Patrick left, please ask him to check it out, the route is all on roads so it’s basically just signage cost

If a route was signed from the end of Route 50 at Cossington to Link to the Route 6 northbound, it would need to go down Platts Lane, through Cossington Village on to Sileby then on to Mountsorrel to link up.

Let me know how the discussion goes tonight.

Regards Chris Thompson

**From:** [Mel and Steve](mailto:melandsteveweb@googlemail.com)

**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 10:40 AM

**To:** [Chris Thompson](mailto:chris-thompson-22trees@hotmail.co.uk)

**Subject:** Re: Agenda Item----Route 50 continuation !

Hi Chris,  
Sorry to only just get back to replying to this but I've not been on E-mail much for the past week. I will definitely pass on your ideas to Sustrans HQ as that is, as far as I can see, the whole point of this exercise.

I don't know why the idea is not currently under consideration other than for the usual funding issues. However, at a recent Sustrans conference, it was pointed out that it is a good idea to have projects such as this, with at least a rough cost estimate, on 'stand-by' because some agency or other often has an under-spend and needs a quick infrastructure project to justify the following year's budget! Do you know if any such estimates of cost have been done for this proposed extension?

In a similar vein, I spoke to James about how viable he thinks it would be to link Cossington across to NCN 6. This would enable people north of Leicester to have a signed route to Loughborough (and Derby). Also, people could cut out cycling alongside the A6, which is not too pleasant. Such a link would even better apply to an extended NCN50. This link is also not currently on the radar as far as I know.

Hopefully, James will be at the meeting tonight to hear me feedback on what people have told me.

Best wishes and have a great Christmas.  
Steve  
  
  
On Thu, Dec 5, 2013 at 6:50 PM, Chris Thompson <[chris-thompson-22trees@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:chris-thompson-22trees@hotmail.co.uk)> wrote:

Hi Steve

Just thought I would raise this issue, as you reported that Sustrans have asked for ‘New Route’ or Link proposals from the Leicester Rangers Group. Please read below---

Over the last 6 years I have had many conversations regarding the proposed continuation to Link Route 50 from where it now finishes at the end of the Connect 2 section at Cossington, through to South Nottingham.

Patrick Davis had investigated the route options using unclassified country lanes to link with cycle routes coming out South from Nottingham, either linking at Gamston or Rushcliffe Country Park (Ruddington) He also had some feedback regarding this with Hugh McClintock, from ‘Nottingham Pedals’ Campaign group.

Keith Drury has also shown an interest in this route and has ridden the section North of Cossington.

I recently asked James Lowe if there had been any recent consideration linking Route 50 with Nottingham as Patrick had proposed before he retired. He said it was not a consideration currently.

I think this should be reconsidered as it would provide a relatively cost effective cycle route through the Wolds Villages of North Leicester and South Nottingham. With the Cycle networks now developed at both ends, it may well inspire many new cycle users for commuting and leisure journeys.

I live in a small Wolds Village (Seagrave) on the route and obviously would be very willing to be involved helping to plan route and have some interesting route options.

Many Thanks Chris Thompson (currently Ranger for route 48)

**From:** [Mel and Steve](mailto:melandsteveweb@googlemail.com)

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 03, 2013 4:25 PM

**To:** [Mel and Steve](mailto:melandsteveweb@gmail.com)

**Subject:** Leicestershire Sustrans meeting

Dear all,  
I hope that you are all well and still out and about on your bikes. Thank-you to those of you who have returned your audit maps and feedback already. For those of you who have not and who cannot make the meeting mentioned below, please could you let me have back your maps (even un-annotated ones) by the end of next week. Thanks.

I have scheduled a meeting for **Thursday 12th December** at the **Exchange bar on Rutland St**. (opposite the Curve). The meeting will start at **7.30** and should easily be over by 9.30. For those of you who made the last meting, you will know that this is a great venue. we will probably be in the small room at the back and, if not, try downstairs.

I am experimenting with having the meeting on a Thursday since Monday seemed to be less popular. I hope that you can make it.

