

**HMCC BACKGROUND NOTES TO SUPPLEMENT THE AGENDA FOR THE PEDALS MEETING AGENDA ON MONDAY 17 OCTOBER 2011, 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.**

**AGENDA FOR PEDALS MONTHLY MEETING:**

**7.30 p.m. on Monday 17 October 2011**

**in the upper room of The Globe PH, 152 London Road, NG2 3BQ (between London Road and Meadows Way, on corner with Ryehill Street, just north of Trent Bridge)**

1. Welcome, and apologies for absence, and including brief introductions
2. Discussion with Jerry Clough on OpenStreetMapping (30- 45 minutes)

***(15 minutes break)***

3. Minutes of the previous Pedals Meeting (19 September 2011) and matters arising / update
4. Future of Rural Rides and proposed new funding bid for Rural Rides for All from 2012
5. Report on recent meetings by people who have attended on behalf of Pedals.
6. Finance and Membership (Chris Gardner and Pete Elderton to report)
7. Forthcoming events / meetings
  - Pedals meetings
  - Other meetings / events
8. Increase in local cycle thefts and possible Pedals response
9. Cycle facility and traffic management matters
10. Autumn newsletter
11. Miscellaneous items
12. Any other business

**BACKGROUND NOTES and including extracts from relevant emails**

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

**Apologies for absence** from Mara Ozolins, Pete Osborne.

**2. Minutes of the previous Pedals Meeting (19 Sept) and matters arising / update**

**(Minutes taken by Arthur Williams)**

**1. Apologies:** Peter Elderton, Susan Young, Mara Ozolins, Peter Osborne.

**Present:** Andrew Martin, Hugh McClintock, Hilary and Roland Backhouse, Terry Scott, David Miller, Julian Bentley, Peter Briggs (later).

Repair of Gazebo roof: needs cutting and re-making to fit over the frame. David Miller suggested a business on Lenton Boulevard that could do the modification. Me to contact Chris to ask for some photos. Arthur to get details from DM.

**2. Minutes** of the previous Pedals Meeting (15 August 2011) were accepted. Items for matters arising / update were:

**Storage of stall equipment and materials:** Hugh is to put a plea in next newsletter for alternative storage as Chris has only offered storage on a temporary basis.

*Discussion on future of Rural Rides for All:* It was decided to wait until Peter Briggs arrived before discussing this. See under 8.

### **3. Report back from Meetings** recently attended:

*Meeting on redevelopment of station:* Hugh met with Keith Morgan, Gary Smerdon-White and representatives of Hub and British Transport Police.

The plan is now to have additional cycle parking on south side of the station once the new car park is completed; porte-cochere stands will go this weekend.

Hugh has put an announcement on the Pedals website. Agreement in principle has been agreed to expansion of the existing bike compound, but this is unlikely to happen soon. Good dialogue developing.

Possibility of a cycle retail/repair outlet; Evans are interested in station based outlets nationally.

*Highways Agency Non-Motorised users' study (A52)* – Hugh attended a meeting that highlighted the weaknesses of this HA study. A co-ordinated response to be put together with Sustrans, City Co. and Ridewise. Roland suggested that a representative of University also be involved and offered to follow this up. Concern was raised that accident statistics are not taken into account.

### **4. Finance:**

Andrew has taken up problems of direct debits from Lloyds account. He will report back to Chris.

**Membership** is generally down compared to this time last year – it was proposed that Peter Elderton should bring a list of existing members who need to renew or update their subscriptions to the next monthly meeting, for those present to check and follow up.

### **5. Future Pedals meetings:**

Next month: Jerry Clough, Speaker on Open Street Map (Open source mapping for cycling)... agreed to invite him for (up to) 45 mins (inc. questions).

Andrew has made contact with the Sneinton Bikers; proposed to invite them to November meeting to discuss ways of working together.

*CTC-Cyclenation National Cycle Campaign Conference* in Sheffield, 15<sup>th</sup> October. Hugh to go; Peter Briggs to go; Roland to consider going. Andrew Martin may also go.

Julian is starting a new set of *cycle maintenance classes* starting 24 September; please advertise!

*AGM date:* Andrew M to book Friends meeting house for 24<sup>th</sup> or 31<sup>st</sup> March.

*30 Sept. Cycling Development Group (CDG):* Hugh is to raise issue of the cycle route on new flood defence between Colwick Park and Netherfield.

Another issue is better respect of advanced Stop Lines (ASLs) especially by bus drivers; Hugh has followed up with Premier Travel without result.

*Driver respect campaign by Notts police.* Hugh is to ask for more car stickers from Heidi Duffy at Notts police, to send out with next newsletter. Roland suggested using Ucycle too.

*Bike Ride events:* Julian running a bike ride this Saturday around the theme of history of cycling in Nottingham; Framework Charity Bike Ride 22<sup>nd</sup> October; funding for bike club is continuing for the time being; please pass word around for this fund-raising event.

### **6. Cycle Facilities and Traffic Management:**

*Maintenance of Cycle facilities:* At the Forum organized by the City Council in June, many cyclists' representatives raised issues of maintenance; Larry has put a link for reporting problems at fairly obvious place on website.

Consultation on city council road changes; Andrew is to check the Aspley Lane road safety scheme and send in a response.

There is consultation on a proposal for Sunday car parking in City. No comments were suggested.

Wigman Road, New Basford: no consultation has been sent to Pedals. Andrew Martin is to go and take a look. Andrew suggests to raise at next CDG meeting.

Comments requested from John Lee about policy of horse-riders on cycle paths; ideal arrangement is for softer surface; one issue is where cycle path is narrow and it is then difficult to pass a horse safely.

Problems with paths through Attenborough nature reserve; County council are following up about unofficial signs; Broxtowe are planning to widen the paths; Peter Briggs is going to follow up at Broxtowe Transport Users' Sub-group.

There are still problems with Erewash Trail – but these are mainly in Derbyshire.

EM Trains – have done a cycling survey, but Hugh will raise at CDG what are outcomes of this. Peter B will be able to attend next CDG along with Hugh.

Lenton Lane islands – Roland has reported 4 times about problems with obstruction and vehicles passing on the wrong side of the islands. Suggestion that a 1-2pm “no parking” restriction would be effective in reducing the problem of obstructive car parking more effectively than a double yellow line. Hugh and Peter to raise at CDG.

#### **8. Miscellaneous items:**

*Rural Rides for All:* Peter B reported on the last management meeting of Rural Rides for All project.

Targets for ride leaders will be met, but overall wider benefit will make it difficult to get funding for next year.

Gary is following up with NCVS the possibilities for a focus that would be suitable for funding next year.

Andrew M suggested that closer links with Framework would be beneficial, and also specifically targeting cyclists with disabilities where access to cycle rides could be significant.

Peter B raised suggestion that Ridewise could benefit more from expertise within Pedals in relation to their own funded project in relation to developing “Big Society” links.

#### **9. A.O.B.**

*Questionnaire:* Roland proposed putting together a questionnaire as a marketing tool for Pedals to use at events. He would like suggestions for questions. Suggestion to develop some ideas at December meeting.

Meeting closed at 9.55 pm.

## **Update**

### **Aspley Lane Road Safety Scheme: message of 23 September from Andrew Martin to Jennifer Williams, Nottm City Council in response to consultation:**

“Dear Jennifer

I am writing on behalf of Nottingham Pedals and would like to thank you for the opportunity to respond to the consultation letter regarding the Aspley Lane Road Safety Scheme.

We recently held our monthly meeting for Pedals members and agreed that the proposed options could indeed be useful for all road users. We are keen to encourage and engage with Nottingham City Council to pursue sensible and cost-effective measures which help with reducing the number and severity of casualties resulting from Road Traffic Collisions. (Please note that such incidents on the public highway may not be considered **accidents** which just happen without human cause or responsibility!).

Please ensure that all appropriate staff have double-checked the proposals as one (and possibly more) recent Nottingham City Council scheme (Trowell Road) has in fact created a greater hazard for cyclists. Have you considered whether there is scope for independent assessments of such proposed Road Safety Schemes to help reduce the possibility of further permanent hazards for cyclists?

Yours sincerely

Andrew Martin

Facilitator, Nottingham Pedals

### **Dangerous driving caused by parking: Lenton Lane Gregory Street – my response of 20 Sept to message from Gary Smerdon-White in reply to the message from Roland Backhouse discussed at the 19 Sept Pedals meeting:**

**...message from Roland of 19 Sept:**

“Hugh,

>> Today I reported to the police another case of dangerous driving past the traffic islands on Lenton Lane/Gregory Street. I was overtaken by a large white van driving on the wrong side of the traffic island (the one with the bypass for cyclists). I took a note of the driver's number. A year or so ago, I reported 3 such incidents. At that time car drivers were parking their cars opposite the traffic islands. They have stopped doing that now but do park as close as possible to the traffic islands without infringing the law against parking opposite a traffic island ([http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/TravelAndTransport/Highwaycode/DG\\_069860\\_rule\\_243](http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/TravelAndTransport/Highwaycode/DG_069860_rule_243)).

I got a telephone call this evening from one of the police officers who deals with this area. Her name is, I believe, PC?? Dobson; she said the beat officer is PC Mellor. She said that she herself cycles along the road, she is also appalled by the

situation (although I don't know if those were her exact words) and they had tried to eliminate the problem but had had no success. She said, for example, that the traffic cones they had put down had all been removed - but not by them!

She urged me to complain to the council's Highways department saying that the more people who complain the better. Can we start a petition by chain email about this problem? I'm thinking of just asking cyclists/pedestrians to send in a complaint. I would also propose simultaneously complaining about the give-way markings on the pavement outside the Red Cow pub at the same time (quoting rule 170 of the highway code [http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/TravelAndTransport/Highwaycode/DG\\_070332](http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/TravelAndTransport/Highwaycode/DG_070332)).

The objective would be twofold: get double-yellow lines painted on the road for a substantial distance (say 20m) on either side of the traffic islands, and get the give-way markings on the pavement outside the Red Cow removed. The problem I have is that I don't know where to send a complaint to at the council. I've tried looking on the council's website but can't find the appropriate place. (Perhaps [road.safety@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:road.safety@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)?) If you can suggest where we send emails to - the best would be if all emails are directed to the same place and as close together as possible - I would be quite happy to start the ball rolling. Photos could also be made available: see attached.

Any help you can give would be much appreciated.  
Roland

**....response from Gary (20 Sept)**

"Hi

There is no doubt it is a recipe for accidents on that patch.

- The parking, speeding and road behaviour is an issue all along from the old studios down to the main traffic lights. The police/community police could do something about it if they really wanted to as could road safety team with their CCTV car
- The markings outside of the Red Cow were supposedly another example of poor specification and we are led to believe mindless/non-expert construction teams which I understood Keith was putting right asap

Personally prior to the tram even I'd lobby for double yellow lines along its length with unbroken cycle track on pavements and a lot more enforcement  
Gary"

**...and my response of 20 Sept:**

Gary

Thanks for your comments on this with which I much agree. Clearly the problem is getting worse, with increased parking pressures from the QMC and similar pressures now likely from the University with the introduction of car parking charges on campus.

Measures like double yellow lines and greater enforcement are certainly needed sooner rather than later without waiting for the tram-related changes. Can I therefore suggest please that we discuss this at the next Cycling Development Group meeting on Friday week (30 June)?

Hugh

**....my message of 2 Oct in forwarding Roland's message to Chris Carter, in response to Chris's request for further evidence of the problems:**

"Chris

At the Cycling Development Group meeting on Friday you asked for further evidence of the increasing obstruction and safety problems arising from the growth of 'overspill' car parking on Gregory Street and Lenton Lane. I am therefore now forwarding to you a detailed account of the problems from Professor Roland Backhouse who regularly cycles this route when riding from West Bridgford to the Jubilee Campus and who has mentioned to me several times how the problems have been growing. I should mention that we have had similar concerns from several other people, to whom I am copying this message and who may like to send you directly their further comments. There were several comments on this at the September Pedals meeting.

Lenton Lane and Gregory Street, as you know, form part of a strategic cycle route across the south of the city between West Bridgford and The Meadows on the one hand, and Lenton, Nottingham University and Beeston etc. on the other as well as being very important for more local trips in the Lenton and Dunkirk areas and of course to two of the major Sustrans UCycle Project sites, the QMC and Nottingham University.

