

[CycleSheffield response to the Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy \(CWIS\)](#)

CycleSheffield is a constituted organisation run by volunteers with over 500 members in Sheffield.

We are responding on behalf of our membership, based upon:

- our understanding of the real economic, health and social benefits of cycling and walking,
- our understanding that the lack of safe, segregated cycling routes is the greatest barrier to everyday cycling in a busy city with increasing traffic congestion, parked-up cycle lanes and tram tracks, and that this barrier is most significant to women, ethnic minorities and older people
- our frustration with the ongoing difficulties faced by Sheffield City Council in delivering high quality cycling and walking infrastructure, and
- our desire to see fundamental improvement in our urban landscape.

We are pleased to see that authors of CWIS understand:

- the need to actively encourage cycling and walking, in particular as an alternative to private cars for commuting, school runs and other local journeys
- this modal shift will not happen without the provision of infrastructure, and active intervention to move people from cars to walking and cycling
- that with adequate infrastructure and active encouragement, modal shift can be achieved.

We believe that the proposed CWIS needs substantial change. Without the changes we are proposing the CWIS will be ineffective, wasteful and potentially dangerous.

Conversely, if properly defined and followed through, CWIS will transform the shape and usage of public space in cities across the UK, and the health and wellbeing of our nation. This is our ambition.

Our responses to the questions posed in the consultation document are attached below. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these to achieve a better Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy.

Barry Dobson, Dexter Johnson, Tony Polly, Sam Wakeling

CycleSheffield

Question 1 - The Government would be interested to hear views on the approach and actions set out in section 8 of this strategy

The strategy, approach and actions proposed in CWIS will fail:

- They will not deliver the transformative change required to raise cycling and walking levels, even to the cautious targets set in the consultation paper.
- The approach is wasteful of effort and introduces risks for cyclists and walkers which could and should be avoided.

We say this because:

CWIS does not demonstrate the leadership, or the 'change in attitude... in central Government' which it rightly identifies as necessary for transforming change. Leadership is setting precise direction and targets, ensuring that necessary resources are made available and taking responsibility for both actions and their consequences.

CWIS does not provide the financial resources that are required to implement safe and attractive routes for cycling and walking.

Current funding levels are insufficient to develop, deliver and maintain the infrastructure we require in the UK. The funding streams in the Strategy are not new, and much of the funds are restricted to the 8 Cycle Ambition Cities. Little or no ring-fenced additional funding is being made available.

CWIS refers to the Local Growth Fund, from which Local Authorities may choose to fund Cycling and Walking Infrastructure. We believe this is misleading (and unlikely) since Local Authorities will understandably wish to make more direct investment in the local economy, and it must also be considered in the wake of the ongoing austerity-driven cuts to Local Government funding.

(As a consequence those cities with greatest need to invest in economic growth, by definition the less affluent cities, and usually with high populations of under-represented groups, will be the least likely to invest in cycling and walking. This will deny the benefits of cycling and walking to those most in need of them.)

CWIS proposes an approach to the development of design standards that wasteful of effort and potentially dangerous. In the absence of central guidance and control there is already ongoing and wide disparity in the style and quality of cycling infrastructure being delivered in different cities, even those in receipt of Cycle City funding. The development of

design standards separately by each Local Authority duplicates infrastructure design costs many times. It leads to local variants of road layouts which visiting users do not understand, resulting in serious risks for cyclists, walkers and motorists. This will in time lead to traffic solutions being re-developed and re-deployed.

The Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Strategy should include the following:

1: A government body should be fully accountable and responsible for delivering modal shift from private motor vehicles to public transport, cycling and walking. This body should set and monitor specific targets for all Local Authorities, DfT and Highways Authority for the delivery of Cycling- and Walking- friendly Infrastructure and open spaces. It should also implement the measures proposed in the CWIS proposal for sharing best practice in the implementation of infrastructure and making behavioural change.