On the agenda will be : route audit returns, updates, new volunteers details, news from other cycling groups, proposed signing rides and anything else that you would like to discuss. Please let me have ideas if you definitely want something on the agenda.  
Best wishes, Steve Massey

**…PS comments of 16 Dec from Robin Harrison, Rushcliffe School:**If it helps, I am able to confirm that Rushcliffe School is very keen to see improvements happen to increase the safety of pupils cycling from Ruddington to the School.

The suggested upgrade of the underpass under the A52 referred to towards the end of Hugh’s email below, is one we would wish to encourage.

J Robin Harrison

Facilities & Resources Manager

The Rushcliffe School Academy Trust

Tel. 0115 9744050

**…related messages (15-18 Dec) on proposals for a cycle path / shared path on former railway land in Ruddington, involving myself, Paul Hillier (Notts CC), Julian Bentley and Chris Thompson (Sustrans Ranger based in N. Leics):  
From:** Julian B [[mailto:dr\_jools@hotmail.com]](mailto:[mailto:dr_jools@hotmail.com])   
**Sent:** 16 December 2013 19:11**Subject:** RE: Nottm Post article (15 Dec) about bid to turn railway land into cycle path in Ruddington

Hugh  
If this is true it could be an opportunity for a thru- route foot/cycle path to Gotham, as there is an existing footpath alongside the GCR track which runs into a bridleway that goes all the way to Gotham.  
  
As part of the bigger picture and a Sustrans/NCN route between Nottingham and Leicester- this would be a very useful link that would bypass the loop that is currently needed to progress from Nottingham-Gotham/East Leake.  I have ridden to Leicester several times this year and remain of the view that the best, flattest and most efficient route (and thus the best for cyclists and likely to get the most use) involves riding thru East Leake.

I rode to Leicester and back last weekend and my companions were also of the view that a link from Gotham/east Leake to Ruddington avoiding the speeding traffic on Bunny lane/A60 and the Gotham-East Leake road would be a 'godsend'.  
Julian

From: [hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com](mailto:hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com)  
To: [paul.hillier@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:paul.hillier@nottscc.gov.uk)  
CC: [chris.gardner@nsn.com](mailto:chris.gardner@nsn.com); [dr\_jools@hotmail.com](mailto:dr_jools@hotmail.com); [peter.elderton@live.co.uk](mailto:peter.elderton@live.co.uk)  
Subject: Nottm Post article (15 Dec) about bid to turn railway land into cycle path in Ruddington  
Date: Mon, 16 Dec 2013 18:42:53 +0000

Paul

I noticed a small article in the Post today (p20) saying that land surrounding an old railway line could be sold by the Council to make way for a foot and cycle path. The land in question is under Clifton Road bridge on Clifton Lane, Ruddington, it says, and was given to the Council in 2007 by the British Railway (?Property) Board.

Do you know anything about these plans, apparently first proposed in 2009 and then dropped as being "at the bottom of the Council's priorities"?

Thanks and best wishes

Hugh

,

**..message of 18 Dec from Chris Thompson:**

Hugh

Let’s see what response James Lowe gets from the Council Highways at Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire, if it gets the green light with funding then we can start talking over route options in detail.

Many Thanks, Chris Thompson

**Cycle safety proposals for Mansfield Rd / Forest Road and Dunkirk / Abbey Street junctions circulated by Keith Morgan City Council) on 6 Jan**Hugh,   
I have attached drawings for the Abbey Street and Mansfield Road schemes.

As well as the attached, the Dunkirk scheme will upgrade the crossing on Beeston Road to a toucan. It will also provide a new toucan across Abbey Street, making use of the existing refuge. Depending on budgets and whether I can get the road space to undertake the work (in what is currently an area where there is a large amount of work and disruption already) the shared paths around the roundabout would also be resurfaced.

The proposals for Mansfield Road will see the existing crossing over the southern arm of the junction upgraded to a toucan. Cyclists will have two new areas of shared space on either side of the crossing to allow them to exit Mansfield Road and rejoin Forest Road. This will enable cyclists who are heading for the City Centre to make use of North Sherwood Street. The junction at the other end of North Sherwood Street, next to the Orange Tree pub has been put forward as a scheme for next year. This will allow cyclists to continue straight through the junction. I have also attached a plan highlighting these proposals.

