

PE1595/QQQ

Petitioner Letter of 1 February 2017

Thank you for giving me a further opportunity to respond to events and correspondence. I am grateful to the Scottish Parliament Petitions Committee and to Scottish Transport Minister Humza Yousef MSP for their deliberations at the last meeting in November 2016. It was interesting and reassuring to hear the Minister state that "all schemes must be inclusive" and that there should be no reason why traffic controls and controlled crossings could not be part of a Shared Space Scheme. He also said that he would contact East Dunbartonshire Council to express his concerns over safety and equality issues affecting the visually impaired and other disabled people, who can no longer access their town centre. Unfortunately this has had no effect on Council plans as they continue to complete this scheme despite his concerns and the continued exclusion of many disabled people. In a recent BBC Radio Scotland interview in which both Committee Member Rona Mackay MSP and I also participated, EDC Council Leader Rhondda Geekie said that the scheme had been a failure and that it would require EDC Councillors to vote to reinstate traffic lights and controlled crossings. However, as reported in the Kirkintilloch Herald on 31 January, there has been a change of mind and the Council have no plans to reinstate controls.

I wish to advise members of the Petitions Committee of my concerns over the role of Sustrans, who appear to have been given the task of rolling out Transport Scotland's policy, particularly with regard to the implementation of Shared Space Schemes. As you will see from the attached Community Link Programme Scoring Matrix, Sustrans are offering funding to Councils on condition that their criteria, that of Shared Space is adopted. Funding of up to 50% is available and cash-strapped Councils are being lured into installing these schemes which exclude many vulnerable people, by the inducement of this funding.

The Minister's letter to the Petitions Committee appeared to show a change of heart by Sustrans, saying that they now accept that controlled crossings can be part of a Shared Space Scheme, however in a subsequent letter to EDC they claimed that this is what has been installed in Kirkintilloch. Rona Mackay MSP can explain to her colleagues that this is not so, as the controlled crossings are in 2 side streets and a detour of over 800 metres is required to cross the street safely, this cannot be considered to be a reasonable adjustment. Sustrans state that a Shared Space Scheme no longer exists if controlled crossings are installed, if this is so, they are not fit for purpose!

Both Sustrans and EDC continue to claim that Shared Space Schemes are designed to reduce the dominance of vehicles, however without traffic controls in place, it can now be proved that the vehicle is now more dominant than before, as hundreds of people feel so intimidated and fearful that they avoid the town altogether.

I am grateful to the Transport Minister for his invitation to attend a Seminar at Napier University in Edinburgh this spring, where guidelines on Shared Space Schemes will be addressed. I noted the Ministers comment that he and his Officials await a report from the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) which was

expected at the end of 2016 but has been delayed. He said that this report would deliver amended guidelines, however CIHT recently stated that only recommendations would be delivered.

Members of the Committee may be interested in the following extract from a meeting of the Women's and Equality Committee during their enquiry into Disability in the Built Environment—

“Q168 Chair: Is there not a fundamental problem with the principle that you are following there? You very clearly set out the principle of shifting from regulated to unregulated space, and that is where the principle of shared space comes in, trying to make that movement. If negotiations of social space are regulated by social conventions, and particularly the ability of people to be able to see traffic moving around, do you not inherently risk excluding people who cannot easily recognise or easily participate in those social conventions from being able to get eye contact with other road users, or, as you say, recognise a heightened risk?”

I understand what you mean by the removal of white lines in roads or the removal of signage. However, if one cannot see other road users and that raised level of risk, how are you not inherently excluding particularly people who are partially sighted or blind?

Andrew Hugill (CIHT): One thing in the review today is clear. If we actually look for evidence of whether those schemes have created inclusive environments, that evidence is very hard to find. One might suspect that is because it has not been an objective of the scheme from the start. There is a clear area where that clarity of objective means that the engagement gets carried out on these types of changes. The point about change is an important one. We are not talking about building new things from scratch, but changing existing public spaces that include highway, and that have very definite rights for the public to use in different ways.”

I wish to ask the Committee if any of the funding allocated by Sustrans on behalf of the Scottish Government was sourced from the EU, as I understand that European regional Structural Funds cannot be used on projects that will cause discrimination against disabled people.

The Transport Minister stated that he awaited information on accident data at other Shared Space Schemes, this will prove difficult as was stated in a report by Lord Chris Holmes 'Accidents by Design', Informal or Courtesy crossings are unclassified, therefore no data can be attributed to accidents which occur there. Miss Sarah Gayton has previously submitted data detailing accidents at several locations, using information from web-sites such as 'Crash-map', together with information gathered from Police and other sources. Miss Gayton would be happy to forward her findings to the Minister or the Petitions Committee if required to do so.