2: A unified national Outdoor Space Standards Group should be set up, to bring together and develop:

- design standards for Cycling and Walking Infrastructure, ensuring that these recognise and cater for the needs of people who are blind or have disabilities
- minimum requirements for Walking- and Cycling- friendly facilities to be provided at transport interchanges, places of education, leisure facilities (including retail centres), and work-places,
- design criteria for public open spaces to be applied to all new developments and redevelopments to deliver spaces fit for walking and cycling.

3: Priority should be given to Cycling and Walking Infrastructure investment within Transport funding.

The DfT Paper 'Value for Money Assessment for Cycling Grants', published in August 2014, concludes that investments in Cycling have delivered a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of 5.5, with benefits of £5.50 for every £1 spent, which *'provides further confirmation that **targeted investment into cycling can bring very strong returns to society***'. Many of these tangible benefits are associated with improved health. In contrast, the BCR for HS2, which cost £43Bn, is 2.3.

The investment needed to deliver high quality Cycling and Walking Infrastructure throughout the UK is significant and much greater than is currently available. Our crude estimate to provide every city in the UK with Dutch-quality Cycling Infrastructure is £2.0 Bn per year for 10 years*. This level of funding should be ring-fenced centrally and made

available to Local authorities specifically and solely for the deployment of such infrastructure.

* To provide Sheffield with primary cycle routes might cost up to £300M (based on 20 radial cycle routes, averaging 15km in length and using an estimated cost of £1M per km), plus the cost of making cycle-friendly the roads and streets accessing these routes, let us estimate a further £100M, totalling £400M. Assume 30 cities of this size and 40 of half this size, and the bill will be £20Bn. Over a 10 year period this amounts to c £30 per person per year across the UK which is of the same order as the Dutch investment.

We have not included in this estimate the additional requirement for Cycling and Walking Infrastructure in towns and villages.

Further funding may be required for inter-city/inter-town cycle routes if a high quality national cycle network is required.

Local Enterprise Partnerships funding of Walking and Cycling infrastructure from the Local Growth fund, persuaded by plans drawn up by their Local Authority following DfT guidelines, will lead at best to partial and inconsistent deployment. We believe the provision will be least and worst where it is most needed.

Specific budget should be set aside by the DfT to fund Local Authorities to deliver Cycling and Walking Infrastructure. Allocation of the funds to Local Authorities should be initially dependent upon the development of an acceptable Cycling and Walking Plan; release of these funds should be dependent upon the deployment of infrastructure in accordance with that plan. Directly in line with the intent to modal shift, Cycling and Walking Infrastructure spending should take priority over funding other modes of transport.

4: Obligations should be placed on Local Authorities to develop Cycling and Walking plans in line with the standards specified by the Outdoor Space Standards Group, and to deliver in line with their plans.

5: The ongoing modal shift towards use of private motor vehicles for commuting, local journeys and school-runs should be addressed; Recognising that once the hurdle of car purchase is crossed, the marginal cost of its use is often less than public transport, the quality of the vehicle is determined by the owner, and it is more convenient to use.

Measures are likely to include:

- Public transport with quality, price and frequency profile that competes effectively with a private car for local and long-distance journeys. There is an implication of subsidy in the short/medium term.
- Extended application of congestion charging, in particular where there is limited road-space or where air quality is compromised.
- Supporting the development of economic, high-quality and convenient self-service car rental facilities to reduce the need for car ownership.
- Mandatory provision of secure cycle parking, lockers and shower facilities by employers and schools. Financial incentives to provide these.

We would like to emphasise that high quality, frequent and reasonably priced public transport is absolutely necessary to achieve a modal shift towards walking and cycling.

Consideration should be given to the establishment of a facility in one of our Universities to develop and share practical approaches to encourage walking and cycling and to drive modal shift.

6: Projects should be set up to apply a co-ordinated multi-disciplinary approach to developing cycling and walking among key populations, based on travelling to a particular **destination** - for example a school or an employer.

The target of these projects should be >50% participation. Each project should understand and address all issues which deter people from walking and cycling to that destination, including actual and perceived safety on routes, availability/reliability of cycles, cycling ability/confidence, safe and dry storage of cycles and luggage, image and cultural issues. There may be specific interventions to support low participation and excluded groups, for example it may be necessary to provide segregated changing areas or access to low-cost or free bicycles.

