

Cycle Advisory and Liaison Group Meeting Minutes

Wednesday 26th February 2025

Attendees:	INITIALS	STATUS
Moor, Nigel;	NM	Chair
Smith, Roger;	RS	Forum rep
Taylor, Malcom;	MT	Forum rep
Gray, Cllr David;	DG	Member
Cody, Cllr Cate;	CC	Member
Bloxsom, Cllr John;	JB	Member
Bullock, Alan;	AB	Officer
Williams, Sarah;	SW	Officer
Chick, Danielle;	DC	Officer
Humm, Jason;	JH	Officer
Atkins, Jo;	JA	Officer
Hazel, Ollie;	OH	Officer
Williams, Phillip;	PW	Officer
Schofield, Craig;	CS	Officer
Haworth, Alex;	AH	Officer
Hine, Nathan;	NH	Officer
Davis, Nathaniel;	ND	Officer
Chick, Colin;	CC	Officer
Bryant, Nick;	NB	Tewkesbury Borough Council

Apologies

Morris, Cllr Dominic;	DM	Member
Willingham, Cllr David;	DW	Member
Marshall, Tracy	TM	Officer
Haworth, Kathryn;	KH	Officer
Senft-Hayward, Luisa;	LSH	Officer
Davies, Petula;	PD	Officer
Excell, Simon;	SE	Officer
Ward, Christopher;	CW	Observer

1.0 Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and read apologies.

2.0 Actions and minutes of 7th November 2024

Minutes agreed. Previous actions:

Action: OH to email CC regarding the budget update and the interest in having a cycle bus at Tewkesbury C of E.

- OH noted that the cycle bus at Tewkesbury C of E has been affected by flooding, which has taken priority. A cycle-led ride is planned there in a few

weeks, and OH will discuss it further then. JO and OH are in discussions with the PE lead regarding the plans.

Action: OH to follow up on the legal issue with Tewkesbury Council regarding the borrowing of bikes, ensuring they are fully serviced and delivered next week.

- They have received the bikes, and the issue has been resolved.

Action: Robert Vesty to engage with staff to address the speed camera issue and ensure timely follow-up on concerns raised by CC.

- CC noted that the cameras have been updated to battery-operated but are still not functioning. A response from SB is needed. Cameras are installed based on speed limits, and the police have agreed to use vehicle-activated signs until speeds decrease enough to justify a speed camera. ND to follow up with SB and report back to the group.

Action: CC to invite someone from Tewkesbury Planning to attend next CAG meeting.

- NB attended the meeting.

