

Cross Party Group on Cycling

Minutes of Meeting Thursday, 19 September 2013

Committee Room 3, Scottish Parliament, 5:30 – 7:30pm

<p>1. Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p>Alison Johnstone, MSP welcomed the group.</p>	
	<p>In attendance were:</p> <p>Jim Eadie MSP, Co-Convenor of Group (JE) Alison Johnstone MSP, Co-Convenor of Group (AJ) Sarah Boyack MSP, Deputy co-convenor (SB) Claudia Beamish MSP, Deputy co-convenor (CB) Ian McNicoll – Andrew Cyclist Charitable Trust (IM) Tim Bartlett – Andrew Cyclist Charitable Trust (TB) Dave Frew – SCOTS (DF) David Brennan – Pedal on Parliament (DB) Peter Hayman – CTC (PH) Tricia Fort – GoBike (TF) Brenda Mitchell – Cycle Law Scotland (BM) Janice Fenny – Sustrans (JF) John Lauder – Sustrans (JL) Chris Hill – Citycyclingedinburgh.info (CH) Karen Furey – Transport Scotland (KF) Janice Gray – Paths for All (JG) Colin Howden – Transform Scotland (CHO) Maureen Kidd – Cycling Scotland (MK) Ian Aitken – Cycling Scotland (IA) Nathan Kaczmarek – Cycling Scotland (NK) Andrew Pankhurst – Cycling Scotland (AP) Jane Cullingworth – Forth Environment Link (JC) Helen Todd – Ramblers (HT) Dave du Feu – Spokes (DdF) Craig Burn – Scottish Cycling (CB) Keith Irving – Living Streets (KI) Ben Miller – MSP Staff (BM) Patrick Hogan – IndigoPR (PHo)</p> <p>Apologies were received from: Fiona McLeod, MSP Chris Oliver – CTC Scotland Kim Harding – Pedal on Parliament</p>	
<p>2. Minutes of the previous meeting and Matters Arising</p>	<p>AJ asked attendees to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p>DdF noted several amendments, including an action for DdF to send Keith Brown, MSP, Minister for Transport and Veterans the Spokes NPF3 submission. In addition,</p>	

	<p>DdF noted an amendment with regard to potential invitees for future meetings only suggesting Mark Lazarowicz, MP.</p> <p>TF also noted that there should be actions linked with Cllr Jim Orr in relation to his suggested actions following the study trip to the Netherlands.</p> <p><i>These amendments will be made to the previous minutes.</i></p> <p><i>No other notes or matters arising were raised.</i></p> <p><i>All remaining actions were accounted for and minutes approved.</i></p>	
<p>3. John Lauder, Sustrans Scotland – Cycling Infrastructure in Scotland</p>	<p>AJ introduced John Lauder (JL), Director, Sustrans Scotland.</p> <p>JL introduced the topic of cycling infrastructure in Scotland and noted that he would cover an overview of Sustrans’ work in this area, along with the work being done in partnership and other delivery bodies/funding streams.</p> <p>JL noted that the focus is on the situation post-2007 as this is when a predictable budget had first been put in place. JL added that all capital provided through Sustrans’ programmes are on a match-funding basis and that the 3-year spending review has allowed for some more complex projects to be put in place due to ability to forward plan and overcome issues (e.g., feasibility, land-ownership, etc.).</p> <p>JL indicated that the capital funding is primarily to target gaps/black spots in the network through the National Cycle Network (NCN) and Community Links programmes, all delivered in partnership to create direct and confident places for people to cycle.</p> <p>JL presented the two streams of projects: the NCN and Community Links programmes. NCN expenditure is largely being spent between Oban-Fort William-Inverness on the NCN 78 to create an alternative to the trunk road. JL added that in addition to partnership working with local authorities, volunteers are key to ensuring upkeep of the NCN.</p>	