Community Links Programme Scoring Matrix 2015/16

Appendix A

December 2014

Community Links Programme Scoring Matrix

The decision to award your project funding will be made by the Community Links Steering Group. A site visit by a Community links project officer and recommendation from a selection panel where appropriate will also help inform the Steering Group decision making process. Please refer to the Community Links Guide 2015/16 and this Scoring Matrix for details on what interventions are / are not eligible and for the overall objectives of the programme.

Your Project will be reviewed and scored under the following weighted sections:

Theme	Weighting (%)
1. Project Outcomes	20%
2. Design - Standards and Quality	20%
3. Deliverability	20%
4. Community involvement	10%
5. Strategic vision	10%
6. Collaborative working	5%
7. Smarter Choices measures	5%
8. Innovation	5%
9. Monitoring	5%

Notes:

- Scoring sections relevant to construction projects will be indicated by a 'C' next to the scoring mark of each section.
- Scoring sections relevant to solely non-construction projects will be indicated by an 'N' next to the scoring mark of each section.

Section 1 - Project Outcomes

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
Improving environment for cycling (and active travel) How will the proposals help to generate utility trips by bicycle (and other active modes)? How does this project create an effective everyday link or provide a series of significant local interventions that make it easier to cycle (or travel actively) than to drive for shorter trips? How will this project lead to the provision of direct, convenient and attractive cycling or cycling and active travel links to places people want to go to? What types of amenities and trip generators will this project affect?	0 marks = project does not improve existing environment for cycling (and other active travel modes) in the locality 5 marks = project will make it more appealing to cycle (travel actively) between the destination(s) by being direct/attractive/convenient 10 marks = project will make it easy to make everyday journeys by bicycle (and other active travel modes) between the destination(s) identified by creating links which are direct, attractive and convenient and improving existing environment for cycling (and active	10 C N

	travel). Project is of a standard that will be suitable for people who do not already cycle (or travel actively) for everyday journeys to use it.	
--	---	--

Section 2 - Design - Standards and Quality

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
<p>Design (quality) All projects are expected to apply relevant design standards and guidance. Your project will be assessed based on: the quality of the information you provide how well the project aligns with current guidance how well the project demonstrates best practice through innovative and imaginative design This will take into consideration the context of the interventions and how the specifications will account for increasing numbers of cyclists. How will the infrastructure proposals create an environment that encourages people to travel actively? How will the proposals help to create an environment that prioritises cyclists and other active travel modes? How will the proposals create a sense of place? Notes: Unless clearly justified, all active travel routes built as a result of the Community Links Programme will have to be of a sealed surface and a minimum of 2.5 metres wide</p>	<p>. 0 marks - Infrastructure proposals poorly cater for the needs of cyclists (and other active travel modes). 10 marks - The needs of cyclists (and other active travel modes) have been catered for fully in the designs. Active travel modes have been prioritized over and above other modes.</p>	10 C
<p>Signage (quality) Directional and destination signage is an integral part of the promotion and legacy of Community Links construction projects. Signage should be planned, designed and scheduled for installation at the earliest possible point in project delivery. In this section, please consider the following: How does the proposed signage meet the needs of cyclists and other active travel modes? How does the information on the proposed signage integrate with existing active travel routes and cycle networks (i.e. NCN)? How does the proposed signage promote the route? How does the proposed signage increase the utility of the route?</p>	<p>Quality of signage proposals will be scored as follows: 0 marks - no signage 2 marks - regulatory signage only. (Meets regulations) 4 marks - (as above plus) some basic wayfinding signage informing users of direction only (helps people on the route follow the route) 6 marks - (as above plus) some destinations and/or symbols but no evidence of much thought about their choice (some thought paid to different route users) 8 marks - (as above plus) good consideration of destinations, distances (and/or times) on the route (informative and useful). 10 marks - (as above plus) high quality signage project - informative, signs for existing and new users. Integration</p>	10 C

Applicants will be expected to upload signage designs, maps, schedules and plans to the application portal. All design and construction projects will be expected to show evidence that signage has been planned and budgeted into the scheme.	with existing signage and routes. Thought has been put into locating and installing signs (signs form an important part of the route, inform users and promote the route)	
--	---	--

Section 3 - Deliverability

It is essential that your project is delivered within the agreed financial timeline. The Community Links Programme does not have the ability to carry over funds from one financial year to the next.

