

MINUTES of a meeting of the **PEAK PARK TRANSPORT FORUM** held at County Hall, Matlock on 24 January 2005

PRESENT

Councillor W Burrows (Derbyshire County Council)
(In the Chair)

Barnsley MBC

A Chymera

Cheshire County Council

J Gray

Derbyshire County Council

J Seymour, Councillors D B Taylor and Mrs J A Twigg

GMPTE/PTA

P Johnston and Councillor A Whitehead

Highways Agency

S Greenhalgh

Kirklees MC

M Padgett

Macclesfield BC

A J Knowles

Mott MacDonald

J Ryde

Mowlem Plc

L McAully

Oldham MBC

J M T Sutcliffe and G Willerton

Peak District National Park Authority

A Ashe, T Critchlow, M Crompton, P Stubbs, S Turner, and Councillor Mrs B J Wilson

SPITS

C Bell

Stockport MBC

R Banks

Tameside MBC

P Calverley and Councillor R Oldham

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor T Bristowe (Barnsley MBC), Councillor B C Lucas (Derbyshire County Council), J Prince (Staffordshire/Moorlands DC), K Sanderson (SYPTE), and Councillor E Wallace (Cheshire County Council)

1/05 **MINUTES RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Peak Park Transport Forum held on 18 October 2004 be received.

2/05 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – (a) Brian Butler, Longendale Siege Committee** Mr Butler presented the views of the Longendale Siege Committee on the proposed Mottram Hollingworth Tintwistle bypass and the CPRE's 'Way To Go' report. The Siege Committee is a pro-bypass group, and was committed to seeing it completed in the current timeframe. Mr Butler argued that proposals in the 'Way to Go' document, particularly, diverting HGV traffic onto the M62, were not viable, and without the bypass measures such as local traffic calming, pedestrian improvements, and safer school routes would be unworkable. Mr Butler also stated that the Committee intended to conduct a third petition campaign prior to the Public Inquiry into the bypass and stated his disappointment at the lack of appreciation for the strength of views on the issue of the residents of the villages by the CPRE.

(b) Councillor J Brocklehurst, Tintwistle Parish Council Councillor Brocklehurst spoke on behalf of the Parish Council and the residents of Tintwistle in support of the bypass. She emphasised the effect the volume of traffic and congestion had on the village, and the fact that residents were afraid to walk on the footpaths along the A628 due to the speed of HGV's using the road. She also commented on the pollution caused by the increase in traffic.

Councillor Brocklehurst stressed that in order to alleviate the problems, it was essential that the bypass was completed and the existing main road corridors through Tintwistle were de-trunked.

(c) Pat Ellison, Alternative Proposals in Transport Mrs Ellison began by stating that a weight restriction on the A628 would be of some benefit to the residents that lived alongside the road. She also said that it was vital that lorries were moved away from the A628 and back onto the motorway network to improve the quality of life of the residents.

Mrs Ellison argued that there were essentially two solutions; the first was to widen and straighten the A628 to accommodate the lorries, and the second was to remove the lorries from the A628.

Mrs Ellison felt that it would be important to receive details of the HGV impact on the area, for example pollution, accidents, property damage and congestion. She also felt that it would be necessary to have a study into the benefits of a weight restriction on the A628 in the SPITS area.

(d) Anne Robinson, CPRE Ms Robinson expressed that the CPRE was a strong supporter of the Forum as a partnership, and that many of the objectives proposed in the SPITS Business Plan reflected the proposals of CPRE in SPITS The Way to Go. However, she stated that there was concern over several issues, including the compatibility of the SPITS objectives, measures and consistency of the SPITS measures with Government policy, and consistency with the PDNPA's Transport Mission and Strategy. Some of the objectives, which CPRE supported, would be undermined by the development of the bypass, and it was felt that the alternatives to the bypass were not being considered seriously.

Ms Robinson also felt that there were some key omissions from the revised objectives. These were that the revised document had no objective that reflected National Park purposes, and that there was no objective that specifically addressed freight issues in the area. Also, road safety and danger were addressed directly on country lanes.

be a surplus of £28,166 carried forward from the current financial year, and a surplus of £23,680 was forecast for the end of 2005/06. Expected income from partners was said to be £44,800, and total expenditure for the year was expected to be £52,286.

With regard to staffing, it was proposed that the Project Officer's contract, which would expire on 31 March 2005, should be extended for a further year. However, following the departure of the Project Assistant, it was proposed not to make a replacement. It was proposed to reallocate the money from this post to meeting the costs of producing and delivering the revised business plan. In managing the revised staffing levels, £2,000 had been allocated to extra administrative support/overtime.

In relation to project funding, the carry forward value did not include any calls for funding from relevant projects. Peak Connections had requested £10,000, and it was proposed that this should be considered in light of priorities set by the Forum following the development of the new Business Plan.

RESOLVED that (1) the forecast of annual Staffing and Finance for the year 2005/06 be accepted;

(2) the revised staffing arrangements be approved whereby the Project Officer's contract be extended for a further year to 31 March 2006, but the Project Assistant's post be not filled, and that Elizabeth Rowbottom be thanked for her contribution to the management of SPITS; and

(3) the arrangements for receiving calls on project funding and possible changes to existing staffing be accepted.

5/05 **SPITS – UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD RESEARCH INTO STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIPS** The Forum received a brief presentation from Professor Tim Richardson from the University of Sheffield on the findings of the research undertaken into the different forms of Stakeholder representation. The research analysed the mediation of traffic restraint options within the Peak Peak Park Transport Forum, the PDNPA, and the Stanage Forum. The full findings of the research were made available for members of the Forum to read.

Professor Richardson presented the research which evaluated the effectiveness of the Forum in terms of capacity, sustainability and legitimacy. In relation to capacity, it was felt that the Forum had achieved the most, as new knowledge had been generated and a strategy had been delivered. However, these were narrowly defined.

With regard to legitimacy, Professor Richardson argued that there been the ability to break through the policy inertia, although this was fragile, as the Forum was felt to be a 'closed shop' with little room for new ideas

In terms of future research, it was felt that there was potential to consider the changing practices of deliberative governance.

RESOLVED that (1) the findings of the research be noted; and

(2) Professor Tim Richardson's comments on the research be received.

6/05 **A RESPONSE TO AN AGENDA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NORTHERN PASSENGER RAIL SERVICES** A letter had been received from Northern Rail requesting stakeholder viewpoints on "an agenda for the development of Northern Passenger Rail Services". A response had been sent on behalf of the Peak Park Transport Forum, and this was detailed to members.

RESOLVED that the Forum notes both the letter from Northern Trains and the response from the SPITS Project Officer.

7/05 **DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS** **RESOLVED** to note that dates of meetings of the Peak Park Transport Forum for 2005/06 be as follows:-

- Monday 4 April 2005
- Monday 11 July 2005
- Monday 17 October 2005
- Monday 23 January 2006

All meetings were to be held at 2.00pm in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Matlock