	<p>JL noted that the Community Links projects ensure linkages between the NCN, local services and communities. Integral to delivery of Community Links is a partner coming up with ideas; there are over 100 Community Links across Scotland. Key to Community Links is that they are used for purposeful trips (so are not long-distance routes). Recent calculations have shown that the Benefit:Cost ratios for Community Links schemes have ranged from 2:1 to 9.5:1.</p> <p>JL added that Sustrans also delivers cycling infrastructure improvements through some elements of maintenance, street design projects and other projects such as Connect2 and the cycle parking grant.</p> <p>JL noted that there is other cycle infrastructure development outwith Sustrans, such as that delivered through other programmes including Smarter Choices, Smarter Places as well as those funded and delivered directly through local and regional government.</p> <p>JL added insight into assembly of funding to deliver cycling infrastructure. JL noted that Cycling Walking and Safer Streets (CWSS) funding is integral as the foundation for delivering infrastructure investment. It is used not only to apply for external funding, but also to make the case for internal capital budgets. JL noted that most local authorities do rely on CWSS, and without it some would not take cycling forward.</p> <p>AJ opened the floor to questions.</p> <p>PH asked about the linkages with core paths and relationship of Sustrans with core paths, particularly maintenance of core paths.</p> <p>JL noted that where there is overlap of core paths and cycle paths there is an agreement to upgrade mutually, including working with charities that help in delivery such as Paths for All.</p> <p>TF questioned whether people do want segregated routes; or whether it would be more beneficial to focus on providing more space on the roads (e.g., Advanced Stop Lines) and enforcement.</p> <p>JL noted that there is evidence, for example through</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the development of CAPS, that those who want to cycle want safe and predictable routes. The places which have succeeded in getting more people on bicycles provide segregated facilities where they are needed. JL added that this does not mean facilities are segregated everywhere, but the aspiration is to have segregated facilities where they are needed.</p> <p><i>Please see hand-out from JL attached to minutes for further information and detail.</i></p> <p>HT noted that Community Links are almost exclusively urban in focus, but accident statistics show that there is an increase in cycling casualties on rural roads. JL clarified that when referring to 'urban' this does include villages and towns in more rural settings.</p> <p>DB asked, in a perfect world, where should large amounts of funding be spent and what is the role of this funding. JL said that local authorities and regional transport partnerships are the key vanguard of delivery and that to-date, schemes have tended to be smaller scale and act as 'pilots'; however, with larger pots of funding there is an opportunity to implement larger scale schemes to show what can be done.</p> <p>In relation to JL's briefing, DdF noted that the Trunk Road Cycle Budget should also be added as a source of funding.</p> <p>DdF also added that, through the research Spokes does into cycle funding in Scotland, it is clear that many councils put in little, if any, of their own budget into cycling. In addition, 36% of CWSS funding is required to be put into cycling. DdF followed this up by asking whether there is scope for guidance/rules surrounding the grant-funding to take consideration whether a council's own capital funding is being used and, if so, should these schemes gain a higher priority for access to these match-funding opportunities. JL noted this and said that he is happy to look into it. KF added that the 36% was established a few years ago and they are potentially looking at changing this to better reflect the average across local authorities.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>ACTION:</p> <p>KF/Transport Scotland to look at minimum proportion of spend on cycling as part of CWSS funding.</p> <p>DB asked whether focus should be on smaller projects or on a large exemplar project. AJ and JE noted that there had been discussions amongst the Co-conveners and Deputy Conveners on this subject and CB had suggested that there should be an initiative to establish an exemplar cycling project. JE added that this idea has been communicated to the Minister. AJ added that during the Nordic Horizons event last year, the Danish representative suggested an exemplar project could support wider delivery of cycling infrastructure. CB added that there could be scope to highlight local authorities that are not as committed to cycling to help focus their minds on making good decisions to secure funding, highlighting the need for knowledge to be shared to raise confidence. JL agreed that delivering projects across the board helps develop the knowledge bank of delivering cycling projects across Scotland. DdF noted that an exemplar project could be positive, but warned not to move all funding into an exemplar to ensure that knowledge and experience can continue to be gained across Scotland.</p>	<p>KF/Transport Scotland</p>
<p>4. Cycling Action Plan for Scotland 2013</p>	<p>AJ introduced the topic for discussion and reminded the Cross-Party Group of the Group's purpose: <i>"To raise the profile of cycling within the Scottish Parliament and to promote cycle-friendly policies and priorities."</i></p> <p>IA noted the forthcoming Ministerial Leadership Summit (taking place on 24 September in Edinburgh), which highlights some positive movement with regard to leadership – one of the recommendations in Cycling Scotland's CAPS Progress Report. IA also noted that the National Assessment of Local Authority Cycling Policy will soon be completed and will provide an overview for local authorities attending the Summit.</p>	