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
Certainty of match funding	Match funding is an essential component of the programme and can directly affect the deliverability of the project: 0 marks - if no match funding has been identified 5 marks - if the match funding has been applied for but not yet confirmed 10 marks - if the match funding is secure and already in place	10 C N
Required permissions (Landownership)	Has landowner(s) consent been granted to allow the project to be delivered? Maximum of 10 marks available based upon how far consent/permissions have been progressed	10 C
Required permissions (Planning permission)	Have necessary planning permissions been obtained to allow the project to be delivered? Maximum of 10 marks available based upon how far consent/permissions have been progressed	10 C
Required permissions (Others)	Have other necessary permissions been obtained to allow the project to be delivered (e.g. Traffic Regulation Orders, ecology surveys etc.)? Maximum of 10 marks available based upon how far consent/permissions have been progressed)	10 C
Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
Advancement of the design	0 marks - where no design is in place. 5 marks - where an outline design or options are presented. 10 marks - when a project is fully designed up and ready to go.	10 C
Evidence of the design For all construction project applications,	0 marks - if no plans of the proposals are uploaded with the application 5	10 C

<p>Sustrans requires sufficient supporting maps, feasibility studies, engineering plans, cross sections and technical drawings in order to properly review proposals.</p>	<p>marks - if a map only is uploaded with the application 10 marks - if a map, cross section drawings and technical design drawings are uploaded with the application 15 marks - (as above) and additional visual aids of proposals are uploaded with the application such as 3D visualizations and conceptual drawings (where appropriate).</p>	
---	---	--

Section 4 - Community involvement

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
<p>Community need and demand How will this project meet the needs, demands and objectives of the local community? Where possible you should reference any public support for the project such as correspondence from community groups, members of the public or local councillors. Please provide evidence of local support for your scheme. This could include support for the project communicated during consultation on Council strategies such as local and regional Active Travel or Cycling Strategies, School Travel Plans, Core Path Plans, Local Transport Strategies or Local Development Strategies.</p>	<p>Scored on a scale of 1 to 10 based on the level of support demonstrated: 0 marks - no evidence is provided that the project meets a need or demand from the local community 5 marks - some local support for the project has been demonstrated 10 marks - Strong local demand for the project has been demonstrated and a letter of support for the project has been supplied by a local community group or similar</p>	<p>10 C N</p>
<p>Guidance notes</p> <p>Community Engagement The quality and effectiveness of community engagement will be proportional to the cost and scale of a project bid. The marking of this section will be judged against Planning Aid Scotland best practise guidance (SP=EED™) which can be found here: www.pas.org.uk/speed/ A coherent community engagement strategy will involve as much of the local community as possible including (where applicable) community councils, local workplaces and educational institutions. For higher cost/scale projects, higher marks will be available for those projects that cast their community engagement programme to the widest local audience. How will the local community be engaged prior, during and after</p>	<p>Criteria</p> <p>Demonstrated level of community engagement: Maximum of 10 marks available based upon the quality and effectiveness of community engagement proposals.</p>	<p>Score</p> <p>10 C N</p>

<p>project delivery? One of the key objectives of community engagement will be to address any concerns from the local community about real or perceived impacts of community links projects. Please demonstrate in section how these concerns have been addressed to allow delivery of the proposals.</p>		
---	--	--

Section 5 - Strategic vision

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
<p>Cycling and Active Travel Strategies Please describe how the project fits into your local authority's wider strategy for cycling or active travel and the level of priority assigned to it. For instance: Does it form part of a local cycle network proposal? Has it been identified as a high priority in a feasibility study to make a settlement more accessible by bicycle/on foot? Is it identified as a regional priority in a Regional Transport Partnership or National Park cycling/active travel strategy? Scored on a scale of 1 to 10 on how central the project is to delivering the aims and objectives of a local authority (and/or regional) cycling/active travel strategy.</p>	<p>0 marks - no evidence that the project forms part of local or regional active travel strategy. 5 marks - the project is identified as an action in a draft local or regional cycling/active travel strategy. 10 marks - the project is identified in a finalised and approved local or regional cycling/active travel strategy. It is clear how it fits into long term plans for the local authority area and the Cycling Action Plan for Scotland.</p>	<p>10 C N</p>