I might also mention that one person I have recently discussed this issue with is Mark Wells, the CEO of Games Workshop, who not himself also cycles to work on Lenton Lane and has noticed this increasing problems. He also commented to me that the growing obstruction is now causing many problems for HGVs serving their premises.

These comments clearly show the problems for other road users as well as

cyclists and therefore underline all the more the need for urgent action to address these increasing problems and we would be very happy to arrange a site meeting if that would help to discuss these further.

best wishes

Hugh

PS. The attached photos were taken by Roland Backhouse and one by me. I can send you higher resolution versions of any of these if you wish.

**....response of 3 Oct from Chris Carter, City Council Transport Strategy Team Leader:**

Thanks

Keith is looking into the various issues raised.

Chris

Chris Carter | Transport Strategy Manager |

Development | Nottingham City Council |

4th Floor | Loxley House | Station Street | Nottingham | NG2 3NG

T: 0115 876 3940 | E: [chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

**....response of 3 Oct from Cllr. Jane Urquhart, City Council Transport Portfolio Holder:**

Thank you Hugh, very useful insight, let's hope that together we can improve the situation Jane Urquhart"

**.....further comments from Roland Backhouse (4 Oct) passed on to Keith Morgan (City Council) and PC David Silverwood (Canning Circus Police Station)**

I agree with Arthur. The problem started when the QMC car park was closed. In fact, the situation has improved since the new QMC car park opened. It was much worse a year or so ago but after the police put no-parking bollards up alongside the islands the motorists (most of whom are regulars and park in the same spot every day) stopped parking directly opposite the islands. I fear, however, that the problem is beginning to get worse again. One day last week when I went home in the middle of the day, cars were parked opposite the islands again. (They park entirely on the pavement; presumably they are aware that it is illegal to park opposite an island but think that parking on the pavement makes it legal.) On another day, a van overtook me on the wrong side of the island: this was a common practice when the problem was at its worst and is the main reason why I think the current situation is intolerable.

The problem may be getting worse or about to get worse because of University motorists. Ironically, I once saw was a woman who had parked her car close to the island get a bicycle out of the boot, presumably in order to continue her journey. This was before September so she is unlikely to have been from the University. But I think that it is inevitable that many motorists will have no compunction about parking on pavements and similar places so long it is close to their place of work, it is free, and they can get away with it. If they can get away with it here, they will get away with it elsewhere.

When I once reminded the police that it is illegal to drive on the pavement except in an emergency or to gain access and hence all drivers who park on the pavement have committed an offence, I was told that there is a difference between the law and actual practice. Indeed, that is clear from the cyclists-give-way signs outside the Red Cow pub: the actual practice is to flout the law in favour of non-vulnerable motorists and against the interests of vulnerable traffic.

QMC and the University need to take steps to discourage selfish behaviour and to encourage an awareness and respect for vulnerable traffic. They could, for example, provide bicycle lockers at the park-and-ride places; they could create bicycle centres on all their campuses; they could make motorists give way to pedestrians and cyclists when turning into car parks, etc., etc.

Roland

**A52T Bramcote to Dunkirk Non-Motorised User Study – Response from Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign), September 2011)**

**Introduction**

Pedals very much welcomes the interest of the Highways Agency and A-One Plus in improving provision for non-motorised users on this very important radial route into Nottingham and one which is of particular importance for cyclists being relatively flat and because of its location in a part of Greater Nottingham with above average numbers of cyclists. It is also of particular importance because of its close proximity to the main University Park campus of Nottingham University with its high numbers of staff and student cyclists and where Sustrans, in close collaboration with the University and Nottingham City Council are involved in a major effort to promote cycling further through the Ucycle Project.

The report mentions (in Table 3, on page 12) that the accident rate for both cyclists and pedestrians greatly exceeds the national average. However, it then fails to address what should surely be the clear implications of this very important fact, i.e. that measures to improve NMU safety must be given much higher priority, rather than giving overriding importance to the provision of extra capacity for general motor traffic.

**Detailed comments**

We do welcome these specific proposed cycling improvements:-

- a new shared path on the south side of the A52T between Church Street and Town Street (Bramcote)
- the provision of a wheeling ramp on the footbridge across the southern arm of the Bramcote roundabout
- the conversion of some of the pelican crossings at the Priory roundabout to toucan crossings
- the recognition of the need to ensure that all drivers respect the toucan crossing signals across the slip roads on the south side of the QMC (Derby Road) roundabout

However at the same time we do find it very disappointing that little else is proposed and that most of the suggestions made by Pedals and other groups have been rejected as not practicable.

We are particularly disappointed at the dismissal of the case made by Pedals and other organisations for the provision of cycle lanes in both directions on the stretch of the A52T between the Priory and QMC islands where the lane width for two officially marked general traffic lanes in each direction is inadequate and where it is only on the approaches to the main junctions at both ends (Priory and QMC islands) and in the peak periods that drivers are inclined to form two unofficial traffic lanes. We consider that this unofficial usage by drivers is being too readily regarded as an absolute barrier to improved cycling provision and that the overall desirability and practicality of achieving this needs to be much more carefully and thoroughly scrutinised.

While appreciating the constraints on converting the two footways to shared paths we do think that it should be feasible to create 1.5m cycle lanes in both directions, accompanied by reducing the speed limits on this single carriageway stretch to 30mph to make on-road cycling safer and more comfortable for less confident cyclists who, in the absence of safe on-road provision, are more likely to resort to riding on the footway. There does, incidentally, appear to be some confusion in the report in its discussion (page 22) of the type of cyclists to whom such cycle lanes might appeal (if well-designed and well-enforced). Its statement that “: *the provision of an on carriageway facility would not necessarily be attractive to most categories of cyclists other than „utility“ cyclists*” appears not to recognise that the majority of users here are “utility cyclists”.

Although University Boulevard, on the south side of University Park, with its good shared paths, is a very popular route for most cyclists (and forms part of Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 6), we do also consider that there is also a specific need for improved provision on the Derby Road route to the north of University Park, as this is better suited to the origins and destinations of some cyclists, e.g. those riding between Beeston and area along the Outer Ring Road (Middleton Boulevard etc) to the north of Derby Road, a major and relatively flat link to and from the north side of Nottingham and a route where the City Council intend to improve provision for cyclists as part of their Ring Road Major Scheme, if funding for this is confirmed.

Our feeling that the NMU Study has not investigated sufficiently the scope for cycling improvements (in partnership with other organisations including Pedals, Sustrans, Nottingham City Council, Ridewise and the Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership as well as Nottingham University and the Queen’s Medical Centre) is strengthened by the apparent lack of involvement of many of these organisations in the preparation of the study.

Had there been more such partnership working we think that the Study would have been strengthened by showing more awareness of the existing links (e.g. the shared use subway south of the Dunkirk flyover roundabout and the pedestrian overbridge between University Park and the QMC to the north of the roundabout) are apparently not mentioned). There would also have been more accuracy in references to the status of existing paths, cycle paths and shared paths both within the highway boundary of the A52T (e.g. in Sections 3F and 3G on page 19, covering the area on Clifton Boulevard near the east side of University Park etc.) and nearby, including important cycle routes across it such as the route from Beeston town centre to Moor Lane etc. to the north of the A52T via the shared path across the Beeston Fields Golf Course, Brindle Way, etc.

There would also have been less risk of the apparent confusion in some passages in the report, e.g. between the Bramcote and Dunkirk roundabouts (as in the wrong caption on page 27; Figure 3) and in the references near the bottom of page 10 to the locations of the proposed tram (Nottingham Express Transit extension line to Toton) stops to be developed in the vicinity, mentioning one at the Dunkirk roundabout as well as the one actually proposed on the south side of the QMC.

Closer partnership working in the preparation of the Study would also have enabled a more thorough investigation of the possible use of nearby cycle routes to take some of the pressure for cycling provision away from the A52T itself, where there really are major constraints to achieving this.

Although we do not think it feasible on the section between the Priory and QMC islands to find practical, direct and convenient routes through either University Park or Wollaton Park, we do think there may be some potential for encouraging the use of alternative parallel routes, not just on paths but on quiet roads, on the section between the Priory and Bramcote roundabouts (i.e. between Woodside Road and Brindle Road) where nearby roads are much quieter, if also in some cases hillier. Such a route could also be considered in relation to the City Council’s plans for improved cycling

provision on the west side of Woodside Road, between the Priory roundabout and the roundabout by the west entrance to University Park and east of Broadgate Beeston.

We also think that closer collaboration with other organisations would help to find ways of making better cycling provision between the QMC and Dunkirk roundabouts, both in terms of a better use of space on the existing footways and cycle path (particularly on the west side of Clifton Boulevard) and also in terms of accesses to and from it, e.g. achieving some form of contraflow cycle lane or cycle path on the south side of the campus exit onto the Clifton Boulevard slip road just south of the QMC roundabout, through close working with Nottingham University since most of the land to provide this link lies within the University Park campus rather than within the highway boundary. This proposal from Pedals seems to be dismissed all too readily as though it is solely a matter for the Highways Agency.

As well as making more effort to take account of the knowledge and experience of a range of possible partner organisations about cycling provision the study would benefit from cooperation with such organisations to assess how other transport projects such as the NET extension could be best used to help give improve provision for cyclists, as in the case of the detailed alignment for the new tram bridge across Clifton Boulevard between the QMC and Science Road (University Park) and its approaches.

It should also be remembered, in considering the scope for taking further the work of this study, that many of the organisations mentioned have extensive wider cycling expertise not just in terms of the relationship of this study to ongoing plans for the expansion and improvement of the Greater Nottingham cycle network but also in terms of being able to learn lessons from good practice in other places in the UK and elsewhere.

For example, Sustrans, the major partner in the Ucycle Project, has very extensive experience of developing and promoting good cycling infrastructure, not just in terms of off-road routes such as disused railways and canal paths (many forming part of the National Cycle Network) for which they are particularly renowned but also in terms of a range of quality on-road provision, designed and implemented according to local needs and contexts as well as good engineering standards.

It would therefore be very useful to follow up this study with a more concerted effort to engage with these various partners and, where appropriate, as in the case of Sustrans, with their wider national expertise, both in terms of specific site visits and further discussion of possible solutions at several locations between the Bramcote and Dunkirk roundabouts.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

While welcoming this detailed study of the needs of non-motorised users on this very important, busy and dangerous section of the A52T, we do think that there needs to be a much more thorough and comprehensive assessment of the potential for improved NMU (especially cycling) provision, going beyond the relatively small number of specific proposals in this report.

This report should be regarded as the beginning of a dialogue with other interested organisations, particularly Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham University as well as Sustrans and Pedals to investigate further the potential for improvements both with the A52T highway corridor and in its vicinity and taking full account both of the existing provision away from trunk roads in the area and other plans for extending and improving it, on a closely coordinated basis, and with particular regard to the improvement of road safety.

As in the case of our earlier involvement with the Highways Agency over proposed cycling provision within the A453T and A46T improvement schemes, we very much hope that further dialogue will help ensure improved provision in the case of this scheme too.

Hugh McClintock  
for Pedals  
22.9.11

### **Wigman Road layout changes: message of 30 Sept from Alison Russell:**

"Hi Hugh,

I understand that you are due to be meeting with someone from the City Council about the mess that's been made of the recent installation of traffic calming measures on Wigman Road in Bilborough.

As you know, I live just down the road from there, and I use a trike as my usual cycle.

I think the kerbed islands that have been added to divide the cycle lane from the speed bumps in the general traffic lane are a real problem. Each island has been installed partway across the cycle lane, and for some of them, entirely inside the already-narrow cycle lane. Surely this is unnecessary.

Although the vertical reflector posts dividing the cycle lane from the general traffic lane are conspicuous, it is much less obvious -

particularly in the dark - that each post stands in the middle of a wider island, which has been built out into the cycle lane.

Why are wider, kerbed islands used at all if there's not enough room? The upright post would be sufficient on its own to keep motorists out of the cycle lane, without the wider kerbs. This road is shared with frequent buses - every 8-10 minutes in the daytime, 15 minutes after 6pm. It is not hard to envisage a cyclist's attention being distracted if there's a bus immediately over their shoulder, especially if it's approaching one of the bus stops.

I think there is a real danger of cyclists hitting these kerbs in the cycle lane, particularly after dark. As well as people heading to and from Harvey Hadden, the Co-op on Bracebridge Drive is open until 8pm, along with takeaways, so there are reasons for local journeys up Wigman Road in the evening, and in winter cycle commuters will be riding home in the dark, including from the nearby industrial estates.

