

## SUPPLEMENTARY WRITTEN EVIDENCE FROM PEDAL ON PARLIAMENT

We write with regard to Deputy First Minister Nicola Sturgeon's evidence to the ICI committee on 7 November 2012. While we welcome her reaffirmation that the government is committed to the target of 10% of journeys by bike by 2020, we remain concerned that the government is not matching that commitment with the funding that **all** Scottish cycling organisations agree is necessary to meet the target. We appreciate that the budget overall is fixed but we wish to emphasise that, contrary to Ms Sturgeon's evidence, we did explain where the money could come from, and how this would further economic growth, save lives and also contribute to health targets.

In our budget submission, under the heading '**How can this be afforded?**', we wrote:

1. Building roads creates traffic; building cycling infrastructure creates cyclists. Road widening and road building programmes can only bring about short-term cuts in congestion at best whereas investing in cycling infrastructure creates a lasting legacy. We therefore feel that increasing road capacity should be a last resort when considering spending priorities to tackle congestion.
2. Dangerous roads do not necessarily have to be widened to make them safer. Expensive projects like dualling the A9 are often justified by the number of lives saved through collisions avoided. Yet recent evidence shows that average speed cameras are extremely effective at reducing accidents at a fraction of the cost. In fact the Transport Scotland report that on the A77 average speed cameras alone have resulted in a reduction of deaths annually by 60% and casualties by 40%. A recent report by the A9 Safety group also backs the use of average speed cameras on the A9. Trying average speed cameras first, and road widening only as a last resort, would free up significant money for investment in active travel. Smart, targeted road improvements such as overtaking lanes can also result in reduced casualties and lives saved for fractions of the cost.
3. Electric cars, even those powered entirely from renewable resources, do nothing to reduce congestion, nor do they encourage active travel and despite subsidies have not been widely taken up in Scotland. They are currently only really practical for short journeys – exactly the sort of trips that could be done by bike. We believe that money spent subsidising both their purchase and the development of charging infrastructure would be better spent on cycling instead.

Further, our response to the CAPS suggested making 20mph speed limits the default for places where people live, work and shop. This would also significantly reduce the cost of making our towns safer, freeing up the CWSS budget for additional measure. As the government's own research has shown, the majority of Scots do not want to cycle if it means mixing with fast and heavy traffic. **If 10% of journeys are to be made by bike, then a coherent, well-designed and well-implemented cycling network needs to be put in place as a matter of urgency**

We hope this corrects the impression the Deputy First Minister has made that we have not made any suggestions as to where the funding could be found. We would be very happy to discuss this further if necessary.