Section 6 - Collaborative working

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
<p>Internal co-ordination Applicant organisations, especially local authorities, should co-ordinate all their applications across various departments so that all information is consistent and project planning and delivery is coordinated. How have you involved other departments / expertise in your proposals and how will they be involved in the delivery of the project. Please show evidence of cross departmental working</p>	<p>Maximum of 10 marks available based upon how effectively you have liaised and co-ordinated your proposals with other departments and internal stakeholders.</p>	<p>10 C N</p>
<p>Regional co-ordination Where the scope of a project spans two or more local authority areas, plans should be put in place to communicate and co-ordinate resources effectively to deliver</p>	<p>Maximum of 10 marks available based upon how effectively you have liaised and co-ordinated your proposals with other local authorities and external stakeholders.</p>	<p>10 C N</p>

the project. Where applicable, how will your project involve adjoining local authorities and other relevant stakeholders in planning and delivery?		
--	--	--

Section 7 - Smarter Choices

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
<p>Smarter Choices , promotion and behaviour change In order to achieve a modal shift from the car to walking and cycling for shorter journeys it is recognised that the Community Links programme needs to have complementary people focused measures (behaviour change and smarter measures). Partners are encouraged to combine measures that encourage use of the infrastructure delivered in these proposals and help to achieve more sustainable travel habits. Partners may be invited to present to a Sustrans panel to elaborate on the people-focused measures identified in project applications. Encourage use of the infrastructure delivered in these proposals These could involve any or all of the following: Local travel information - including route maps, public transport links, web and printed materials Campaigns - marketing activities covering a range of media, branding, leaflets, campaigns and other social marketing Active travel promotion - creation of community hubs, general promotion including health walks, healthy lifestyles and other materials/activities Cycle promotion - specific to led rides, promoting bike sharing/rental/loan schemes, cycle publicity and maintenance Training and events - activities to improve skills of people to travel independently, cycle training, and events to engage residents, workplaces and businesses to raise awareness of sustainable transport Travel planning or offering targeted travel advice - in a variety of settings - school/workplace/residential</p> <p><i>Partners should be able to demonstrate clearly identified smarter measures</i></p>	<p>0 marks - if the project involves no smarter measures 5 marks - an overarching smarter choices strategy is in place and a wide range of smarter measures are proposed 10 marks - (in addition to the above) the project has a comprehensive and innovative behaviour change strategy to coincide with the capital works. A commitment to employ a dedicated staff member to implement a comprehensive smarter choices programme will be expected to achieve full marks.</p>	<p>10 C N</p>

<i>funds dedicated towards behaviour change, the sustainability of the project including legacy and training of local people and how this ties in with community engagement.</i>		
--	--	--

Section 8 - Innovation

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
Innovative and imaginative solutions In what ways will your project involve innovative and imaginative solutions in its planning and delivery? Please think about both hard and soft measure interventions when completing this section. Innovative projects are those that use new and pioneering approaches either in their construction or as part of their smarter measures programme. Higher marks will be given to those projects that use ideas, solutions or concepts that have not been previously used in Scotland that prioritise cyclists and other active travel modes or encourage use of the infrastructure delivered in these proposals. The aim here is to set useful precedents across hard and soft measure interventions.	Scored on a scale of 1 to 10 on how innovative or imaginative your proposals are: 0 marks - no evidence of innovative or imaginative concepts shown but applicable standards satisfied 5 marks - evidence of new, innovative and imaginative concepts in the proposals 10 marks - evidence of pioneering and novel concepts. These concepts could be used to set new precedents in best practice.	10 C N

Section 9 - Monitoring

Guidance notes	Criteria	Score
Monitoring (for appropriate projects only) All applications should demonstrate how the outcomes set out in Section 1 will be delivered. Data should be gathered at baseline and again at completion of the project and should be used to demonstrate: How the project has helped to generate utility trips by bicycle (and other active modes)? How the project has created an effective everyday link or series of significant local interventions that make it easier to cycle (or travel actively) rather than drive for short trips under 5km? How the project has led to the provision of direct, convenient and attractive cycling and active travel links in places people want to go? How the project links to amenities and what trip	Demonstrated effectiveness of community engagement proposals: Maximum of 10 marks available based upon anticipated effectiveness of monitoring plans.	10 C N

generators it will affect? How the project will create or improve direct cycling connections to/between destinations detailing levels of convenience and attractiveness? How the project has addressed any community demand for the works (this could include feedback from the community engagement required in Section 4)? The data to be collected should directly address the intended outcomes and impacts, and should relate to what is to be delivered on the ground.

--	--