This is a route that's already used by cyclists with non-standard, wide cycles. I cycle this way on my trike as it's the road to the nearest supermarket; just this evening I was passed by a couple on a tandem towing a child trailer who were heading up Wigman Road, and the Festival of Disability Cycling has just been held at the Harvey Hadden stadium, with a whole selection of bikes, trikes and trailers to interest people locally.

I rode up Wigman Road at a quiet time, holding the left line of the cycle lane as marked, as you would do if you hadn't spotted in the dark that there's a unexpected kerb intruding into the lane. My back right wheel scraped one island's kerb, and only just missed at other points. There is very little margin for error.

Then the cycle lane abruptly disappears altogether at a pinch point that has been created at a pelican crossing. The pavements have been built out entirely across the cycle lanes, so we now have to move into the general traffic lane to get through the crossing. At busy times of day there are long streams of cars bunching together as they go up Wigman Road. Joining the other lane can be particularly difficult here because it's a long uphill drag and therefore cycling speeds will be slower, so there is greater potential for conflict with impatient drivers.

As it will be traffic light-controlled it doesn't make pedestrians any safer to reduce the width of the crossing without the cycle lane, but the sudden pinch point does makes things more dangerous for cyclists.

The recent traffic calming measures as currently installed have now made Wigman Road more difficult and dangerous to cycle than it was without them. In particular I think the kerbs in the cycle lanes are dangerous.

I hope the issue will be taken seriously at the meeting.  
Alison

PS. This was raised at the CDG meeting on 30 September and Chris Carter, City Council Transport Strategy Team Leader admitted that, for various reasons, "this was not their finest hour". The reasons included the fact that the scheme was designed by consultants for the developers of the campus site nearby and that the people in the City Council who should have been scrutinising their work were not long afterwards made redundant.

Chris promised to investigate the issue and agreed to my idea of a site visit to follow this up in due course.

**Lenton Lane – Gregory Street; dangers from growth of obstructive car parking.**

This too was raised at the CDG meeting and Chris Carter was reluctant to accept the seriousness of the problem. He asked for further evidence for them to consider and I have now send this, relying in particular on the messages and photos from Roland Backhouse.

Roland several other people have since made me aware of the problems this is now causing for other road users, e.g. HGV drivers and bus drivers as well.

**Notts. Police 'Think Bike – Give Cyclists Space' car stickers campaign – Nottm Post Story of Wed 28 Sept:**  
<http://www.thisisnottingham.co.uk/Campaign-launched-help-cyclists/story-13418406-detail/story.html>

Any comments please on this story, particular the bit about cyclists and bus drivers?

**Nottingham Station – removal of cycle stands from the Porte Cochere area and British Transport Police strong encouragement to cyclists to leave their bikes instead in the Station Street Bike Compound – message of 30 Sept from Cathy Melia, Notts CTC, which I have since replied to in person:**

"Hi Hugh,

I was dismayed to find that the cycle racks at Nottm Rail station (the under cover ones at the front, handy for the Booking Office) are closed off and are due to be removed "on 23 Sept"!!

This is said to be due to theft of bikes. I use these for short stay visits to the station when buying a ticket etc. The public racks on Carrington St (on pavement) were full and overflowing as a result. I do not really want to go all the way half way down Station St to use the alternative suggested racks, (not all under cover anyway) to then have to walk back all the way round the station (as you can't get in the station at the footbridge entrance without a ticket!). I can see that some people (regular commuters by train e.g.) might want to use these if they have a season ticket and can then pop in the footbridge entrance perhaps (although they bypass the newsagents, coffee shop etc).

If the station can make the Station St racks "secure" CCTV etc supposedly, then why can't they make the useful ones inside the station porch secure with CCTV?

It strikes me as an excuse to close these cycle racks (which I believe they have been wanting to do for a while?). It also looks like "Oh there are thefts from here, so let's just take out the facility!". It means fewer bike racks in the end and more likely that people will end up leaving bikes in even less secure places.

Cathy"

**PS (my comments).** We will now need to keep a special eye on the use of the cycle stands on the pavement outside, intended to be just for people making very short visits to book tickets or make enquiries but which now may be mostly used by those wishing to park for longer periods. How do we ensure that they are only used for their intended purpose?

#### **4. Future of Rural Rides and proposed new funding bid for Rural Rides for All from 2012**

**Minutes of Rural Rides For All Project Management Group meeting of 26<sup>th</sup> September 2011, held in the Ridewise offices at the Lenton Centre.**

**Present:** Gary Smerdon-White, Graham Hubbard, Helen McCullen, Hugh McClintock, Peter Briggs  
**Apologies for absence** from Andrew Martin

**Matters arising from the minutes of the 23 August meeting:**

- 1) improvements to *Ridewise* Website; still awaited but **Gary said that he now has someone to take responsibility for this**
- 2) Electronic newsletters for Ride Leaders and RRFA flyers; Peter said he was very impressed with these. Helen commented that she now felt that she was now having more success in developing electronic communication including the use of Facebook. She also mentioned that she has developed good contacts with Broxtowe and Gedling Borough Councils. **Suggestions were made, by Hugh and Gary, for similar contacts to cultivate in Rushcliffe BC and the City Council, i.e. Rose Melvin (RBC) and Laraine Reckless (City Council)**
- 3) Further cheque (£1000) now given by Peter from Pedals to Ridewise to cover recent payments to Helen and **it was agreed that he would also now arrange with Susan Young and Hugh to issue a further cheque for £500 asap for the outstanding amount owed to Helen.**

#### **Rural Rides leader training**

New Ride Leader's course took place on 31 August (8 people). Gary and Graham said that the guidelines and assessment criteria have been revised for those wishing to qualify as ride leaders and **Graham said that he will be writing to all concerned about these changes**

Gary mentioned that a further 8 people had been trained as ride leaders on the recent British Cycling women only 'Breeze' training course in Nottingham, although only 2 of these were actually from Nottingham. Helen said she had taken this training and learnt from it. Although it was more prescriptive than that offered by Ridewise, she thought that we should be able to learn some lessons.

#### **Differentiating types of Ride**

Agreed that we need to do more to differentiate types of ride and encourage better summaries by ride leaders so that prospective riders know just what they are being offered, including whether the ride had a special focus such as local

history or local wildlife rather than just being a ride.

Peter suggested having a series of tick boxes, e.g. to help ride leaders indicate the type of ride, e.g. social rather than themed and whether mainly for beginners, to help rides sound more interesting. **He agreed to draft these for discussion at our next meeting.**

#### **Success of rides**

Several ride participants have already given feedback, helped by the increasing use of Facebook. **Agreed that we should encourage this kind of informal subjective feedback, as well as getting answers to a series of specific questions.**

Graham suggested that these specific questions could include asking 'Would you use Facebook?', 'Are the ride distances about right?', 'Do you come on the ride with friends?', 'If not, do you think that they might come?', and 'How did you hear about the ride?'.

There was some discussion about the best timing to survey riders and it was agreed to do this rather later in the ride programme 'season', while being in a good time, to carry out and analyse the findings before the 7 December ride leaders meeting, i.e. about 3 weeks before this meeting.

#### **Christmas Ride Leaders event, Tuesday 6 December**

Agreed to hold this on Wednesday 7 December in the Lenton Centre – *later changed to Tuesday 6 December, for reasons of room availability*). **Helen agreed to finalise the arrangements with the Lenton Centre and the Crocus Café (room booked on 29 Sept for 5.50-9pm)**

There was discussion about who to invite and whether to invite a range of stakeholders as well as ride leaders and prospective new ride leaders (e.g. friends of current ride leaders). These stakeholders could include Ucycle, Perfect Motion, CTC (Notts DA) and, Gary suggested, the Local Sustainable Transport Fund Community Organiser, to be appointed by the City Council. Hugh also suggested inviting the organisers of the 4 U3A (University of the Third Age) cycling groups now running in Nottinghamshire, i.e. Beeston, Keyworth, the Soar Valley and West Bridgford.

Inviting other stakeholders might possibly help to nurture their interest in future funding support for RRFA by giving them more of an idea of what the programme was like than could be gleaned just from a glossy brochure (although there was perhaps some danger of negative impressions if too many negative points were raised!). A separate meeting could be arranged later with stakeholders if necessary to discuss further possible funding support.

It was agreed that the evening should be planned mainly as a celebratory event, to thank the ride leaders for their efforts, to report on rider feedback and to suggest improvements or other changes for next year.

It was important to encourage continued ride leader involvement and Graham suggested that we investigate incentives for this, e.g. discounts on clothing and accessories, as well as giving out 3-4 prizes for different categories of ride success.

Gary said that the meeting should start with a Powerpoint presentation to help make clear all that has been achieved over the last year since the takeover from the County Council. This should cover not just the numbers of rides, ride leaders and ride participants but also all the background work, e.g. on volunteer procedures, and the procedures for managing the ride leaders and riders and promoting the rides.

Graham said that we needed to reissue a statement to remind people where we are at and why, e.g. on the lack of finance for glossy printed brochures, This would help us to get useful detailed feedback rather than just a repeat of complaints made before, e.g. why were the brochures dropped.

Graham also said that it would be useful to get more information on why some past leaders have dropped out, In doing this we should recognise that some people dropped out from being leaders for a couple of years but then came back.

It was agreed that the presentation could include some good examples of ride description summaries.

There was then some discussion of timing for the event and it was agreed to allow some time for people working to get there, especially if coming from more distant areas of the county. We should start with tea and coffee to welcome people at 6pm and then start the main bit of the meeting (presentation and discussion) at 6.30pm, lasting about an hour and a maximum of 1 ½ hours before leaving the rest of the time for informal discussion and networking.

There were 71 ride leaders now on the Contact Management System and all would be invited.

Hugh suggested that, if funding permitted and if there were spare spaces (e.g. if not all ride leaders could attend) we should have a reserve list of other people to invite, including Phil Keynes (still at Notts CC and possibly in touch with former County Council countryside rangers who had apparently not continued their involvement since leaving the County Council) and also some former County Council officers such as Steve Jones and Steve Calvert who had been associated with the former programme. **It was agreed that we should all draw up a list of suggestions for this reserve list, for discussion at our next meeting and then to draw on if we found we did have some 'spare capacity'.**

#### **Progress Report:**

Helen said that we had a very good turnout in August with 124 participants on 12 rides and that the total number of participants had now reached 642, i.e. 42 more than our target of 600. At the same time there were many rides still to take place in September, October and November so our final total should greatly exceed the target.

Helen also presented her findings on Rural Riders' Information sources, based on a survey of 102 riders on 4 well-attended rides.

Between May-September 39.7% of riders said 'word of mouth', compared with 19.1% website and 14.7% email. 14.7% cited the leaflets. Excluding word of mouth the percentage of riders citing e-comms was now 68%, Helen emphasised.

Gary said that it was important to keep repeating or renewing basic information as the information though distributed to some people often did not get through to others, e.g. in the same bike shops. Still many people it seemed had the idea that the Rides programme had stopped last year. We needed therefore to make sure we had some follow-up information, e.g. printed leaflets to bike shops as well as volunteers to keep calling in and encouraging their interest and support. In doing this we should also, Gary said, use leaflet distribution channels such as that run by Laraine at the City Council.

### **Budget and spending**

Helen presented the latest figures for budget and spending. The figure for salary spending in September (£728) covered expected spending to the end of the month, and in relation to the budget salary spend of £650 per month. However, we were still well within the total budget allocated for salary of £6370 (£4426 spent). Total spending so far was £7501 as against £9730 budgeted. There had been a slight overspend on subsistence.

Peter reminded the meeting that the way to allow some spending flexibility was through modifying the allocation for the total number of hours worked by Helen. In this way we could allow for the cost of spending on the Christmas event and the summary of achievements publication to be prepared in association with it. **At the next meeting therefore, once we had a clearer idea of these other likely costs, we could finalise a decision on the number of hours still to be worked by Helen, which would probably mean reducing the total from 70 to about 60 to 65 hours.**

**Helen agreed asap to get quotes from the Crocus café for the cost of the refreshments for the Christmas event.**

It was agreed that we would need only a limited number of copies of the c8 page Project Evaluation glossy report summary, to be printed on good quality paper and with an eye to encouraging possible wider stakeholder funding support but that we should not need to make any special allocation for this.