In addition to the toucan at Mansfield Road two new pedestrian crossings will also be installed over Mapperley and Forest Road. The Road is also to be resurfaced, with the works all taking place at the same time.

If there are any questions or anyone would like more detail on the schemes, please let me know.

Regards, Keith

**Dunkirk / Abbey St and Mansfield Rd / Forest Rd E junctions cycle safety schemes; drawings from Keith Morgan (City Council) circulated on 6 Jan**

It seems to be that a crucial issue is the waiting times for cyclists with the new arrangements for toucan crossings on Abbey Street and Beeston Road. As well as taking this up with Keith Morgan we discuss it at our February meeting with Alistair Mclean of the City Council who is coming along for a discussion on cyclists and signal timings.

**Dunkirk / Abbey St. proposals: comments of 6 Jan from Roland Backhouse::**It is not at all clear to me what difference this will make.    
  
I'm not sure what the difference is between a toucan and a pelican crossing.  I had to look it up.  If I have understood it correctly, a toucan doesn't have the flashing-amber stage.  This may make it marginally safer for cyclists/pedestrians who are trying to get across when the lights have turned red for them but the main danger (in my experience on Abbey Street) is drivers going through the lights at red.  (I am always very careful when crossing Abbey Street at the pelican that the motorists have actually stopped.  Sadly, as you may recall telling you, some cyclist also ignore the red light too!) I expect that this danger will remain or possibly be exacerbated.  Also, if there is an island the two sides are completely separate on a toucan crossing (but not on a pelican).  I don't think this will help cyclists; I think it is something that is intended to allow greater priority to motorists by causing vulnerable traffic to stop twice and not once.  
  
What I had hoped they might do is to provide proper separation between pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.  Currently there is a white line along the pavement on Abbey Street.  Wherever I can, I avoid shared-use pavements and use the road.  This is one place where the pavement is convenient (particularly cycling on the right side of the road).  But it puts cyclists in conflict with pedestrians.   I remember the first year I came to Nottingham.  It was very icey and, going round the bend, a woman was walking on the cyclists' side of the white line.  The cyclist in front of me fell off his bike trying to avoid her and I fell off trying to avoid the cyclist.  (A contributory problem was that the council does not grit pavements/cycle tracks and the only ice-free part was next to the hedge.)  This is just an example of the dangers of shared-use pavements - they just contribute to conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians and gives motorists more opportunity to moan about reckless cyclists!  
  
Given the current volume of cyclists and the potential for much greater volumes, I think we should say that these facilities are inadequate and we should demand much more radical solutions - like a dedicated pedestrian/cyclist bridge linking the main campus with the Jubilee campus.  
Cheers, Roland

**….comments of 10 Jan from Mara Ozolins re the Dunkirk (Abbey St) proposals:**

 Hi Hugh,

Good that they’re putting in a crossing on Abbey Road.

I wonder though why they are making the underpass under the ring road no-cycling. I used to use this route when I worked at the University’s King’s Meadow Campus. It wouldn’t be the end of the world, but a nuisance to get on and off your bike at this point. To use the crossings would mean waiting for 6 sets of lights, so not worth it.

Best wishes, Mara

**Comments from Larry Neylon on the Mansfield Road / Forest Road proposals** **(6 and 7 Jan 2014):**

Hi Hugh,

I’m not convinced by the North/South proposals.  Although the ASL on the Mansfield Road going south is very welcome, I personally wouldn’t follow the suggested route.

I and most cyclists I see in the morning currently use the Mansfield Road straight into town and then cross straight over into the pedestrian/van congested Clumber St to cross town, and I don’t think the suggested route would be popular as I think it would add 5-10 mins onto a 15 min commute.

If I’m up early enough tomorrow, I might try the suggested route to work to see what it’s currently like to cycle, but I don’t fancy Maid Marion Way and Collin St at 9am!