	<p>SB added that it is an important step for all local authorities to have assistance to establish strategies. This will allow everyone to have an opportunity to lobby for change during development of the strategies. SB noted the Edinburgh example highlights the importance in lobbying individual councils to impact policy and actions.</p> <p>AJ raised the potential of a cycle champion appointment and suggested a number of options. IA and KF noted that there have been approaches in the past on this subject, so these should be reviewed before any new approaches made. KI noted that if champion(s) is(are) identified, it is important that they do not only represent male sporting-types and rather engage a wider audience (e.g., by including a female outside of sport, etc.).</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>AJ to explore proposal to suggest appointment of Cycle Champion.</p> <p>AJ noted Action 10 relating to Bikeability Scotland and asked IA how this was progressing. IA noted that there is definite progress, but barriers are present through a bottleneck at some local authorities and with some schools. IA added that key to progressing Bikeability Scotland on-road training is delivery at a local level, through the local authority and individual schools. This will be raised at the Ministerial Leadership Summit.</p> <p>JL raised that the increase in funding for capital projects is good news, but there should also be additional funding for behaviour change measures such as Bikeability Scotland, perhaps approaching other government departments that benefit from these programmes as potential sources.</p> <p>AJ linked this to encouraging young people taking up cycling and one such opportunity could be as part of the Commonwealth Games legacy from 2014.</p> <p>CB added that there has been a large increase in membership for Scottish Cycling. Most of this has come from middle-aged males; however, many youth cycling clubs have a waiting list. CB added that</p>	<p>AJ</p>
--	--	-----------

	<p>potential capacity could be gained from focusing on and linking new facilities and facility development, as cycling facilities can be low-cost compared to other sports. CB suggested that this could be done by making cycling more 'acceptable' in certain places, e.g., public parks or in closed-roads circuits.</p> <p>The Group noted that there is concern that children are not able to take part in cycling, and that this should be addressed. PH and DB noted some specific schemes, such as CTC Bike Club and other grassroots projects that support children and young people cycling. CB added the potential in key markets for attracting children and young people to cycling such as BMX and closed-roads circuits.</p> <p><i>Also in this agenda item, the CPG wished to formally note congratulations to Sally Hinchcliffe, Pedal on Parliament, for winning the Sheila McKechnie Foundation (SMK) Transport Campaigner Award.</i></p>	
<p>5. Draft Budget 2014-15</p>	<p>JE introduced this topic and indicated that the recent Draft Budget 2014-15 announcement included £10 million over the next two financial years for cycling infrastructure. The Draft Budget also confirmed the £8.2 million for CWSS in 2014-15. Also, clarity on the cycling budget line has been requested by Patrick Harvie, MSP. JE noted this as definite progress.</p> <p>KF noted that the clarification on the budget line for cycling has been responded to and this letter can be circulated to the CPG.</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>Circulate Cabinet Secretary for Finance's response to Patrick Harvie, MSP query on clarity on cycling within the Draft Budget 2014-15.</p> <p>JE and KF clarified that the £20 million is additional funding. DdF noted that the increase in funding is welcome, but that there should be some scrutiny on the funding proposed for 2015-16 where there is predicted to be a drop in total funding for cycling and active travel when compared to 2014-15. DdF also</p>	<p>NK</p>