So far, Peter said, we had paid out a total of £7000 for Helen's work, including the cheque for £1000 which he and Hugh had handed over today to Ridewise.

### **Future funding prospects**

Gary reported on his recent meetings with Richard Bacon at NCVS to explore potential funding sources, related to different funding themes. It was clear that there was no chance of getting further funding from the Awards for All scheme, even though we would be able to show in the Final Report that we had met our targets.

Richard had suggested to Gary that we should think about some longer-term funding source, e.g. getting funding of about £50,000 for 3-4 years. **Both Pedals and Ridewise would now need to think very carefully about this and, if ready to go ahead, should be prepared to start the process asap.** With the Awards for All funding bid we had started the process in late November but not had final confirmation of the grant and that Helen could start work until well into May. This had been long enough but we had also to realise that for a larger sum the total bid time period would be longer.

Gary also said that he estimated the total RRFA set-up and running costs for Ridewise had been about £6500 in the first year (of which £1000 was for set-up costs) and that it would need about £6250 p.a. to keep the programme going even on a simple basis, and without the extra funding boost that we had this year from Awards for All for Helen's work.

Peter said that he had doubts about whether or not we had enough evidence to support a stronger bid, in relation to the number of potential beneficiaries for the amount being sought. Against that we could point to our successful experience from this year's funding support in terms of building organisational capacity and generating useful contacts and information for use in possible future Rides programme development.

**It was agreed that it was now very important for Pedals to take a definite decision asap on whether or not to proceed with a new funding bid, going beyond the somewhat lukewarm response there had been when Peter and Hugh raised this issue in a brief discussion at the most recent monthly meeting (19 September).**

### **Date of Next meeting**

Tuesday 1 November at 10.00 at the Lenton Centre

## **5. Report on (other) recent meetings by people who have attended on behalf of Pedals.**

## **Greater Nottm Cycling Development Group, 30 September:**

Hugh McClintock and Peter Briggs to report, with reference to these notes from the CDG Chair, Gary Smerdon-White

### **Notes 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011 at Loxley House**

#### **1. Introductions and Apologies**

In attendance – Peter Briggs, Pedals; Chris Carter, City Council; John Cutler, CTC; Matt Easter, Sustrans; Paul Hillier, County Council; Adrian Juffs, RideWise; Hugh McClintock, Pedals; Keith Morgan, City Council; Gary Smerdon-White, GNTP & RideWise;

Apologies were given by Andrew Martin, Pedals; Arthur Williams, Pedals.

Note: Steve Brewer has now left the City Council and Gary has sent a message of thanks and best wishes to him.

It was confirmed that Francesca Gibson would attend for sports related items and Helen Ross might return to the CDG.

#### **2. LSTF Update**

Chris confirmed the City Council had formally accepted the offer of £4.9m on the Key Component bid and DfT had requested they do a business case for the £11m main bid. The economic benefits would have to be strengthened and CDG proposed a number of ideas whereby growth and employment could benefit from cycling investments.

The key component bid has a number of cycling initiatives such as continuation of Ucycle, community cycling schemes plus wider use of smartcards in cycling facilities including commuter cycle hire. Efforts are also being concentrated on a series of cycling events with a festival of cycling with schools programmes, carnival, GNBR and possibly an elite ride.

#### **3. Mapping Update**

Keith distributed the City Cycle map and although a reprint was not going to be for some time asked for any suggestions or errors on the maps or website information to be brought to his attention so he could update the City/Transport Direct data.

### **Consideration was to be given to improvements such as one-way streets, gradients and definitions of busy roads**

#### **4. Infrastructure Update**

- 4.1. Strategic Cycling Network – **it was agreed to include on the map**
  - A Cycle Path between Wilford Lane and Ruddington alongside tram developments and with a view to linking into a NCN route between Leicester and Nottingham
  - Cycle improvements from Bardills alongside the proposed tram lines.
- 4.2. Hub/Station Bike Compound – a meeting with the Hub team had concluded that more facilities would be provided on the south concourse, the milk dock would be extended after smartcard access had been installed and more of the area covered. There is a concern that the Milk dock is quite full, the stands in the porte cochere are being removed and the dock will be needed for Hub construction storage. It was confirmed that EMT would have to take responsibility for CCTV surveillance.
- 4.3. Clifton Corridor incl MMW and Collin St crossing improvements. It was confirmed this work is complete but an HA issue near Clifton Bridge is being followed up.
- 4.4. Highways Agency / AM Scott A52T capacity improvement proposals (Bramcote island - QMC island) – All CDG partners are proposing that HA should carry out a more collaborative and comprehensive study which looks at wider aspects of the strategic cycling network near the A52 in order to see if cyclists could have better alternative routes to the A52.
- 4.5. Shared use of the A52 Subway at Sharpill – Hugh confirmed work is moving forward albeit slowly.
- 4.6. Sustrans routes around Bennerley Viaduct – more Councils were getting interested in Sustrans proposals however the refurbishment of the viaduct itself would be a major cost barrier.
- 4.7. River Leen path upgrading works (funded via Growth Point) – work due to complete this summer is subject to hold-ups with EA.
- 4.8. Big Track work on Lenton Lane is complete and signing is to be carried out on the whole of the Big Track
- 4.9. Forest – the scheme to improve lighting and footpaths was explained and **Chris asked for any comments from CDG**. No date has been set to start the work.
- 4.10. Broxtowe Country Park – tracks for leisure and commuting purposes are planned for March 2012
- 4.11. Left Bank Flood Scheme to the east of the City – **Paul agreed to follow-up on the status of proposed cycle infrastructure improvements**

#### **5. Latest Bike Counts**

Keith presented the latest information based on manual counts at the bridges and an increasing number of automatic counters at other key points on the cycle network. The information was scrutinised by Sustrans. Year to date 2011 against 2010 showed a 6.6% increase overall. There was only one place where numbers were down and this would be investigated. However the results were most encouraging and at last were backing up CDG's subjective judgement that more cyclists are on the road.

#### **6. Ride Programme Updates**

- 6.1. Rural Rides – numbers of rides, ride leaders and participants had met all targets already this year. Funding for next year now needed to be considered.
- 6.2. CfH Community and Broxtowe Rides – all are going to plan

## 7. Discussions and Consultations

- 7.1. Cycling Action Plan – **Keith had done a review of performance and would share the draft with us. He is now working on a plan based on best practice elsewhere, past performance and input from CDG and Cycle Forum – a draft plan would be presented at the next CDG**
- 7.2. Obstruction Safety and enforcement – Lenton Lane Car Parking. It was agreed it was an issue and that greater enforcement was needed. **Pedals would pull evidence together of illegal parking, obstruction and dangerous driving.** Once the evidence was available we would prompt action from either the community police teams or the Nottingham Constabulary. Peter suggested prohibition of parking between 12 noon and 1pm was a good deterrent to parking.
- 7.3. ASL abuse and bus drivers, with particular reference to Premier Buses – **Pedals would continue lobbying with Premier**
- 7.4. Notts. Police 'Think Bike - Give cyclists' space campaign' the campaign is pleasing but once again **CDG want to have more police involvement at CDG.**
- 7.5. EMT cycling survey and follow-up - **CDG would be pleased to have more EMT involvement at CDG.**
- 7.6. Cyclists' Notice boards – Although it had been proposed that there be a notice board at Wilford Bridge there was no evidence from counts that it was the best place for a board. It was agreed **RideWise would hold the key to the Milk dock board and would leave a message on it that potential posters of info should contact RideWise.** However we do need to **ensure CDG members start encouraging more cycling activity from the Milk dock** e.g. Rural rides starting there. **Gary agreed to get a virtual notice board set up on the RideWise website.**
- 7.7. Wigman Road Haddon Hall highway changes. **Chris agreed that the development on the scheme had not gone through a sensible process, that the changes appeared unsafe and would look into the issues affecting cyclist.**

## 8. Matters outstanding from previous meetings

- 8.1. 'Drive Safe, Cycle Safe' CTC-AA-RAC- IAM' advice brochure - **Gary SW**
- 8.2. Riding on Pavements - Spots improvements could cyclists' safety - **Keith**
  - Sherwood Shops (a Mansfield Street alternative was mentioned)
  - Junction of Woodborough Road and Huntingdon St.
  - London Road outside emda – City are considering possibilities
- 8.3. On-street signage on main cross city cycle routes - **Chris.**
- 8.4. Musters Road would be audited in the new year and on-pavement cycling would be counted at that time - **Paul**

## 9. AOB

Hugh provided information about cycle storage in flats.

**Matt offered to give a presentation of the UCycle Review report at the next meeting.**

## 10. Date of Next Meeting

22<sup>nd</sup> November – **Keith to book room and give us the time.**

## Appendix 1 - Strategic Cycling Network

The following additions are needed

- NCN 6 re-aligned from Long Eaton to the Trent/Big Track then a parallel route with Queens Road through Beeston to Broadgate for commuters
- The map proved very useful as it helped identify
  - Problems in providing a north east orbital through hilly parts of Mapperley Gedling
  - Gap between Stapleford and NCN67 (**which Keith is working with Steve Foster at Broxtowe BC**)
  - Gap between West Bridgford into some parts of rural area to the south and east
  - Gap in Carlton radial

Funding will be a major concern.

**Further Workshops and CDG discussions were needed to**

- **See how City and County investment programmes can deliver it and how funding partners might help**
- **Develop ideas about strategic signage along key radials and orbitals**
- **develop ideas further around NCN numbering**

**Comments on matters discussed at the 30 Sept CDG meeting:**

**.....comments on these notes from Julian Bentley (4 Oct): proposed cyclists' notice boards**

Thanks for these notes. I see from the notes that there 'is no evidence from counts that Wilford Bridge would be good place for (a notice board)'

I'd still like to continue campaign on this issue:

(a) Because I firmly believe in the likelihood that such boards will deliver good publicity/campaign benefits for a low cost

(b) the count mentioned in the report was done ( I saw it taking place in August) *only* on Main Road, Wilford (i.e. North-South traffic) - **was there another count done on Riverside Way/Victoria Embankment?**

If not then the East-West cycle traffic was missed out in the figures for this count, and this may have accounted for the same (or more) as the Main Road count.

(A well-placed board in this area would be visible/accessible to both the North-South and East-West Cycle/Pedestrian traffic in this location).

Julian Bentley

**.....and my response to Julian (4 Oct):"**

Thanks for your comments. Let us discuss this further at the next Pedals meeting, on Monday 17th.

As I understand it no cycle counts were done on Riverside Way / Victoria Embankment but they were on both Wilford toll bridge and the Suspension Bridge.

Keith Morgan may also perhaps wish to comment  
best wishes, ugh

**.....notice board / Cyclists totem pole proposals; further message from Julian Bentley (6 Oct):**

"Hi Hugh

Yes I'd like to keep campaigning on this issue as I'm convinced that this sort of low cost Cycling infrastructure would provide benefits for local/visiting cyclists and if done properly/well designed could be something for the City Council to trumpet/show off its green/Tourist friendly credentials (lots of cash has been spent on those stainless steel tourist info car/bus info points in Nottingham- why not something for cyclists/walkers?)

Both Manchester and Leeds have been successfully bidding/spending significantly on Cycling infrastructure recently (7 Cycle 'centres' in Manchester, the 'Cyclepoint' in Leeds).

Note that, in the absence of a better term (suggestions?) and *to avoid the boring/dull/stultifying connotations of the phrase 'notice board'* I am going to call this item a **Cycle Totem Pole** - as Totem poles do/did depict notable events amongst their representations.

Julian"

**...and my response to Julian (6 Oct):**

"Julian

Thanks for your further comments on this idea, which we can also discuss at the next Pedals meeting, on Monday week.

When we discussed this item at the recent CDG meeting I did suggest that we begin by making better use of the existing notice boards in the Station Bike Compound and then, in the light of that, discuss the potential for further sign boards or 'totem poles' as you now suggest. Another consideration in doing this, besides the likely number of cyclists passing different locations, is the likely vulnerability of different locations to vandalism, etc.

Hugh

**.....response from Julian of 7 Oct:**

"Hi Hugh

Yes I agree with you - better use of the current board should be made, will talk to you about this at the Pedals meeting. Yes, vandalism is an issue - but good design and location could minimise this (e.g. at Wilford Toll bridge anti social behaviour dropped since the camera was put in). More thought has led me to believe that "**Bike Beacon**" or "Cycle Beacon" would a better term than 'Notice board' or 'Totem pole'

Julian"

**.....comments of Julian Bentley (6 Oct) re Sharp Hill subway under the A52T south of West Bridgford:**

"The Sharpill underpass is still blocked as of 3rd October - I think we need to keep the pressure up on this one, it'll soon be a year since the site visit we had..."