3.0 Summary of current projects

Initiative/ Scheme	Update
Major Projects	
B4063 Gloucester to Cheltenham Cycle Scheme	<p>Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Junction modelling at Estcourt Road Roundabout verified the preferred option as a Dutch Style Roundabout. - Ongoing design reviews and flood modelling and mitigation work underway. <p>Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation for all phases between Oxstalls Lane and Arle Court Roundabout are complete and all feedback has been published online. - Consultation for Estcourt Road Roundabout is likely to be carried out later this year (2025). <p>Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oxstalls Lane Junction to Elmbridge Court Roundabout - Works are due to complete in Summer 2025 - Elmbridge Court Rbt to Arle Court – Pirton Lane junction due to complete Autumn 2025.
Gloucester City Cycle Spine	<p>Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Southgate Street Ph2 (Tall Ship Pub to St Ann Way junction) detailed design ongoing. - Black Dog Way to Great Western Road - detailed design ongoing. <p>Consultation</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public consultation was undertaken in Summer 2023 and findings have been published online. - Door to door engagement completed ahead of starting on site. <p>Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Northgate Street and Southgate Street Ph1 (Kimbrose Triangle to Tall Ship Pub) construction is planned to start in March 2025 and complete in Autumn 2025. - Black Dog Way construction programme TBC upon completion of design. - Southgate Street Ph2 (Tall Ship PH to St Ann Way junction) construction programme TBC following TRO consultation.
B4008 Standish Multi User Path	<p>Project is being delivered in two phases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Horsemarling Roundabout to Crocumpill Cottage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation event was held in Sept 2024. - Construction commenced in January 2025 to complete June 2025 2. Crocumpill Cottage to Blackbridge access track <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presence of an uncharted and defective culvert has delayed progress of design. Construction programme to be confirmed.
Gloucester to Stroud Cycle Spine	<p>Project is to be delivered in multiple phases.</p> <p>Phase 1 - Bristol Road to Cole Avenue is developed to Preliminary Design stage.</p>
A435 Cheltenham to Bishops Cleeve Cycle Spine	<p>Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - S1 - Honeybourne Line to Racecourse Rbt. Works complete. - S2.1 - GWSR bridge to Bishop's Cleeve. Works started Jan 2025 and completes in October 2025. - S2.2 - Cheltenham Racecourse Rbt to GWSR bridge. Tender process ongoing. Works planned to start Spring 2025 and complete early 2026.
Honeybourne Line pedestrian and cycle link	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GCC are taking over scheme promotor role from GWR. - Works ongoing to review existing design and confirm funding sources and constraints. - Subject to future cabinet approval for procurement.
Highway Improvement Projects	
Minor Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hatherley Safe Streets scheme to improve walking and cycling is set for completion before the end of the financial year. • Cotswold water park, spine road crossing – Atkins is conducting a feasibility study before passing it to the team for implementation. • Steadings to Cirencester – detailed design work will begin next year.
Secure Cycle Storage Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure cycle storage – procurement completed, and locations agreed in Tewkesbury, Gloucester, and Cheltenham. • Cycle hangars at Merrywalks, Churchdown Library, and Bishops Cleeve Library scheduled for installation in March and April.
ThinkTravel	
Cycling/ Bikeability	<p>Bikeability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% of approximately 5,000 pupils across 95% of Gloucestershire schools now participate in Level 1-2 training. • 8% increase in participation over the past 18 months. • 50% of children aged 8-11 still unable to ride a bike. • Increased funding confirmed for 2025-2026 from the Bikeability Trust. <p>Cycling Behaviour Change:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E-mobility – 100 people now using the workplace cycling scheme. • Pedal Easy Scheme – Library-led trial aligned with secure cycle storage work led by Craig. Hoping to expand to Bishops Cleeve as well, using community hubs to promote cycling. • E-bike Scheme (NHS ICB) – E-bikes planned for transporting blood samples, but launch delayed due to additional health and safety requirements as national concerns raised over battery safety. NHS lead to provide a talk on safe charging and battery standards—Sarah Williams to consider raising this at the Cycle Forum. <p>Love to Ride:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now in its third year, growing annually with the most successful campaign to date. • Collaboration with the sustainability team and RTP1 schemes to promote cycling. • Provides a way to track and monitor cycle spine usage, logging carbon savings from journeys. • Accessible and user-friendly platform for new riders. • Planning events along the cycle spine to showcase schemes, raise awareness of e-bikes, and celebrate completion milestones. <p>Additional Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 new workplaces joined over the winter, a positive development. • Road Safety Mapping Tool – Allows users to rate routes; ATE updating datasets accordingly. • Capability Programme – Includes Safer Routes to School initiative, funded by the Emergency Climate Change Fund, working with 50 schools.
Strategic Planning	
Funding Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ATE £2.3m allocated to GCC through the Combined Active Travel Fund, this will plug existing funding gaps with allocations towards design, network planning and behaviour change too. - Officers have recommended £1.7m SLP CIL be awarded to GCC post meeting note District Cllrs have agreed the funding allocations to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Honeybourne Line Extension to A40 £770,424 - Cheltenham – Bishop's Cleeve spine £532,856 - Gloucester – Haresfield cycle spine design £400,000
LCWIP development update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Central Severn Vale LCWIP programmed for review in 2025/26, to include links into the cycle spine (previously focused on urban centres)
Cheltenham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See funding update re A40 link
Cotswold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steadings to Cirencester cycle link: progressing well, this will be handed over to Engineering Team - Spine Road Crossing: survey work progressing, this will be handed over to Engineering Team
Forest of Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hartpury to Gloucester Corridor feasibility and concept design nearing completion
Stroud	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Successful REPF bid for £6,600 towards surfacing and wall repairs at the entrance to the Nailsworth cycle path – match funded by GCC
Tewkesbury	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised LCWIP published at www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/lcwip

AB confirmed that funding allocations for the next financial year have been secured, with an additional £2.3M from the combined Active Travel Fund. JH noted that this will allow works to commence. A decision on CIL funding for the Honeybourne Line is still required.