	<p>supported the increase on existing funding, but also the focus on an exemplar project with some funding going towards improvements at Leith Walk, Edinburgh, but also potentially through bigger pots of money going to local authorities. DF also noted support from SCOTS for an exemplar project and the improvement of funding for local authorities.</p> <p>DB noted that the £20 million is a step in the right direction, but also called for further increases in funding to reach the 10% as noted in CAPS along with more consistent and clear funding for cycling.</p> <p>KF noted that the £20 million will be matched-funding, so equates to up to £40 million.</p> <p>HT, KI and CHo supported the increase in and budget clarity on funding for cycling but also noted that there needs to be consideration for how the Walking Strategy is funded as well or there may be a similar situation as CAPS where funding does not link to that necessary to deliver on policy.</p> <p>AJ noted the linkages between walking and cycling and the importance of noting the two together as active travel.</p>	
<p>5. Safer Cycling</p>	<p>JE introduced this topic and asked BM to update on the Roadshare/Strict Liability campaign.</p> <p>BM provided a brief overview of the campaign. JE asked what actions would be appropriate for the CPG and how to keep the issue on the agenda for debate.</p> <p>BM noted the research into Strict Liability undertaken by Transport Scotland. KF noted that this research could be circulated if requested.</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>ALL to contact Karen Furey if interested in research evidence compiled by Transport Scotland on Strict Liability.</p> <p>The Group continued to discuss availability of evidence and how Strict Liability sits within the package of measures various countries have used to improve cycling. The Group was in general agreement that the</p>	<p>ALL CPG MEMBERS</p>

	<p>topic should remain a standing item, but further work would be required to establish robust evidence and to ensure that debate continued. AJ and JE both supported development of a debate on the subject of Strict Liability.</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>Highlight issue of Strict Liability in form of a debate in Scottish Parliament.</p> <p>AJ noted that the reception on Strict Liability will be held on 12 December.</p> <p>The Key Reported Road Casualties Scotland 2012 released in June 2013 was noted. DdF noted that despite the declining trend of casualties for overall road users, cycling casualties are increasing. DdF noted that there are potential theories behind this, particularly the increase on rural roads, but noted that there needs to be research on why cycling casualties are increasing. AJ supported further consideration on this at a future meeting.</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>CPG (NK) to include cycling casualty statistics/research as a future topic for the CPG, potentially inviting an expert on the subject (e.g., Malcolm Wardlaw).</p> <p>AJ noted that she had lodged a Parliamentary Question regarding the Nice Way Code Campaign. In addition, AJ received a response from the Minister on queries on the Nice Way Code.</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>CPG (NK) to distribute Parliamentary Questions and answers and Letter from the Minister regarding the Nice Way Code.</p> <p>IA noted that the Nice Way Code was currently being independently evaluated and the report on this would be due back in October/November 2013. IA noted that feedback would be provided to partners and stakeholders and that this could be presented to the CPG at the next meeting.</p>	<p>AJ</p> <p>CPG (NK)</p> <p>CPG (NK)</p>
--	--	---

	<p>JL noted that not only should discussion at the next meeting cover lessons learnt on the campaign itself, but lessons from across the board for all members of the CPG, particularly with regard to issues surrounding communication. JL and IA highlighted the need of duty of care to the staff of their organisations in relation to this.</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>Cycling Scotland/partners to present the Nice Way Code Evaluation Report at the next CPG meeting</p>	<p>IA / Cycling Scotland</p>
7. AOB	<p>HT noted the recent report and research into level crossings undertaken jointly by the Law Commission and Scottish Law Commission.</p>	
8. Date of Next Meeting	<p>JE noted that the next meeting will be on Tuesday, 3 December at Scottish Parliament.</p>	