**....and my response to Julian re keeping up the pressure re the Sharp Hill subway (6 Oct):**

On your points about Sharp Hill subway I agree that we should keep up the pressure if there is no further change in the 2next few weeks. One of the many complications in this case is that the next steps is primarily a matter for Jane Baines of the County Rights of Way Section, a section that in the last few months has suffered disproportionately from the County Council cutbacks, making it all the harder for those who remain to keep on top of all their work and continue with all the various things they were previously engaged with!

**Reports on other recent meetings:**

**Cyclenation-CTC national campaigners' conference in Sheffield on Sat. 15 Oct -**

Theme: "**Cycle Campaigning and Localism – Threats and Opportunities**"

Andrew Martin, Hugh McClintock, Peter Briggs and Roland Backhouse to report.

**Programme - Morning**

9.30 to 10.30 Registration and Refreshments

10.30 to 12.15 **Commencement of Conference**

Welcome & Housekeeping

Phillip Darnton (Bicycle Association) - Chair

Matt Brunt (Assistant Director - Passenger Transport Executive Support Unit)

Jason Torrance (Sustrans)

Roger Geffen (CTC)

Simon Geller/Andre Curtis (Cyclenation)

12.15 **Workshop Introductions/Headlines**

Simon Nuttall (Cyclestreets)

Jim Chisholm (Cambridge)

Rod King (20s plenty)

12.30 **Workshop signup & Lunch.** Including Stalls and Poster exhibitions

Programme – Afternoon

13.25 **Workshop Announcements**

13.30 to 14.20 **Workshop Stream 1 Facilitator**

A. Collaboration Simon Geller, Roger Geffen

B. Bristol - Cycle City Steve Kinsella, Martin Twedell

C. Support for Groups Jim Chisholm (Cambridge)

D. Cyclestreets Simon Nuttall (Cyclestreets)

14.30 to 15.20 **Workshop Stream 2 Facilitator**

A. 20s Plenty Q & A Rod King (20s Plenty for Us)

B. Media & Image Projection Victoria Hazael, Andre Curtis (CTC/Cyclenation)

C. Running a dispersed group. Stephen Fawkes, (East Kent Spokes)

D. Cyclestreets (repeat of stream 1) Simon Nuttall (Cyclestreets)

15.30 to 15.45 **Tea break**

15.45 to 16.15 **Access & Mobility Professor Danny Dorling -University of Sheffield**

16.15 to 17.00 **Panel**

17.00 **Conference ends**

## **6. Finance and Membership (Chris Gardner and Pete Elderton to report)**

We need a good discussion about the reasons for the recent low rate of membership and subs renewals, and ways in we might improve matters.

Among the possible causes of this we may wish to discuss are:-

- the recession and the lack of money even by people who do have jobs
- lack of any awareness of Pedals and what we do
- disillusionment with what Pedals has done, e.g. how many people share Dave Clark's view that "we have not really done any campaigning for about 20 years", or possible views that our campaigns have been the wrong ones and/or poorly targeted and implemented.
- a failure to have a high enough profile at a range of local events, to help attract new members
- an impression from our website that we are not really active and of a lack of clear information on our current campaign and main areas of interest
- a perception that we do not do enough to reflect / cater for the interests of cyclists from all part of Greater Nottingham and of different types of cyclist, keen and less keen, experienced and less experienced, younger and older, male and female.
- a collective failure to do enough to remind people that their subs is due, i.e. following up people personally face to face and by phone rather than just relying on emails and letters from the Membership Secretary.

- a failure to enough to use our personal contacts to get new members to join
- a failure to make the most of new technologies such as Facebook and Twitter.
- Too much dependence in our communications on the website and email and appearing to forget that many people still do not have access to these new technologies and prefer the printed word (aggravated by us now sending members only 2 newsletters per year and not 3).

How far are of these true and what do we need to do to improve things?

## 7. Forthcoming events / meetings

### **Invitation to East Midlands Trains Stakeholder Conference – Friday 4 November – message of 7 Oct from Emma Knight, Senior Group Communications Manager**

I would like to invite you to the next East Midlands Trains Stakeholder Conference which will take place in Derby on Friday 4 November.

The conference will provide you with a chance to hear the latest news from across our business, including updates on our investment programme and plans for the future. It will also include an update from David Horne, who will be taking over as Managing Director of East Midlands Trains later this month. This follows the announcement earlier this week that Tim Shoveller will be leaving East Midlands Trains to take up the position of Managing Director at our sister company, South West Trains.

The conference will take place from 10.00 until 13.00 at our Academy, which is located on Hudson Way, Pride Park, Derby. Tea and coffee will be provided from 09.30.

I do hope that either yourself, or a nominated representative from your organisation will be able to join us on 4 November.

Please confirm your attendance by emailing [liz.haynes@eastmidlandstrains.co.uk](mailto:liz.haynes@eastmidlandstrains.co.uk) by Monday 31 October. We will be providing complimentary travel on East Midlands Trains services to the conference. If you would like a complimentary ticket, please state this in your RSVP, along with your departure station. A limited amount of car parking will be available.

If you have any questions or need further information on the conference, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Many thanks  
 Emma Knight  
 Senior Group Communications Manager  
 Tel 07771 830995  
 e mail [emma.knight@stagecoachgroup.com](mailto:emma.knight@stagecoachgroup.com)

### **...comments of 11 Oct from Peter Briggs in accepting the invitation from Liz Haynes of EMT to attend on behalf of Pedals:**

"I found last year's conference interesting, informative and pleasantly informal. However there were two issues I raised last year for which I was promised a response. Despite repeat reminders to EMT I have not received one.

- 1) Signing each coach externally so that there is a pointer arrow and symbol to the cycle and disabled entrances. Given the different configurations of the trains I am sure you would get away from the platform more quickly it disabled/cyclists could see as the train slows down into the station the train entrance they need to be walking towards.
- 2) Ability to book a cycle space when making an internet booking.

Would much appreciate it if you could have a further think about these issues before the meeting?

Many thanks, Peter Briggs

**PS.** I have suggested to Peter that he also tries to find out what happened to their Cycling Survey earlier this year, what the results were and what actions they propose in the light of these!

### **Proposed Pedals display in the Victoria Centre one weekend in November**

Andrew Martin to update on this.

**Nottingham City Council's new Local Plan - Colleagues and Partners Workshop, Nottingham Conference Centre, Burton Street, NG1 4BU, in the Adams Room from 9.15am until 12.30pm., Thursday 17 November 2011, invitation of 10 Oct from Kate Perrey, City Council:**

"Dear colleague, councillor or partner,

### **Colleagues and Partners Workshop**

Nottingham City Council are developing a new Local Plan, known as the 'Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document', which will set out 'allocations' for development sites and a range of policies which consider particular planning issues and will be used to decide planning applications. The Local Plan is likely to have implications for many of the City Council's and our Partner's services, such as housing (size, type, and mix of tenure), education (locations for new facilities, approach to developer contributions), open spaces (developer contributions, open space network, natural environment policies), property (disposals, land uses), economic development (site allocations, approach to developer contributions for training and employment), it will also be highly relevant to the City's neighbourhoods.

The first stage in this process is the production of an "Issues and Options" document, which sets out the challenges facing Nottingham today, together with the ways in which they can be met. The consultation on this document started on 26 September and will run until 21 November, and can be found at <http://nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan>.

On **Thursday 17 November**, the Planning Policy team would like to invite you or a representative to a "**Colleagues and Partners Workshop**" to discuss the contents of the Issues and Options paper, and to help frame a new range of policies. This will be held at the **Nottingham Conference Centre, Burton Street, NG1 4BU**, in the **Adams Room** from **9.15am** until **12.30pm**.

If you intend on coming, please respond to **Kate Perrey, Tel: (0115) 876 3964**.

**Email:** [kate.perrey@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:kate.perrey@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

An agenda, together with further details of the morning, will be circulated prior to the event.

Regards

Kate Perrey

Planning Officer

Policy & Research Team

Planning and Transport Strategy

Development Department

Nottingham City Council

Loxley House

Station Street

Nottingham

NG2 3NG

t: (0115) 876 3964

e: [kate.perrey@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:kate.perrey@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

Who is interested in attending please?

In our response we need to ensure that we include a reference both to the Pedals Strategic Vision, revised in 2009 (and on our website at [http://www.pedals.org.uk/pedals\\_plan](http://www.pedals.org.uk/pedals_plan) and also to the Pedals comprehensive detailed wish list for Nottingham submitted in April 2010)

### **Monday 21 November Pedals meeting**

Andrew Martin has invited Brendan from the Sneinton Bikers (with no response, when I last heard)

If this is not possible, other ideas are to invite

a) Gary Smerdon-White to talk about the successful Ridewise bid for 'Transition' funding and how Pedals could support this.

b) Heidi Duffy from Notts. Police (and the Notts. Road Safety Partnership) to talk about their recently launched 'Think Bike' campaign including the 'Think Bike – Give Cyclists' Space' car stickers.

**Tuesday 6 December (6pm): Rural Ride Leaders, Celebration evening (invitation of 10 October from Helen McCullen to all Rural Ride leaders;** subject to space being available the event is also open to people interested in becoming ride leaders)

"We are nearing the end of our first year of independent operation. We have had over 700 people out on Rural Rides and trained 15 new leaders, with even more on the current waiting list. There are many positive things to celebrate and some learning points to incorporate into next year's plan.

We would like to invite you to celebrate with us, and give you the opportunity to provide some feedback. We will be holding an event

**at:** The Lenton Centre, Willoughby St., Lenton, Nottingham, Postcode  
**on:** Tuesday 6th December 2011  
**from:** 6:00-6:30 - coffee/tea  
6:30-7:30 - Presentation/awards/feedback  
7:30 onwards - Hot food"

**Monday 19 December: Pedals Christmas Social evening**

What do we want to do for this this year? Just drinking, snacks and chatting as last year (and no quiz or slide show etc.)?

**Sat. 11 February: East Midlands Cyclists Forum meeting in Derby**

Sat. 11 Feb is the new date for the next EMCF meeting, postponed from 8 Oct, to be hosted by the Derby Cycling Group.

**Date for 2012 AGM next March**

Update from Andrew Martin in progress with fixing a date for this, to go in the Autumn newsletter about to go to press.

**8. Increase in local bike thefts – Pedals response, following the 26 Sept Subject: Nottm Post story re increase in cycle thefts in Nottm**

The Nottm Post of 26 Sept had a story about the recent sharp increase in cycle thefts in Nottingham which various people have commented to me on in recent weeks:

<http://www.thisisnottingham.co.uk/Tackling-rise-city-bike-thefts/story-13405063-detail/story.html>

How we should respond to this, including helping to publicise better the Police contact number for reporting cycle thefts and any other relevant information. Larry Neylon, our Webmaster, has now featured this prominently on the home page.

**Cycle facility and traffic management matters:**

**Consultation Events for Nottingham Local Plan – message of 4 Oct from Andrew Martin to Pedals committee and my response:**

I recently picked up a copy of the leaflet on Public Consultation Events for the Nottingham Local Plan, with particular interest in the issues relating to cycling. I propose that a number of us attend (individually or in pairs) whenever possible, to better inform a brief discussion at the next Pedals meeting on Monday 17/10. I intend visiting either Bulwell on Wednesday 12/10 or Hyson Green on Monday 16/10. Two further events are on Tuesday 18th and Wednesday 19th. Consultation is open until 21/11.

See <http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=15859>

and <http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=721>

Peace and pedals, Andrew

**....and my response:**

"Andrew

Thanks for this. I agree that it is important that Pedals responds to this consultation (with particular reference to our comprehensive wish list for Nottingham submitted to the City Council in April last year as well as our 'Strategic Vision', as revised in 2009.

I will certainly try to get to one of the consultation events, probably the one in Clifton on Tuesday 18th (or possibly the one at the Central Library on Wed 19th).

We should also discuss this at our next meeting, on Monday 17th.  
Hugh"

**....info on this from the City Council website and including the programme of consultation events:**

**Have your say on the Local Plan**

Residents, business groups and businesses in Nottingham City are being asked for their views on how and where development should take place within the City.