I’ve also sent the maps onto some fellow cycle users of this route to see what they think.

Thanks, Larry.

**….my response to Larry of 7 Jan:**Larry

Thanks for your comments. I can well understand that you and many other cyclists find it preferable just to keep on Mansfield Road when riding into town.

However, it is possible that this alternative, continuing via North Sherwood Street etc., might perhaps suit some people, depending on just where they are heading. There has been clear evidence of a good many cyclists crossing over Mansfield Road further down (to the north of the Forest Road junction) and then riding on the narrowish footway to reach this junction and Forest Road, etc. It was this evidence, and the number of accidents in the vicinity, which lead the City Council to think that some improvement scheme was necessary.

No doubt peoples' choice of route through this junction will also be affected by the prevailing traffic conditions, in and out of the peak periods.

I look forward to seeing what further comments you have or get.

Hugh

**….Larry’s further comments (7 Jan):**Hi Hugh,

I rode the proposed route today on my way to work.

My main points are:

1. The pavement area on the corners of the east side of the Forest Road/Mansfield Road are very tight.  If you get two cyclists wanting to cross then pedestrians will struggle to get past.
2. Sherwood Street is fine to cycle up and down and if the junction by the Orange Tree is sorted as per the plan that that should be ok.
3. Maid Marion Way and Collin St were very busy at 8.45am.  I think if you were a less confident/experienced cyclist it would be quite daunting, but I’d need to see the details of the turn from Collin St towards the station to see how that would work.

I’d estimate it would add around 10 minutes to a rush hour commute from Forest Park to the station over the cross-city route, but I do realise that the cross-city route isn’t something that is wanted to be promoted/encouraged due to the number of pedestrians.

If I get more feedback then I’ll send it over.

Regards, Larry.

**…..comments of 8 Jan from Andrew Martin:**

Greetings all  
This week Nottingham City Council staff have installed a Mobile Variable Message Sign on Mansfield Road at the junction with St Andrew's Road (North of Forest Road junction) and another on Mansfield Road South of the junction. The sign states 'Advance Warning, Junction Improvements start mid Feb' or similar wording.  
  
I am surprised and concerned that there seems to be little time for proper discussion by interested parties (and for possible amendments to be understood and implemented by Nottingham CC) , especially considering the original funding bid failed last year?  
  
I would like to discuss this at our next meeting and not by email. Please note that I have removed Keith's email address from this message.  
Andrew

**Improving cycle access across the new tram tracks at the junction of Queen's Dr and Castle Bridge Rd – message of 6 Jan from Keith Morgan:**Hugh,

This is a scheme that we are looking to go ahead with. As far as I understand a it is being designed to fit in with the tram construction programme. The scheme has been put on the programme for next year. Next year’s programme will need to get approval by Councillors and when we have a final design and costs, I would be happy to discuss these with you.

Thanks, Keith

**Meadow Lane Sneinton new rail bridge (replacing level crossing) message of 5 Jan from Julian Bentley:**

Hugh   
The Meadow lane rail bridge issue has had 360 views (largest number since a November post) and has had several local people posting on Pedals Facebook about it -about how they went to the 'consultation ' meetings, looked at the drawings and told Network Rail of the shortcomings of their designs

**….comments from Arthur Williams (14 Jan) and my response:**

Hugh, Julian,

I went to have a look at this bridge yesterday. It is not yet open for use. I don’t use facebook, so have not seen other comments. My impression is of lots of railings and a long route backwards and forwards for cyclists. A connection to the greenway, which was one thing I suggested, has been incorporated, but as a set of shallow steps, so cyclists would need to dismount, but skateboarders can have a whale of a time! If it looks ugly now, I’m sure it will appear horrible in 15-20 years. Planting a few low shrubs around the bottom might help, without reducing safety.

Regards, Arthur

**…my response to Arthur (14 Jan)**

Thanks for your comments which echo mine from a visit to the site last weekend.

I agree, and yesterday pointed out to John Lee, that it appears that the short flight of steps are the only direct access to the Greenway at the west end of the new bridge and am surprised that there is no ramp connection at this point, despite their evidently being room for it.

