

APPG consultation on Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy 2 – 16.7.21

Crawley Borough Council

Kay.Wagland@crawley.gov.uk

1. Modal shift **targets** are likely to be more useful than active travel trips – and possibly more related to journey purpose. It will not be as advantageous for an increase in active travel to be drawn from a drop in public transport use rather than a shift from car use. Utility trips are more important than leisure trips, from a health as well as transport impact. Active mobility is more likely to be undertaken *routinely* for functional transport than for leisure (beyond an initial introduction to active travel). It is not clear that the targets recognise this.
2. Budgets need to be assessed in relation to those allocated to wider road infrastructure. Looking at an LCWIP network for a town like Crawley of 110,000, costing iro £40m to meet LTN1/20 standards when cycle, and (to a lesser extent) walking, infrastructure is starting at a low or non-existent baseline, it is clear that **£2bn isn't going to go very far**. In contrast, continued expansion of an existing, relatively sophisticated road network demands far greater sums with outcomes that rarely meet objectives and frequently undermine active travel, often creating literal barriers to improved active travel outcomes.
3. Local authorities are cut to the bone and have little **capacity** to deliver without additional staff resources. There is also a cultural deficit within LTA Highway departments meaning there is some resistance to prioritising active travel infra and embracing Gear Change principles.
4. CWIS needs to acknowledge the need for upskilling LTA highways engineers. Active Travel England could usefully provide an advice and guidance centre and library that recognises an embedded Highways culture that may struggle with new Active Travel priorities. Funding needs to cover some resources for project development and community engagement.
5. The LCWIP development programme was a good one, if a little complex. West Sussex' atypical model of sharing the DfT support with its districts and borough authorities has been effective in enabling full LCWIP network plans, skills, knowledge and sense of ownership to be developed within several 2nd tier authorities in one hit. Crucially, funding to local planning authorities is needed to ensure land use planning has active travel at its heart in a realistic and practical way rather than as an aspirational principle. This work tends to rely on the LTA response to planning applications. Targeted funds and training for (largely 2nd tier) LPAs could enable more effective S106 leverage and better travel network integration.
6. **Capital for infrastructure** needs to be prioritised as poor safety and functionality are key reasons that people do not cycle, not lack of cycle skills. However, **guidance and training**

should be funded for local policy and delivery officers. Funds for other agencies supporting this work, including non-transport authorities and voluntary sector bodies would be important in developing appropriate and high quality schemes and ensuring working partnerships, such as with local business or other major partners for potentially contentious proposals. Active Travel England needs to be well funded to be a key support for guidance as well as enforcer.

7. **Highways England and HS2** need to raise the bar with their associated active travel infrastructure and see its relevance more widely applied than simply along their routes. Highways England, at least, needs to recognise that active travel access to rail stations and other key destinations away from their road developments and facilities are sometimes not best placed alongside a busy A road if it is to appeal to any other than hardened cyclists. Active Travel England needs to have an overseeing role with the bigger transport infrastructure projects.
8. Fund distribution needs to recognise associated work such as traffic flow modelling for LTNs or other area treatments.
9. Experience in the UK, Netherlands, Belgium and elsewhere shows that **there is always resistance** to change, but this dissipates in the face of effective schemes. A good evidence base for developing schemes, effective community engagement (rather than agreement) and committed political leadership will win over public support. Government campaigns, much in the style of smoking or seatbelt wearing would be useful to help normalise active travel culture and provision of targeted guidance on community engagement and to ensure positive local messages can go a long way. Watered down schemes to accommodate negative community feedback is a massive waste of money and achieves very little.
10. Messaging to LTA council members, who have to give approval for active travel proposals, is key.
11. **Target health organisations.** As large employers, key destination sites and major public influencers they are important, however there is a serious current deficit in 'walking the talk' in the NHS, relative to public health messages. Hospitals and other medical centres are generally have very poor active travel access and there seems to be little organisational engagement in terms of transport planning with local authorities.
12. Talk to authorities and community representatives in Ghent, Groningen, Copenhagen to find out how they did it!
13. We have to stop glamorising cars, particularly in advertising, much in the way that cigarette advertising was restricted. While SUVs are aspirational and their promotion misrepresents reality, particularly by engendering a sense of safety, people will go for them. While infrastructure and messaging favours car use, cars will predominate. Even good cycle infrastructure does not shift people out of their cars while motor vehicle infrastructure is

favourable, witness Stevenage and Milton Keynes. Car demand management and 'locking in' modal shift trends.

14. Review of **highways design rules** to permit infra changes that has been shown to work in other countries, including degrees of flexibility without compromising safety. Sometimes 'safety' considerations are used to block change unnecessarily. Review constraints on use of zebra crossings, signals priority and rigid space standards at junctions amongst many others. Active travel priority and safe, easy active travel sends a better message to achieve behaviour change than exhortations to do the right thing.
15. The importance of wider road network measures being inextricably linked with cycle and walking infra really needs to be highlighted and there is a danger that LTAs simply looking for opportunities to develop cycle routes where there is space and money takes precedence, rather than addressing the whole mobility and access picture in cities, towns and even villages. This means that developing LTNs and 'mini-Hollands' are really key as practical, holistic sets of measures. They need to be promoted with a wider regeneration and healthy neighbourhood approach to engage business and resident communities rather than as simply transport improvements. These neighbourhood measures also need the local understanding and vision that exists at local district and borough planning authority level. Government support and guidance for tools for engagement and messaging would aid this significantly.