The City Council is looking for views and opinions, now, before drafting policies or deciding on sites at the first stage of preparing a new [Local Plan](#) for the City.

The plan aims to make sure any new development meets the needs of Nottingham's citizens while protecting what is best about the city. The consultation will suggest potential new development sites to provide as many citizens as possible with local job opportunities, appropriate housing and retail areas.

The new [Local Plan](#) will help boost Nottingham's economy by providing new land and protecting existing sites for new developments that will result in local jobs for local people. It will also aim to ensure that enough shopping and other town centre development is considered for right locations and that 'vitality and viability' of existing centres is protected, while providing for and protecting the role and economic growth of the city centre.

The plan will also consider how to provide sufficient housing to meet the requirements of Nottingham's increasing population. Studies show that at least 970 new homes a year are required. To deliver housing on this scale, appropriate land needs to be identified, as well as providing the right mix of housing, with a particular emphasis on new family housing and homes for the elderly and students.

The council will want views on what uses will be most appropriate for several larger areas within Nottingham that are important for the regeneration of the city, such as the important Waterside, Eastside and Southside Regeneration Zones, but also areas such as the Meadows and Radford where Neighbourhood Plans have already been drawn up.

Views will also be sought on how to ensure that Nottingham's future buildings are of a high quality, how to protect our historic assets while ensuring new development complements what is already good about the city and how to ensure that new development does not have an adverse impact on existing or future occupiers.

Community facilities including open spaces, parks and allotments will be considered and will be protected wherever possible. Any development affecting open spaces will need to be fully justified and bring wider benefit to the area, as they can help keep people fit and healthy and they provide important wildlife habitats for animals and plants.

The plan will also take sustainability issues into account - looking at how to build on the renewable energy and heat supplies which Nottingham is well served by and reduce carbon emissions by making any new development as sustainable as possible. It will also look at how sensible planning can help to encourage better use of public transport such as the new tram lines, while recognising the need for the right level of parking for various types of new development.

Councillor Jane Urquhart, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport said: "We are committed to engaging and debating before things are set in stone, and giving the public, as well as the development community, an opportunity to take part in this open conversation at an early stage".

Following this consultation, the Council will use the information to prepare a full draft of the [Local Plan](#), known as a 'preferred option,' which will be published for further consultation next summer.

The following drop-in events are being held where officers from the City Council will be available to discuss the initial proposals:

**Wednesday 12 October from 2pm until 6pm:**

[Bulwell Library](#), Highbury Road, Bulwell, Nottingham NG6 9AE

**Monday 17th October from 2pm until 7pm:**

[The Mary Potter Centre](#), Gregory Boulevard, Nottingham NG7 5HY

**Tuesday 18th October from 2pm until 7pm:**

[Clifton Cornerstone](#), Southchurch Drive, Clifton, Nottingham NG11 8EW

**Wednesday 19th October from 2pm until 7pm:**

[Nottingham Central Library \(1st floor\)](#), Angel Row, Nottingham NG1 6HP

Residents can take part in the consultation by:

- Attending one of the above events

- Visiting the Local Plan website at [www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan)
- Writing to the Planning Policy team at Loxley House, Station Street, NG2 3BS
- Phoning the Planning Policy team on 0115 876 3974
- Email the Planning Policy team on [ldf@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

**Improving the signing and marking of the contraflow cycling arrangements on Warser Gate between Stoney Street and the top of St. Mary's Gate**

Neil Harby from the City Council rang on 7 Oct to say that he is still investigating what best to do about this issue, which I discussed with him on site earlier last year.

He is also still investigating another issue nearby which we discussed then, i.e. having a cycle route sign to encourage cyclists to enter the Lace Market area from Belward Street (near the Ice Stadium) via the bottom of Woolpack Lane.

**Cycling Tragedy in Carlton – message of 30 Sept from Arthur Williams to Andy Whittaker, BBC Radio Nottingham, and comments from Gary Smerdon-White:**

"Dear Andy,  
Earlier this week I made a detour on my cycle to work because my son had left his lunch box at home. I passed by the floral tributes on Forester Grove in Carlton where young Daniel was tragically knocked off his bike. My two children go to the same school that Daniel used to attend.

As a cyclist it doesn't make me want to leave my bike at home, but I'm taking extra care. As one who also drives a car, it reminds me that at 30 mph I am in charge of a dangerous machine, potentially lethal to a pedestrian or cyclist that makes a split-second not-so-good decision. It raises the issue of what is a reasonable speed to drive on a residential road. I live less than a mile away on a parallel road to Forester Grove. It

sends shivers down my spine when I hear cars accelerate over the traffic calming strips outside my house to get up to 30 mph before the end of the road. With cars parked on either side there is very little room for split-second decisions!

Pedals, the Nottingham cycle group of which I am a member, is a strong supporter of the 20's plenty campaign ( [www.20splentyforus.org.uk/](http://www.20splentyforus.org.uk/) ) to get drivers to slow down on residential roads. This could help to avoid similar tragedies in the future.

A big thanks for to Mark Dennison for the really good piece about cycle paths on yesterday's show!  
Keep up the good work!  
Arthur

**...my comments in forwarding this to Gary S-W:**

Gary  
Had you heard about this tragic accident in Carlton a week or so ago, followed, very unfortunately by another cyclist being killed in Hucknall, a few days later?  
Hugh  
"

**...and comments from Gary S-W (1 Oct) in response to mine in forwarding the message to him:**

"Yes I did indeed it is very worrying but now is the time to put pressure on Councils locally for 20mph zones  
Gary

**consultations with Pedals re detailed NET extension alignments ; response of 13 Oct from Chris Carter to my message to him of 9 October:**

Chris  
At the last Cycling Development Group meeting on 30th September I recall that you asked me, as an aside to some other discussion we were having, whether or not there had been any recent discussions with Pedals about the latest detailed alignment plans for the NET extension. I think I briefly replied that there had not been for some time but thought afterwards that perhaps I should now follow this up. The last detailed consultation I recall was about 1-2 years ago, by Mitch ?, regarding a few issues on two sections of the routes but otherwise nothing since before the public inquiry nearly 4 years ago.

If you think it would be a good idea to discuss these plans afresh we would indeed welcome an opportunity to do that.  
Who should I now contact?  
best wishes, Hugh

....response from Chris Carter:

"Hugh

Just to let you know I have raised this with the NET Team

The formal Highway Design approvals process is still being finalised including how groups such as Pedals can be utilised to add their input.

Will let you know when they come back to me.

Chris

**Chris Carter | Transport Strategy Manager |**

Development | Nottingham City Council |

4th Floor | Loxley House | Station Street | Nottingham | NG2 3NG

T: 0115 876 3940 | E: [chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

**29 Sept BBC Radio Nottingham interview with Hugh McClintock and Mark Dennison re poor maintenance of cycle paths, with particular reference to the A52 shared path between West Bridgford Radcliffe on Trent and Bingham, etc and response (with offer of help) from Mark Dennison, Radio Nottm presenter in response to my message to Jeremy Dixon of A-One Plus, Managing Agents Consultancy for the Highways Agency for their Area 7 (i.e. Notts Trunk Roads)**

**From:** Hugh McClintock (Dell) [mailto:[Hugh.McClintock@ntlworld.com](mailto:Hugh.McClintock@ntlworld.com)]

**Sent:** 29 September 2011 20:12

**To:** Jeremy Dixon

**Cc:** Gary Smerdon-White; Michael Bedford; Peter Osborne; Nicola Jones; Paul Hillier; Clive Wood; Mark Dennison

**Subject:** maintenance of A52T cycle path between West Bridgford and Radcliffe on Trent etc - need for urgent repairs!

Jeremy

Early this morning I was invited by BBC Radio Nottingham's Morning Show to do a live interview from a point on the A52T cycle path near the turn to Shelford (between Radcliffe and Bingham) to discuss the need for improved maintenance of cycle paths but with particular reference to the now very poor condition of much of the cycle path by the A52T, especially between Radcliffe and Gamston. We were joined by one their presenters, Mark Dennison, who lives in the Vale of Belvoir and who uses this route to cycle in most days to the BBC, I gather.

The decision to feature this topic, and this cycle path in particular, arose in part from a discussion about cycling on Mark's programme several weeks ago which I know included a lot of phone calls from people ringing in to complain about poor maintenance of cycle facilities in general, to which Mark added some comments from his own experience about this cycle path.

We are well aware from discussions at recent Pedals meetings that poor maintenance has become an issue of increasing concern and indeed I recall that this also featured prominently in the discussions at the GNTP Cycle Forum held at the Council House back in June. We are therefore trying to give the issue more of a profile with the local authorities and have recently altered our website to make more prominent the relevant contact details to report such complaints.

Riding to the interview this morning gave me a fresh chance to see for myself the latest deterioration on the A52T cycle path, which I use fairly infrequently, and these fresh impressions very much bear out Mark's comments on the programme today. The gist of these was not only that poor maintenance makes the path often quite difficult to use, e.g. because of badly intruding vegetation, and especially when there is anyone (on foot or on a bike) coming the other way but that also several bits are now quite dangerous. This is because of the recent growth of a series of longitudinal cracks in the path, some of which are now big enough for a narrow bike tyre to get trapped in. If these are not soon repaired the situation will of course soon become all the more dangerous once winter frost and ice intrude and widen the cracks. There are several other places where the surface has become quite rough and patchy and there are also uneven kerb crossings, e.g. near the Pig Farm towards the Gamston roundabout.

We do of course appreciate that the major funding cuts affecting the Highways Agency as well as local highway authorities make it much harder to ensure that cycle paths and shared paths as well as roads themselves are properly maintained but do feel in this case the situation is now so serious that it needs a comprehensive inspection and programme of repair to ensure that the path are again both safe and attractive to use. I am sure that Mark as a regular user will be only too pleased to give you more details of the sections in most need of attention and therefore would ask that you and your colleagues give this urgent attention please.

When the new cycle facilities near Bingham on the new A46T scheme (forming part of Sustrans NCN Route 15, like the existing shared path east of Radcliffe) are complete there will be new interest in the whole of this route from West Bridgford to Bingham etc, so the prospect of this extra appeal also makes it all the more important to improve the existing paths.

best wishes

Hugh

for Pedals

**....comments from Mark Dennison**

"Hi Hugh –

Thanks for the note and good to see you yesterday...

Just as a matter of interest, does Jeremy work for the council?

Is Notts CC responsible for the upkeep of the cycle path?

**Let's keep in touch about this and let me know if there's anything I can do to help your cause.**

Mark

**follow-up to removal of cycle lanes on Musters Road (West Bridgford) and changes to signs etc. – my message of 21 Sept to Paul Hillier, Notts. County Council:**

"Paul

I notice that a new black on yellow sign has been erected on the corner of Musters Road and Chaworth Road, on the southern approach to the junction of Musters Road and Melton Road, to make clearer to drivers which lane they should get into for their intended manoeuvres at the Melton Road junction. This may help a little to ensure that drivers get into and stay in the correct lane (despite the fact, rather oddly, that the double headed arrow on the sign for the left lane appears to show the northern part of Musters Road, veering half left rather than going straight on!).

However, despite this change, I am in no doubt that some drivers will continue to use the wrong lane if only, as I have noticed on several occasions again recently, that some of resent having to wait behind a cyclist at the lights when a cyclist waits in the middle of the lane to go ahead simply because there is no longer room for a motor vehicle to wait alongside a bike. They often then switch to the left hand lane before ziz-zagging back into the right lane, in front of the cyclist. Such impatient behaviour can be intimidating even for more confident and experienced cyclists but particularly for less confident and experienced cyclists who now feel much more tempted to ride on the pavement to avoid this dangerous layout, especially if they want to bear right towards Rectory Road and Tudor Square etc.

Anyway, the main point of my message is to ask if there has yet been any general evaluation of the impact of the changes to the layout of the Musters Road junctions with Melton Road and Rectory Road since their introduction in April.

When three of us from Pedals meet Cllr. Richard Jackson on site several weeks later, to explain the newly created problems in more detail, he did at least indicate that "we will keep the situation under review" or some such phrase. I was thinking of writing to him again in the light of this statement but that I thought that I would first check with you what you understand to be the current position, and with regarding to assessing the impact on overall road safety as well as that of cyclists and pedestrians in particular, and on the incidence of drivers suddenly switching lanes and the possible extra intimidation that that behaviour can cause, even when there are no vulnerable road users in the vicinity.