Let us now see what other comments we get before and at next Monday's Pedals meeting.

best wishes, Hugh

**new River Leen-side pathway work in Cinderhill from Church Lane to Wilkinson Street and north of David Lane (plan sent by Keith Morgan on 10 Jan)**I will bring to the meeting a copy of this plan, already circulated to Andrew Martin, Andy Parkinson and Tanzeel Ansari, in case other people might wish to comment.

**Proposed HS2 and associated SS2 (Slow Speed 2) long-distance cycle route proposals - DfT appointment of consultants to carry out feasibility study my message of 6 Jan:**I understand from Local Transport Today (no 637, that the DfT has awarded consultant Royal Haskoning DHV (UK) and Phil Jones Associated the contract to study the feasibility of building a cycleway in the corridor of building a cycleway in the corridor of HS2 from London (Euston) to the West Midlands and onwards to Manchester and Leeds (phase 2).

Apparently former Sustrans CEO John Grimshaw will also be assisting in the work. A 10-month contract which includes training DfT staff to map and cost cycle routes. I propose to copy relevant people at the DfT, CTC and Sustrans into Pedals response to the Phase 2 consultation due in by the end of this month. See draft below and also the HS2 consultation website at <http://www.hs2.org.uk/developing-hs2/consultations/phase-two>  
  
**draft Pedals response to the DfT HS2 Phase 2 consultation (due in by 31 Jan 2014) – for comments please!**

Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign) welcomes the opportunity respond to this consultation and the recent news from the DfT of the appointment of consultants to carry out a feasibility study of the building of a cycleway in the corridor of the HS2 routes.

While in principle welcoming the proposed long distance route (SS2) we would like to emphasise the importance of such a route complementing existing regional and local routes and not competing with them or resulting in the loss of reduced quality of any such routes. Indeed great care should be taken in the detailed design, layout and landscaping of the alignment of HS2 and SS2 to ensure that connections in existing routes are improved, e.g. with safe and convenient crossing point. It will be much harder to do this satisfactorily if this is considered only as an afterthought rather than an integral part of the whole new railway scheme.

In the proposed HS2 route corridor in the East |Midlands area, on the West Midlands to Leeds extension route, our main area of interest, close to the Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire county boundary, north of the M1, and south of Hucknall it will be particularly important for the proposed HS2 and SS2 alignment to have regard to these routes in particular:-

,

* The Erewash Valley Trail (in the Long Eaton – Sandiacre areas). This was opened in 2011, implemented in a partnership between several organisations including Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire County Councils, Broxtowe and Erewash Borough Councils, the Notts and Derbs Wildlife Trusts, the Environment Agency, and the former British Waterways Trust. It included greatly improved canal towpath surfaces on the Erewash Canal and improved links to the Nutbrook Trail, southwest and west of Ilkeston, and part of Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 67.
* Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 67 (Long Eaton – Ilkeston – Nutbrook Trail area) (as well as further north, between Chesterfield and the Rother Valley Country Park)
* Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 6 (Nottingham-Long Eaton-Derby section). Route 6 is an important national route connecting Inverness with Dover.
* Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 15 (Nottingham – East Midlands Airport section including the new provision being included in the A453 widening scheme between the M1 and Clifton, etc. Route 15 already exists across parts of South Nottinghamshire south of the Trent and is now being further extended.
* The various bridleway links in the Strelley area on the west side of Nottingham and their importance as non-motorised links between the west side of Nottingham and the Erewash Valley.
* The multi-user path on the north-west side of Nottingham, in Broxtowe Borough, between Hempshill Vale (Low Wood Road (on the Nottingham City / Broxtowe Borough boundary) and Watnall etc., part of a proposed Sustrans route via the Bennerley Viaduct and Ilkeston etc, to Derby. This path follows under the M1 via a disused railway bridge and Pedals and Sustrans are also very keen to see this facility safeguarded in the proposals for a further NET extension line (Phase 3) from the current NET Phase 1 terminal site at Phoenix Park towards Kimberley and Eastwood, with improved connections in the north of Broxtowe Borough including to and from the northern part of the Erewash Valley Trail (towards Langley Mill etc).
* Other parts of the Greater Nottingham Cycle Network, especially in the Toton, Chilwell and Beeston areas), existing and proposed and including paths to be developed and / or upgraded in association with the current NET (Nottingham Express Transit) tram extension plans, due for completion in late 2014.