Question 2 The Government would be interested to hear views on the potential roles of national government departments, local government, other public bodies, businesses and the voluntary sector in delivering the strategy and what arrangements could best support partnership working between them.

CWIS is inherently divisive and dilutes the responsibility for change. Ambition is set by Government but the responsibility for delivery (and therefore blame for failure) is devolved to Local Government. Without adequate funding, cycling infrastructure is unlikely to be delivered, and where it is this will be at the expense of other local priorities.

The government must take on the leadership role defined in our response to Question 1. Local Authorities may be devolved responsibility for delivering the Strategy, providing the resources and co-ordination are made available. We anticipate a combination of Local Government, Private Sector and Voluntary Sector organisations would be involved in the delivery of different initiatives.

Question 3 The Government would be interested to hear suggestions and evidence of innovative projects and programmes which could be developed to deliver the objectives outlined in Section 4

CycleSheffield has, in partnership with Sheffield City Council, initiated a Schools Exemplar Project like the one proposed in bullet point 6 of our response to Question 1, with which we intend to deliver game-changing levels of cycling participation. We anticipate this project running in 2016/17.

We are considering a similar scheme with a Private-sector employer.

Direct funding to help us deliver and extend these schemes, potentially in collaboration with one of our Universities, would be welcome. We believe this approach is particularly applicable to the issue raised in Question 4.

Question 4 The Government would be interested to hear your views on how to increase cycling and walking in typically under-represented groups (for example women, older people, or those from black, Asian or minority ethnic backgrounds)

We believe that any overall approach to increase utility (rather than leisure and sporting) walking and cycling will benefit the population as a whole, but we recognise that there are sectors of our society who are less likely to walk and cycle than others.

We think it is important to understand the reasons for lower participation in physical exercise in under-represented groups before attempting to increase participation; Research suggests religious and cultural reasons can be important. Tailored local intervention schemes, involving the participants in design and implementation, are more likely to address the true barriers, and may be more successful.

Research also suggests that the reason for the gap in participation rates may be attributable to the 'lower' socioeconomic status of black, Asian or minority ethnic background communities. Research supported by the British Heart Foundation (Withall 2011) into low levels of participation among low income groups *'suggests that some factors such as cost, the fear of 'walking in alone', accessibility of facilities, and appropriate communication strategies may be of particular importance to increasing recruitment of low income groups. Interventions targeting this group should consider low cost sessions and childcare; activities*

popular with the target group and associated with good recruitment and retention; sessions held at accessible times; a focus on fun and socialising; well-researched and designed communications strategies; targeting of friendship groups; clearly branded beginners' sessions, and the potential of social marketing as strategies.'

'Destination-driven' projects, like the Exemplar Projects we are proposing for schools and employers in Sheffield, offer this opportunity to tailor the approach to participants, and with their involvement in the design of their scheme. Candidate destinations might include social centres, play groups and places of worship as well as schools and employers.

Question 5 The Government would be interested to hear views on what type of assistance Local Authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships would find beneficial to support development of ambitious and high standard Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans

This is dealt with in response to Question 1, but in summary,

Local Authorities need the government to provide:

- Sufficient long-term funding specifically for the delivery and maintenance of Cycling and Walking Infrastructure
- An obligation to develop and deliver upon a Cycling and Walking plan
- Design Standards for Cycling and Walking Infrastructure
- Minimum requirements for facilities to support walkers and cyclists
- Powers to mandate good quality, frequent and economic public transport
- Powers to implement congestion charging
- Planning rules to enforce development of walking- and cycling- friendly places of work, schools, leisure facilities etc.

Withall, J, [Fox, KR & Jago, RP](#) 2011, 'Why some do but most don't. Barriers and enablers to engaging low-income groups in physical activity programmes: a mixed methods study' *BMC Public Health*, vol 11, pp. 507