Several people have recently asked me what the latest position is about this and I thought that it was therefore high time to raise it again, especially given that it now more than 6 months since these very adverse changes were suddenly introduced.

best wishes, Hugh

**.....reply of 21 Sept from Paul Hillier:**

"Hi Hugh,

The sign isn't quite how I'd have liked it to be but we were restricted by what is allowed by the signing regs. Basically, what we've put up is the best we could do.

As for monitoring of the junction, we receive information regarding all reported accidents so the monitoring of the safety of the junction will be ongoing. It's far too early to determine whether or not the alterations are "safe". Only time will tell.

I don't believe there are plans to produce any form of formal monitoring report - we don't do so for other small-scale schemes.

Regards, Paul Hillier

Local Transport Plan Programme Manager

Nottinghamshire County Council

Tel: 0115 977 4866 Fax: 0115 977 4054

**....comments from Colin Gray (21 Sept):**

"Hugh

Yes this is a problem. I was cut up by a bus using the inside lane to get past me and if I had not braked I would have collided with the back of the bus, fairly close to the rear wheels.

Worse thing the bus then stopped 50m down the road at a bus stop and I had to wait to get past.

Colin

**....comments from David Nicholson-Cole (21 Sept):**

"Dear Hugh,

Mostly when I am using that junction, I am coming past your house and going down Musters, towards Forest.

But to me, a key point is that the speedy fast lane into Musters is dangerous as it removes the requirement from drivers to slow down or to use indicators if turning left (because the lane gives left turners priority). A firm white dotted line across the entrance to Musters Rd would make it clear that drivers should give way to bicycles continuing along Vicarage Rd, give way to peds crossing musters, and should both slow and indicate before making their turn. This would only cost an amount of paint, not 10,000 pounds worth of tarmac changes.

On one of the occasions when I continued onto Vicarage Rd, I got cut up (forced into the kerb) by one car full of lads at the first traffic light, and another car full of lads (or ladders) at the Musters Rd entrance. Two nasty experiences at the same junction.

===David

**Fw: Sharphill Walkers/Cyclists underpass (A52T) - request for an update please – my message of 21 Sept to Jane Baines and Paul Hillier, Notts CC:**

"Jane

Paul

In view of the message below from Julian Bentley I wonder if you could please give me an update on the latest situation with regard to the Sharp Hill subway under the A52T?

Thanks, Hugh

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Hugh McClintock \(Dell\)](mailto:Hugh.McClintock@ntlworld.com)

**To:** [Julian B](mailto:Julian.B@ntlworld.com)

**Cc:** [Richard Edwards](mailto:Richard.Edwards@ntlworld.com) ; [Pete Elderton](mailto:Pete.Elderton@ntlworld.com) ; [david.cavendish@ntlworld.com](mailto:david.cavendish@ntlworld.com) ; [eliz\\_wright@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:eliz_wright@hotmail.co.uk) ; [media@ruddingtonparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:media@ruddingtonparishcouncil.gov.uk) ; [brian.shaw2@ntlworld.com](mailto:brian.shaw2@ntlworld.com) ; [Karina Wells](mailto:Karina.Wells@ntlworld.com) ; [Cllr. Rod Jones](mailto:Cllr.Rod.Jones@ntlworld.com)

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 21, 2011 5:30 PM

**Subject:** Re: Sharphill Walkers/Cyclists underpass

Julian

Thanks for this message. I was intending soon to go and have a look for myself and see if there had been any recent changes.

Some months ago I gathered from Jane Baines at Notts CC that a small opening in the earthworks had been made to let people walk through and that this would a few weeks later then be enlarged at the same time as a barrier was put in to ensure that motor bikes were kept out.

The suggestion we made, to her and to Paul Hillier of the County Council, was that, once this was done, we would, taking it step by step, then see what use pedal cyclists were also making of the subway (which for now remains legally only a public footpath) while at the same time the County Council would see if they could find the funding, in cooperation with Jeremy Dixon of A-One Plus, the Managing Agents Consultancy for the Highways Agency (who are responsible for the A52 as a Trunk Road and therefore for the structure of the subway, though not the land underneath it, apparently!), for a study to assess just what legal and physical changes would be needed to make the subway available for cyclists also, and integrated with plans for the spine cycle/footway through the new Sharp Hill housing through to Boundary Road and the Green Line etc.

In view of your message I will now ask Jane and Paul for an update on the situation.

best wishes, Hugh

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Julian B](mailto:Julian.B@ntlworld.com)

**To:** [hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com](mailto:hugh.mcclintock@ntlworld.com)

**Cc:** [david.cavendish@ntlworld.com](mailto:david.cavendish@ntlworld.com) ; [eliz\\_wright@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:eliz_wright@hotmail.co.uk) ; [media@ruddingtonparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:media@ruddingtonparishcouncil.gov.uk) ; [brian.shaw2@ntlworld.com](mailto:brian.shaw2@ntlworld.com)

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 21, 2011 11:33 AM

**Subject:** Sharphill Walkers/Cyclists underpass

Hi Hugh

Today I was disappointed to see that the A52 underpass near Sharphill wood is *still largely blocked by earthworks* (that were scheduled to be removed some months ago?) and as a result it still not possible to cycle under the A52 from Landmere lane to Edwalton/W Bridford.

Is it worth chasing this up do you think?

I have copied in some local Cyclists and interested parties.

Julian

.....response of 23 Sept from Jane Baines, Notts CC:

"Hugh

This is progressing slowly with everything else that I have to deal with at the moment.

I chased up Mr Wells last week to clear the full subway so that I can determine where a suitable barrier will go. The HA will also need to inspect it to ensure that they are able to carry out their inspections in the future. I will then sort out a barrier and I think it will be something like the ones on the Grantham canal. If this route does become a full cycle route in the future then the barriers can be changed.

Jane  
Jane Baines  
Area Rights of Way Officer  
Countryside Access  
Transport Policy & Programmes  
Highways  
Environment & Resources  
Nottinghamshire County Council  
Tel 0115 977 4802  
Fax 0115 977 2414

.....and my response to Jane Baines (23 Sept):

"Jane

Thanks for your helpful reply. I can appreciate that you must have much else to deal with at the moment and therefore have limited time to help chase this more quickly. However, we hope that the matters of the clearance of the full subway and the exact location of the barrier can soon be sorted out, along with arrangements for Highways Agency inspection, even if only on a temporary basis initially. A design of barrier such as used on the Grantham canal towpath would at least be more acceptable than using the problematic A-frame barriers!

Please let me know when there are any further developments, even small-scale, which we hope very much will be relatively shortly.

best wishes  
Hugh  
for Pedals

**Beeston Square cycle parking plans update of 7 Oct from John Delaney, Broxtowe BC:**

"Hello Hugh

Sorry for the delay in replying. Here is the update:-

1. We are hoping to install 5 stands outside Specsavers in Beeston Square this month (or possibly next).
2. We are hoping to install 2/3 stands next month as part of the new Borough-operated Beeston railway station car park (this will be under the flyover so will be covered, CCTV'd and lit).
3. We are hoping to install additional covered cycle parking outside our council offices before March next year (budget allocation approved).
4. We are hoping to install cycle parking on the "Tesco jitty" between the High Road, Beeston and the new Tesco store at some point during my lifetime (should Tesco's ever respond to our enquiries!).

Best wishes, and trust that all is well with you and yours  
John"

**Norman Baker announces timetable for making 20mph limits easier – message of 21 Sept from Rod King of the Twenty's Plenty campaign to Cyclenation Forum:**

"In his speech at the Lib-Dem conference today, Norman Baker made specific reference to 20mph limits :-

"But we need to go further. And we are doing. I can today announce that when the House returns next month, I will be laying before Parliament a new Traffic Signs policy document. This will cut pointless form-filling by streamlining Traffic Regulation Orders, cutting time and saving money.

The Traffic Signs review will also end the need for Whitehall approval for special authorisations for a whole range of signs, so councils will for example be able to erect No Entry Except Cyclists signs without having to ask Whitehall first.

I am also making it easier for councils who want to introduce 20mph schemes.

They will, for example, henceforth be able to use painted roundels on the road surface rather than lamppost after lamppost of repeater signs. And the decluttering agenda will also be helped in many ways, particularly by significant changes to the requirements for parking signage."

The full speech can be found at <http://tinyurl.com/3two8rw>

Regards, Rod King

07973 639781, [Rod.k@20splentyforus.org.uk](mailto:Rod.k@20splentyforus.org.uk)

## Miscellaneous items

### Steve Brewer leaving Nottingham City Council

Steve Brewer, who has worked on cycling at both the City and County Councils during the last 20 years or so, left the City Council on 28 September as part of their cutbacks.

### Pedals Secretaryship and Pete Osborne's work commitments: message of 5 Oct from Peter, and comments from Andrew Martin:

Hi Andrew - I won't be able to attend the next two Pedals meetings. Is it possible to be a "virtual" Pedals secretary i.e. be the secretary without attending meetings regularly? Given my change in work situation it is proving rather difficult to have any meaningful presence at the monthly meetings.  
Peter

#### ....response from Andrew Martin:

"Hello Peter, and copied to Hugh  
I am sure your suggestion is fine and wonder if perhaps this is worth a brief discussion at our next meeting? Are you likely to continue as Secretary for the next 6-12 months?  
Andrew

#### ....further message from Peter Osborne (6 Oct):

"Andrew, Hugh - I can carry on indefinitely as a "virtual" secretary, but that may not be satisfactory from Pedals' perspective. If I can get to meetings I will  
Peter"

### Cycle campaign toolkit update: request for feedback from Martin Lucas-Smith of Cyclestreets (27 Sept):

"A quick update on the cycle campaign toolkit project. It's been an extremely busy few weeks on this!

Choice of name - what do you think?  
-----

CycleSpace  
CycleShift

which do you prefer? Let us know your thoughts (just reply to this e-mail)!  
We asked for ideas and we've come down to these two options. We plan to finalise this in the next day or two. The name needs to capture a sense of people coming together to make change, be cycling-specific, and convey a sense of improving the street/cycle network.

Meet our developer team!  
-----

I'm pleased to say that we've appointed a developer team and work is proceeding fast. We've also developed the spec further at a two-day developer meeting last week which kicked-off the work. Read more at: <http://www.cyclestreets.net/blog/2011/09/23/toolkit-developer-team/>

An open-source project  
-----

The code is being developed at <https://github.com/cyclestreets/toolkit>

We'll be looking for volunteers towards the end of October to join in, once much of the initial base of the system is in place.

Design  
-----

We're finalising a design brief and will be approaching designers very

soon. If you know of a really great designer or design company, preferably someone who might be willing to help out at perhaps a slightly discounted rate, please do let us have their details.

The development of the toolkit has been possible thanks to our GeoVation award, which secured us £27,000 of funding. GeoVation is an Ordnance Survey initiative and forms part of the Ideas in Transit project with funding from the Technology Strategy Board and the Department for Transport.

Martin,                   \*\* CycleStreets - For Cyclists, By Cyclists  
Developer, CycleStreets   \*\* <http://www.cyclestreets.net/>

CycleStreets has secured #27,000 of funding as a winner of Geovation □ GeoVation is an Ordnance Survey initiative and forms part of the Ideas in Transit project with funding from the Technology Strategy Board and the Department for Transport.

For subscription changes to this mailing list, contact us  
[info@cyclestreets.net](mailto:info@cyclestreets.net)

**Bike to Work scheme: improving standards and avoiding abuse – letter of 20 Sept from Roland Backhouse to Rt. Hon Kenneth Clarke, MP:**

"Dear Mr Clarke,  
I am writing to you in your capacity as MP for the constituency in which I live.

I am writing to you about the government's Cycle To Work scheme because I am concerned that recent changes in the taxation scheme are detrimental to the scheme, in particular to the safety of participants in the scheme, and will exacerbate yet further the abuse of the scheme by cycle manufacturers and suppliers. I have a selfish interest in ensuring that the scheme works well: I have been cycling regularly to school/university/work for more than 50 years and hope to continue to do so for many more, and I have myself made use of the scheme to purchase a bicycle. The only way that I can satisfy my selfish interests into my old age is to ensure that the density of cyclists in the country increases substantially.