Pedals would welcome the opportunity, in cooperation with other local cycling groups, local authorities and other interested organisations, to discuss these issues in more detail and how best to ensure that the detailed final HS2 and SS2 proposals contribute to enhancing the quality and quantity of local cycle routes in the vicinity.

Hugh McClintock,

for Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)

162 Musters Road

West Bridgford

Nottingham

NG2 7AA

Tel. (0115) 9816206, m 07880 962135

Website: [www.pedals.org.uk](http://www.pedals.org.uk)

*Comments please! I have already emailed this (0n 14 Jan) to various people with a particular interest in this issue and will report any comments I get before our meeting on Monday.*

**…comments on this draft from Chris Parker, Pedals member, ICE (Institution of Civil Engineers Member) and Retired Railway Engineer, 14 Jan:**Hi Hugh,

This looks excellent to me. It reflects similar concerns to some of those my colleagues at the ICE and I have about the possible effects of HS2 on existing rail routes.

There are serious risks that the new infrastructure will interfere with existing transport infrastructure, whether road, rail, canal or cycle facilities. 

This is not just to do with the possible physical conflicts between the proposed new rail and cycle routes and the existing infrastructure.  There is also reason to worry that the future maintenance and renewal funding for existing facilities might be at risk.

That might arise because of shortage of funds or because older routes become seen as obsolete due to the introduction of the new facilities. 

In rail we seen it as critically important that HS2 is in addition to existing rail provision (both infrastructure and the services upon it), and not as a substitute for any portion of them.

It also needs to increase connectivity, across all modes, rather than severing any existing links.

I am glad that your draft response reflects these issues in respect of cycling.

Best regards, Chris Parker

**Fourth Trent Crossing: draft article from Roland Backhouse (13 Jan) for discussion at Pedals meeting**

Roland, who will not be at the meeting, has asked for us to discuss this draft article, which he would like to be finalised and set on behalf of Pedals. It was inspired by the recent renewed calls from the Gedling Borough Council leader, Cllr. John Clark, for the Fourth Trent Crossing road bridge proposal to be revived:

“As reported by the Nottingham Evening Post   
<http://www.nottinghampost.com/time-right-city-s-fourth-bridge/story-20395576-detail/story.html>, Gedling Borough Council has come out in favour of a bridge between the Colwick industrial estate and Holme Pierrepont. It is claimed the benefits would include reduced congestion and economic development. In our view, it is paramount that an increase in the health and well-being of local residents should head the list of benefits. We argue that all three benefits -improved health, reducing congestion and improving the local economy- can only be achieved by a pedestrian/cycling bridge.

The sort of cyclist we envisage using such a bridge is generally referred to as an "everyday" cyclist or "utilitarian" cyclist: a person who may be (very) young or (very) old, male or female, and possibly even disabled (and riding a trike rather than a bike). The typical cyclist would wear normal, everyday clothes and would ride a so-called city bike, fully equipped for utilitarian use with permanently fitted lights, bell, mudguards, chain case and panniers. The very old and the very young would be recommended to wear helmets in order to guard against the consequences of a monomial accident (an accident that involves the cyclist themselves and noone else) but for other utilitarian cyclists a helmet would be seen as unnecessary - in the same way that pedestrians and motorists regard wearing a helmet as unnecessary. The bridge and its approach routes would be free of cars and lorries and, on shared-use roads, motorists would be encouraged and/or required to install pedestrian/cyclist collision-avoidance systems in accordance with the Vision Zero policy (reducing road deaths to zero by 2020) that has been adopted in many countries. In short, the sort of cycling that we envisage is already the norm in countries like the Netherlands and Denmark.