SW added that the strategic CIL schemes, including the Cheltenham Honeybourne Line, need sign-off from districts, whilst the Gloucester to Haresfield and Bishops Cleeve schemes may be removed from the notes. JH confirmed that there is a meeting is scheduled for the 4th March. SW mentioned that agenda details are available on the public website. NB noted that the funding is included in published papers and referenced in recommendations.

NM suggested that, ahead of the purdah period, this could be an opportunity for an update. JH confirmed arrangements have been made around race week. DG indicated that following the meeting, there may be further clarity, with positive signals regarding local government progress.

RS asked what measures are in place to assess the success of the cycle spine. SW noted that at the start of the project, cycling numbers had increased by 60%, and Vivacity data will help track usage along the spine and on the highway. She added that early figures in the LTP report suggest strong trends, with more junctions coming forward.

MT asked if a baseline had been established, and AB confirmed that it had. PW observed that few cyclists use the Arle Court roundabout, but improvements have also benefited pedestrians and disabled users, making crossings in Churchdown safer. NM commented on how experiences shift when dealing with disabilities. PW noted that while most of the route is complete, further work is needed at Longlevens, and a significant increase in cyclists in Churchdown is expected. DG highlighted that as CIL funding progresses, there is an opportunity to align efforts, with the expectation that increased traffic on the spine will enhance its overall impact.

MT raised the Hatherley Safe Streets scheme. CS explained that S106 funds will be used to reduce speed limits to 20mph, install a new pedestrian-controlled crossing, and tighten existing crossings. A traffic regulation order will also introduce double yellow lines to protect the cycleway.

RS questioned the blockage of traffic flow near the post office, which he felt wasn't safe for cyclists. ND responded that it's not part of the scheme but could be looked at, though the budget is limited. PW noted that removing parking spaces could negatively impact the post office's viability. He added that the scheme will create a lower-speed environment around nearby schools and include a zebra crossing at Nuffield Hospital. He emphasised that widening the road or adding cycle infrastructure isn't possible, but the reduced speed limits aim to address these issues.

CC praised the scheme, suggesting it would be helpful to know the costs involved and to receive feedback on how the scheme progresses.

NM asked how much of the information is available online. JA mentioned that there's a lot of content on the ThinkTravel website.

RS inquired about the council's involvement in bike maintenance. OH explained that they've been able to fund bike mechanics to visit schools the week before Bikeability sessions, with

the majority of schools in Cheltenham benefiting. JA added that they are funding bike maintenance and workshops to ensure bikes are ready before Bikeability starts at each school, providing young people the opportunity to learn basic bike repairs.

PW pointed out that some of the work is funded through external grants, but there's no guarantee this funding will always be available. He emphasised the need to plan for the long term, noting that people often don't communicate when they believe contracts are nearing their end, especially in fixed-term roles. JH discussed the difference between revenue and capital funding, stressing the importance of finding ways to communicate these messages beyond the group.

PW noted that the traffic team receives numerous requests for improvements, and these requests need to be flagged during the LCWIP process to be considered more favourably. It's difficult to make a strong case without doing so.

CCh explained that LCWIPs record hopes and ambitions for specific areas but do not have their own funding stream. CIL and S106 funds are used to support these initiatives. The focus has primarily been on building the cycle spine, and the aim now is to use it as a catalyst to connect other areas and drive progress. CCh added that they believe that GCC should be receiving top scores for cycle schemes in rural areas, and this is something to be proud of.

Action: CS will circulate the cycle hangar plan.

Action: JA/OH to share presentation and to discuss at Cycle Forum

4.0 Development and Infrastructure

Update from NB:

Work is underway on a new local plan for Tewkesbury, Cheltenham, and Gloucester. All councils have been required to update their local development schemes, with the government requesting that all Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) submit new plans by 6th March. The scheme outlines a move towards the Regulation 19 formal stage in the summer of 2026 for submission to the Secretary of State.