My concern is that the bicycles being advertised under the Cycle To Work scheme are unfit for their stated purpose and, indeed, cannot be sold legally within the UK as advertised (because they are not fitted with the very minimal requirements of having a bell and front and rear reflectors). I have recently written to Mr Daniel Gillborn about the bicycles advertised by Cyclescheme Ltd (the company through which I bought a bicycle under the scheme) and he has effectively admitted that my concerns about the advertisements published by Cyclescheme are correct. However it is not just Cyclescheme Ltd that is engaging in the practice of advertising bicycles that are unfit for purpose. Evans Cycles advertises a bicycle under its Ride 2 Work scheme that does not have reflectors or bell, and does not have mudguards, chainguard or pannier rack. I have explained in detail my concerns to Mr Gillborn (who I am copying in to this email) but will not repeat them here. Suffice it to say that I believe the manufacturers are abusing the scheme to sell recreational bicycles to customers many of whom have no intention of using them to cycle to work. Those that do will endanger their own safety and contribute to an image of cycling that is restricted to the young and foolhardy.

The primary purpose of writing to you is because recent changes in the tax regime will undoubtedly only exacerbate the current situation. In the document EIM21667a <http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/manuals/eimanual/EIM21667a.htm>, HMRC details how cycles sold under the scheme will be valued after a number of years of use. Compared to when I bought a bicycle under the scheme, the new regime is very discouraging because it gives a much higher resale value to the bicycles and, therefore, a much reduced tax advantage. But much worse than that, the new regime specifically states that:

"In calculating the original price of the cycle, include safety equipment fitted to the cycle (such as lights and bells) but not safety

equipment which would be worn by the cyclist (such as helmets or reflective clothing)."

The point I want to make, and which I cannot over-emphasise, is that "safety equipment .. (such as lights and bells)" should be \*permanently\* fitted to cycles sold under the Cycle To Work scheme and not sold as they are now as clip-on extras. Would you sanction a change in the law that allowed cars to be sold with clip-on lights and a clip-on horn, and with a tax advantage for doing so and not fitting permanent lights and horn? That is in fact what HMRC is now doing in respect of cycles and, as I have said above, organisations like Cyclescheme Ltd and Evans Cycles are responding accordingly in an irresponsible fashion.

I would like to propose a change in the law comprising two elements. The first is to ensure much higher minimum safety standards for bicycles sold under the Cycle To Work scheme and the second is to replace the current tax disadvantage for maintaining such standards by a tax advantage. The elements are:

1. Bicycles sold under the scheme should as a minimum have a bell, front and rear lights (incorporating reflectors in the same way that car lights incorporate reflectors), and reflective tyres (as well as pedal reflectors) \*permanently\* fitted to the bicycle. By "should" I mean required by law at the point of sale.

(Note that these minimum requirements are standard on Dutch bicycles; my wife, son and I all own such bikes. This includes the bell which is integrated into the handlebar grips. It is, however, very difficult to purchase bicycles to this standard here in Nottingham. We bought our bicycles in York where the density of cycling is much higher.)

2. For valuation purposes, safety equipment that is \*permanently\* attached to the bicycle should be discounted: the valuation should be based on the bicycle "shell", i.e. the frame, handlebar, gears and wheels (minus tyres). Preventative safety equipment like pannier racks (as opposed to non-preventative safety equipment like helmets) and permanently attached cycle lock, mudguards and chainguard (the distinguishing attributes of a bicycle that is not solely for recreational use) should also be discounted from the valuation of the bicycle.

In the Netherlands (where I lived for 13 years) such safety standards are a matter of course. As a result, the bicycles in use are of a much higher standard than here in the UK. This has benefits for the less well-off, like students, who can easily obtain good quality second-hand bicycles. It also means that cycling is widespread among all age groups and all sections of the community.

I trust that you will give this email proper consideration and will represent my views to the appropriate authorities. I look forward to an early response.

Yours sincerely,  
Roland Backhouse  
17 Dovedale Road,  
West Bridgford  
NG2 6JB

....and comments on this from Chris Gardner (21 Sept)

"Cheers Hugh, most interesting.

Roland makes many good points and suggestions, good to see he has raised the issue of TAX because that's one reason why I opted out of my latest bike offer for fear of being hit hard after the purchase. I figured it was cheaper to look for a second hand one without the cyclescheme contract.

I still think however, that by enforcing the cycle to work scheme to sell bikes that have bell etc 'permanently fitted' is a non-starter. This will greatly diminish the freedom of choice and also likely mean less take-up of the scheme by potential cycle commuters.

All bikes of course have to be sold with the items that Roland mentions but not in a 'permanent way'. I can't see TREK, Specialized etc redesigning their bike handlebars to permanently incorporate a bell and a light for example.

To avoid confusion I think Roland is right but for various reasons in addition to the above and commercially I just can't see this flying. Chris"

**....further comments from Roland (21 Sept)**

"Hi Chris,  
I beg to disagree. Currently there is no freedom of choice: the manufacturers in the UK are selling clip-on lighting and it is almost impossible to buy bikes with permanent lighting. Worse than this, there appears to be a complete ignorance of what is available even among the so-called professionals. I'm attaching a photo of rear lights/reflectors that are standard on Dutch bikes; a few weeks ago I tried but failed to find such lights on sale at Evans Cycles.

If all age groups are going to get involved with everyday, all-year-round cycling, the bikes need to be properly equipped. The bike to work scheme offers a chance to significantly increase the pool of properly equipped bikes so that those who can't afford to buy new bikes also have a choice.  
Cheers, Roland

**....message of 25 Sept from Roland Backhouse to Roger Geffen, CTC:**

"Dear Roger,  
I have recently written to my MP, Kenneth Clarke, about the HMRC's directive on the valuation of bicycles bought through the cycle-to-work scheme:  
<http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/manuals/eimanual/EIM21667a.htm>,

The directive specifically states that:

"In calculating the original price of the cycle, include safety equipment fitted to the cycle (such as lights and bells) but not safety equipment which would be worn by the cyclist (such as helmets or reflective clothing)."

It seems to me to be ludicrous that the government should penalise cyclists choosing to purchase bicycles that are well-equipped with permanently fitted safety features. This will only exacerbate the situation that I pointed out in my email to Cyclescheme Ltd where bikes in the UK supposedly for cycling to work are in fact racers (misleadingly called "road bikes"). I have argued to Mr Clarke that accessories that I consider essential for cycling to work (permanent bell, permanent lights/reflectors, reflective tyres, pannier rack, mudguards, chainguard, permanent lock) should be discounted from the valuation.

Has CTC formed a view on the HMRC directive? Would CTC support the view that minimum standards should be encouraged/required on all bicycles purchased under the cycle to work scheme? I think minimum standards are vital if the whole population is to be persuaded to see cycling as a normal, everyday, all the year round activity; the current HMRC directive is counter-productive because it encourages the wrong image of what such cycling is about.  
Cheers, Roland"

**Cycling in Parliament – extracts from message of 11 Oct to Cyclenation Forum from Simon Geller (Secretary, Cyclenation) and including comments from Lilian Greenwood, MP for Nottingham South:**

"Just trawling through Hansard - as you do - came across this from 15th Sept. Note that CTC & Cyclenation are represented on the Cycling Forum mentioned by Norman Baker

. **Chris Skidmore (Kingswood) (Con):** What recent steps he has taken to encourage cycling. [71836]

**The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport (Norman Baker):** The Government are strongly in favour of cycling, as we said in our coalition agreement. On 5 July, I announced the allocation of £155.5 million to 37 authorities to deliver packages of measures that support economic growth and cut carbon emissions, as part of the £560 million local sustainable transport fund—many of these include cycling. I will announce the remaining allocations in summer 2012. In addition, I have established a cycling forum, which met for the first time this week. We want to get more people cycling, more safely, more often.

**Chris Skidmore:** The Minister will undoubtedly be aware of the huge success that cycling city status has brought south Gloucestershire. Could he now seriously consider the North Fringe to Hengrove major scheme bid that his Department has received recently? The scheme will further enhance cycling provision and will boost economic growth.

**Norman Baker:** I agree that the initiatives in south Gloucestershire have been successful, and I congratulate my hon. Friend on his inventiveness and ingenuity in including that question under this heading. He will understand that the project he mentions is subject to assessment under the development pool arrangements. A decision will be made later this year, but his support for the scheme is noted.

**Lilian Greenwood (Nottingham South) (Lab):** CTC reports that the biggest deterrent to cycling is fear of busy roads. What are the Government doing to improve

**15 Sep 2011 : Column 1168**

driver training and put more emphasis on cyclists' needs? How can the Minister ensure that dangerous or intimidating driving is made as unacceptable as drink driving?

**Norman Baker:** Dangerous and intimidating driving is already subject to police enforcement, but we are taking steps to ensure that drivers are aware of cyclists on the road. A Trixi mirror pilot has been approved for London, and it is now in place and showing good results. The Under-Secretary with responsibility for road safety is very aware of this issue and is looking at driving training for HGV drivers in particular.

**Mr Speaker:** We are better informed about Trixi mirrors and we are grateful to the Minister for that."

**Message of 12 Oct from Dr. Cuong Phu Nguyen (M.Arch., PhD), Fundraising Officer and Landscape / Architecture Consultant, Groundwork Greater Nottingham, requesting Pedals support for their funding bid for the next stage of an educational project to educate school children in Nottingham about Heritage and the benefits of sustainable transport.**

"Dear Dr. McClintock,

I am writing to you, as one of your previous student at the University of Nottingham, to seek for your advice on an educational project to educate school children in Nottingham about Heritage and the benefits of sustainable transport.

You may remember, I was the Vietnamese PhD student of Dr. Hichem Trache, who came and seek for your advice on sustainable transport planning in my thesis. I was very glad to know that you are now the chairman of the Pedals group which promote cycling and sustainable transport in Nottingham. By coincidence, I am developing an educational project, named "Tram to heritage, travel to a sustainable future", aiming to encourage children to research into local history, cultural and natural heritage, and to explore the hidden values of diverse communities and neighbourhoods in Nottingham. At the same time, it aims to teach children about sustainable transport and its benefits to the environment (Please see attachment). I strongly believe that the participation of sustainable transport experts like you and your group would be very valuable for our project

My current organisation, Groundwork Greater Nottingham, is a registered charitable trust who helps to build sustainable communities across the Greater Nottingham area. We work on regeneration projects covering a wide range of areas including education, heritage, community, environment, youth and landscaping. Between 2008 and 2010, Groundwork Greater Nottingham ran a project called 'Tram Travellers'. We were very pleased to work in partnership with a number of schools across Nottingham, to teach and educate children about the history of the tram in Nottingham. Further information about our project could be found at:

<http://www.eastmidlands.groundwork.org.uk/greater-nottingham/what-we-do/tram-travellers.aspx>. This was a highly successful project, which we would like to expand and develop further.

There are more than 30 conservation sites and 1450 listed buildings in or around Nottingham City Centre, which can be best accessed by public transport. There are also a number of communities and neighbourhoods with diverse local culture and heritage which have often been not heard about. It is important to teach the pupils of more than 100 schools across the city about the very rich culture and heritage of Nottingham. It is also very important to teach our children about the benefit of sustainable transport, for example by using the tram as a safe, convenient, efficient and environmentally friendly way to explore the city. In particular, when the new tramlines to Clifton and Chilwell are completed in 2013, it will become the backbone of the public transport system and a sustainable way to access our heritage from all the communities of Nottingham.

We are currently designing and planning this next project in consultation with schools and other partners, in order to meet the specific needs of children and staff. We are also in the process of applying for funding to deliver the project which aims to start in early 2012. I would be very grateful if you could let me know if Pedal would be interested in this project

and support us with a reference letter to be included in our funding application, which we would like to submit in early November 2011.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me on 0115 978 8212 or email to [Cuong.Nguyen@groundwork.org.uk](mailto:Cuong.Nguyen@groundwork.org.uk).

Yours sincerely,

Cuong Nguyen

Dr. Cuong Phu Nguyen (M.Arch., PhD)

Fundraising Officer and Landscape / Architecture Consultant

Groundwork Greater Nottingham

Denman Street East

Nottingham

NG7 3GX

Tel: 0115 9788212, Fax: 0115 9787496

**PS.** Do we want to support this bid, as Cuong requests? I am not clear how much it is in fact concerned with cycling as opposed to sustainable transport more broadly, but hope to clarify this with him before our meeting on Monday.

Hugh, 13.10.11