Many would argue that our vision of utilitarian cycling is unrealistic. Whilst many would agree that increased, regular exercise is vital for improving health, cycling is just too energetic, particularly on the steep hills in Nottingham and surrounding area. Who wants to take a shower after cycling to the shops or to work? No, cycling is just for young, reckless males in the prime of their lives.

But that argument ignores the rapid advance of technology. The advantages of regular but moderate exercise can be gained by using an e-bike. E-bikes are electrically assisted bicycles (and tricycles). The assistance means that cycling into the wind or uphill becomes comparable to cycling on a normal bike on the flat with no wind resistance. Heavy objects can also be easily and conveniently transported using e-trikes, making them a practical alternative to delivery vans. \*\*Still to confirm\*\* For example, Nottingham City Council is using e-trikes to service its fleet of Citycard bicycles.

In mainland Europe, e-bikes are enormously popular. In the Netherlands, where cycling is already very commonplace, there has been a 50% increase in cycling between 2000 and 2010, and the current aim is to double the number of cycling commuters by 2030. Research has shown that commuters who have switched to using an e-bike travel on average 14km and have an increased journey time of just 5 to 10 minutes. Most importantly, however, they enjoy significant health benefits from their increased mobility. (14km is roughly 9 miles. The use of an ordinary non-assisted bicycle for commuting is typically recommended for distances up to 4 or 5 miles.) Just as the pedal cycle proved enormously popular among women in the 19th and 20th century, so giving significant impetus to their emancipation, the e-bike is most popular among women in the age group 46-60. 13% of this group in the Netherlands owns an e-bike compared to a national average of 10%.

A 4th conventional road bridge over the Trent would certainly not encourage increased levels of routine exercise and would arguably have a negative effect by perpetuating the dominance of the motor car in our lives. Experience has shown that any reduction in congestion would be temporary: car usage would simply increase to fill up the available space. Improving the cycling infrastructure would, in contrast, have a significantly longer-term effect since bicycles take up much less room than cars. One parking space for a car equals 10 parking spaces for bikes. (Ironically, in the long term we would expect congestion of bicycles. Groningen's railway station in the Netherlands has parking space for 6000 bicycles and parking space for 12000 bicycles is currently being built at Utrecht's railway station. But that is a congestion problem that is the envy of the world!)

Increased cycling levels also stimulates the local economy because it stimulates shopping locally. This has long been recognized in other European countries where local shops clamour for better cycle parking rather than better car parking. Modern technology means that shopping patterns are changing rapidly. The old-fashioned bicycle can play a significant role in preserving our local communities.

In previous years, proposals to build a 4th road bridge across the Trent have been rightly condemned by the local community on environmental grounds. In that respect, the situation has only got worse. But now we also need to build health issues into the equation. A cycling/pedestrian bridge would have no negative consequences for the environment, it would reduce congestion and promote the local economy. But above all, it would improve the health and well-being of our communities. When all is said and done, health is our greatest wealth.

Roland Backhouse

13th January 2014

*Comments please!*

**Nottm Post article (15 Jan) re Mapperley Plains cycling improvement controversy (link circulated on 15 Jan):**

Does anyone with more local knowledge than me have any particular comments on this article in today's Post about the work now in progress, financed by developer contributions, on cycle improvements on Mapperley Plains?

<http://www.nottinghampost.com/Stop-wrong-improvements/story-20449107-detail/story.html>

Hugh

1. **Miscellaneous items**

**Drivers’ perspective on poor cycling and cyclists: possible series of article for the Nottm Post:   
Comments of 11 Dec from Susan Young on message from David Easley**Susan and David may wish to make further comments.

**…..comments of 11 Dec from Susan Young on message from David Easley**Now there is a regular post column an article on this sort of issue - basics of bikeability etc. Would need to be collaborative and considered but if we take our time a series of articles could ensue. Discussion needed. Susan

**Invitation for Pedals to send a representative to meetings of the Nottinghamshire Local Access Forum (16 Dec):**Andrew. Peter  
Interested to hear about this approach from Daniel Prisk. It would certainly be a good idea to have a cyclist representative on the County LAF, particularly as I do not think that the CTC are represented nor is there any other cycling organisation involved. Even though Pedals interest is in only part of the county rather than all of Notts, covered by this LAF, it would help in getting more action on issues such as the Attenborough "Bridal path" saga and the developing HS2 rights of way impact debate.

When the LAFs were first set up (under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) Pete Jarman, who was then the Recreational Routes Officer, did ask if I would like to join but I declined saying that I did not have time to attend regularly. Unfortunately no one else volunteered to be the cycling rep.

With the Nottingham LAF on the other hand there has always been a cycling rep. Roger Codling filled that role very usefully for many years until he stepped down about 2 years before he died this summer. John Lee asked me to take his place as the cycling rep which I did. More recently he and the Chair, Diane Moore, asked if I would be willing to stand as Chair for 3 years when she steps down early next year and I have said that I am willing to do so if there are no other contenders and if someone else stands as Vice-Chair, a post that so far has not been filled.

We can indeed discuss this fully at the January Pedals meeting.

Hugh

**From:** Andrew [mailto:andrew@veggies.org.uk]   
**Sent:** 16 December 2013 16:49  
**To:** Daniel.Prisk@nottscc.gov.uk  
**Cc:** peter osborne; Andrew Martin; Hugh.McClintock@ntlworld.com  
**Subject:** RE: Nottinghamshire Local Access Forum

Greetings Daniel  
Thanks for the email inviting a Pedals member to join Notts Local Access Forum. Further to Peter's response below, I will suggest to colleagues that we discuss this matter at the next Pedals meeting, in January.  
Regards, Andrew  
  
On Sat, December 14, 2013 6:20 pm, peter osborne wrote:  
> Hi Daniel - I'd be interested in attending, but only if the meetings are  
> in the evening as otherwise I would have to use annual leave to attend.  
> Regards, Peter  
  
From: [Daniel.Prisk@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:Daniel.Prisk@nottscc.gov.uk)  
> To: [andrew@veggies.org.uk](mailto:andrew@veggies.org.uk); [peterozz@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:peterozz@hotmail.co.uk)  
> Subject: Nottinghamshire Local Access Forum  
> Date: Thu, 12 Dec 2013 11:42:34 +0000  
>   
> Hi Andrew/ Peter  
> My name is Daniel Prisk and I’m a Project Officer in Nottinghamshire  
> County Council’s Highways Division.  
>   
> I’m getting in touch to inform you that Nottinghamshire Local Access Forum  
> (LAF) is currently looking for new members and in particular the forum is  
> looking for a new member who has a particular interest in cycling. I  
> thought this opportunity  
> may be of interest to you and Pedals members  
>   
> As a brief bit of background, the LAF, as you may already be aware, is  
> independent from the County Council but does advise on countryside  
> matters. The forum meets quarterly for full public forums as well as  
> holding more technical or special interest meetings on an ad hoc basis.  
>   
> The County Council plays an active role in facilitating the forum. It’s  
> secretary is our Countryside Access Manager Neil Lewis and we do also  
> facilitate the recruitment and engagement of new members. In addition to  
> looking to recruit a member with a particular interest and knowledge of cycling, the forum is  
> also currently looking for members from the land owning community and  
> also a member with a particular interest in disabled access to the  
> countryside.  
>   
> Please see below link to our information page about the Nottinghamshire  
> LAF and also a PDF information leaflet for further information.  
> <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/enjoying/countryside/rights-of-way/local-access-forum/>  
> leaflet about the Local Access Forum [PDF].  
   
> If you would like any further information, please do not hesitate to  
> contact me on the details below.  
>   
> If you would like to advertise this opportunity through your member  
> mailing list, this would much appreciated. If your members do wish to  
> express an interest in becoming a LAF member, the best contact is  
> [nottslaf@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:nottslaf@nottscc.gov.uk) (marked For Attention of Neil Lewis/Daniel Prisk)  
> or 0115 977 4993  
> Many thanks, Daniel Prisk  
> Highways Division  
> Environment and Resources Department  
> Trent Bridge House Fox Road West Bridgford NG2 6BJ