There has been a shift in approach, as the original plan included a preferred options stage. However, this proposal had to be dropped due to the tight consultation window, which wouldn't have allowed for sufficient public engagement. Additionally, uncertainties surrounding local government reorganisation have complicated the planning process, as plan-making tends to be impacted by such uncertainties.

The planning team is committed to actively engaging with communities and stakeholders to ensure that there is not too much of a gap between providing limited information and presenting highly detailed plans without opportunities for public feedback. Plans are being made to undertake engagement efforts in collaboration with GCC over the next 12 months.

The team is finalising a review of infrastructure needs, recognising that the status of projects and requirements may have changed. They are working with providers to assess the current situation, with an update to the document expected in the spring. This document will form the basis for subsequent CIL committees, with opportunities arising through this work. The aim is to understand the long-term infrastructure needs and plan accordingly, with active stakeholder involvement as part of the infrastructure delivery plan.

There is a focus on integrating sustainable and active travel into the strategic planning process, with an emphasis on managing transport impacts. As part of the Issues and Options consultation, one option for the future growth strategy is being considered. This includes exploring opportunities between Gloucester and Cheltenham, an area expected to see significant growth. The plan aims to maximise public transport options within this corridor.

NM highlighted the importance of engaging with this group going forward, noting the clear direction of the work.

CC referenced a previous meeting where concerns were raised about the lack of developer contributions for cycling in Tewkesbury, with opportunities or windows for funding seemingly missed. NB explained that this links back to LCWIPs, which outline local needs. The bar for collecting S106 monies is high, and there's a proposal to ring-fence 25% of CIL funding for local strategic projects. Tewkesbury has only brought one scheme forward to the committee – a footbridge. Cheltenham has one scheme for a community centre, while Gloucester has two larger projects. NB suggested that locally promoted schemes could be prioritised in future discussions and asked if more could be done with S106. He noted that districts are guided by the transport authority. CC emphasised the need for the footbridge, particularly as flooding increases.

NB mentioned Ashchurch, where Homes England is working on a transport movement strategy. He expressed hope that the outcomes from this work would bring forward more tangible schemes, with a better position anticipated as the work progresses.

JH noted that as the transport authority, their role is to comment on developments, but not to make decisions. He stressed the importance of ensuring the HDM team is involved with S106 monies and suggested that they may sometimes miss opportunities if policy principles are not fully understood. He proposed closer working with officers to avoid missing opportunities in the future. NB agreed, saying there is more that can be done to collaborate. He acknowledged the constraints they are working within and emphasised the need to adapt approaches depending on the scheme and geography, ensuring the right outcomes through the plan-making stage.

CCh highlighted the issue with Ashchurch, noting that the delivery of local plans needs to be more efficient. If the planning process had been quicker, a master plan would have been in place, incorporating community views, costings, and a clear plan for using S106 contributions from developers. Without such a plan, they are now planning by appeal, with developers avoiding S106 agreements. CCh stated that 4,000 houses have been built without any S106 funding.

PW asked about promoting urban densification in Gloucester, noting the lack of evidence supporting this. He questioned how design guidance could help promote this. SW inquired about improving how framework requests are handled. NB responded that in the absence of up-to-date development plans, councils are forced into a more reactive position, making it harder to reconcile these issues without a current plan. He pointed out that urban intensification is more feasible in areas like Tewkesbury, which still has greenfield opportunities, while officers understand the need to maximise potential.

5.0 Advertising/ Encouraging E-bikes

Discussed in agenda item 3.

6.0 AOB

JB raised that at the last forum, JB requested feedback on the feasibility of projects. He asked what information is available regarding the relationship between studies and the progress of getting things delivered. SW explained that studies are essential to bid for funding and move projects forward. CCh added that the studies have been instrumental in securing £55m for the cycle spine, emphasising that without them, the funding they now have would not have been possible.

RS raised maintenance for cycle paths and stated it is still gritty on cycle paths. CCh stated that maintenance is due to start in April and a new vehicle has been purchased.

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 3rd June

Date of next forum: Tuesday 18th March, Thursday 20th November

Agenda items for next meeting: