

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the University. Do not click on any links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

From: Adrian Berendt <adrian.berendt2@gmail.com>

Sent: 13 July 2021 17:27

To: COFFMAN, Adam <coffmana@parliament.uk>

Cc: Gary Outram <gazonabike@yahoo.co.uk>; DuncanEdwards152 <duncanedwards152@gmail.com>; Scott Purchas <scott.purchas@twbug.org.uk>; Paul Mason <paul.mason@twbug.org.uk>

Subject: Submission to APPGCW re CWIS2

I have pleasure in submitting a response on behalf of Kent Active Travel Campaign Group Network.

[Reaching our active travel potential - All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group](#)

Questions

We set out below the questions on which we would welcome written submissions. You are invited to address as many or as few as you wish and/or to range beyond them in your response.

-
-
- **Overall level of funding.**
- What level of funding is required to meet the Government's targets for increased cycling and walking by 2025 and 2030, and/or any new targets we may propose?

Our Comments

-
-
- We need a funding formula commensurate with ambitions. For example, the Dutch are spending
- around £35 per person per annum (excluding bike parking, funded separately). Nationally we will need to spend more than that in order to catch up. Here in Kent, we spent around £6 per resident in the last financial year. For context, this compares with a
- single roundabout in Kent which is costing £75 per resident.
-
-

-
- Funding streams need to be long term to enable councils to organise themselves for delivery,
- public consensus to be developed and for schemes to be really effective. This would create a cycle of success.
-
-
-
- It is not the level of funding alone, but the way the funding is structured - small amounts
- announced annually with tight deadlines for bidding. Kent County Council was obliged to reject many schemes promoted by local district councils because it did not have capacity to process the bids nor deliver them in time. We need local authorities to have
- certainty about funding over the long term and for cycling infrastructure to be integrated with planning for all road schemes.
-
-
-
- Targets are good but our local authorities do not have sufficient revenue funding to develop
- long-term, practical delivery plans for delivering active travel.
-
-
-
- Like many places in the country, road space in Kent towns is constrained and the potential
- to increase capacity for motor vehicles is either limited or doesn't exist. Together with integration with public transport, cycling and walking for local journeys is a much more efficient use of the limited space available and offers a realistic solution
- to what is currently an intractable problem.

-
-
- **Capacity.**
- Do local authorities and other bodies have the capacity and skills needed to spend the funding allocations required to meet the Government's targets (or any new ones)? If not, how can this

capacity be boosted, and how quickly can CWIS spending be ramped up?

- What should be the role of Active Travel England? What resources will it need to fulfil this role?

Our Comments

-
-
- Not in our experience. Like many local authorities, KCC has neither the capacity nor sufficiently
- developed skills to deliver high quality cycling infrastructure. The scarce resources that do exist are often diverted to road building schemes that do not include cycling or walking infrastructure.
-
-
-
- Active Travel England should focus on educating highways engineers and monitoring local
- active travel plans to ensure that highways authorities can plan and deliver LTN1/20 compliant infrastructure as an integral part of their highways work. Monitoring to ensure best practice is celebrated.
-
-
-
- Capacity can be boosted by (1) ensuring revenue funding is available to local authorities
- for longer-term planning (2) by engaging with local active travel advocacy groups and similar and (3) intensive education to these groups to ensure that their local knowledge combines most efficiently with delivery of appropriate infrastructure.

-
-
- **Breakdown of funding.**
- What should CWIS 2 funding be spent on – i.e. what programmes or initiatives should be funded? How much capital and how much revenue? How much of this capital and revenue should go to

transport/highway authorities, to Active Travel England, to the voluntary

- sector, to Highways England and HS2 Ltd, etc, and how much should be spent by government directly? How can government maximise the opportunities for its funding allocations to leverage in additional funding from other sources?

Our Comments

-
-
- Overall funding could be allocated as a proportion of roads funding in line with the ambitions
- for modal share. For example, a local authority that wants to achieve a modal share of 10% could expect sufficient funding for active travel to achieve that 10% share within, say, 10 years.
-
-
-
- Local Authorities should not be expected to deliver any road schemes, other than those that
- benefit active or sustainable travel.
-
-
-
- Leveraging funding from other sources should be done by integration between transport modes
- including public transport.
-
-
-
- While developer contributions are important, they are never sufficient to deliver the required
- change in infrastructure to enable a significant modal shift. They are often limited to providing (for example) inadequate on-site bike parking. Developer contributions need to be either increased or re-targetted to ensure that access by active travel mode
- from the new development to nearby services is a reality for everyone.
-
-
-

- Our experience of local travel plans is that they are largely boilerplate and a waste of
- time in respect of active travel as they contain no SMART targets and are never delivered.

-
-

- **Public and political acceptability.**
- The extensive and widely reported opposition to schemes such as low-traffic neighbourhoods emphasises that interventions promoting walking and cycling are often controversial. How can consensus be built both nationally and locally to support the action required?

Our Comments

-
-
- The crucial role of government is communicating and disseminating good quality effective
- information, similar to the introduction of seatbelts and the more stringent rules on drink driving. From speaking to people locally, we find similar views to those in national surveys: a large proportion would like to walk and cycle more but don't due to
- safety concerns. We also see uninformed, aggressive and well-coordinated responses to active travel initiatives from a vocal minority on social media sites, such as NextDoor and Facebook.

-
-

- **Behaviour change.**
- The pandemic has shown how flexible people's travel behaviour is in certain circumstances. What combination of schemes and policies will provide the basis for a substantial and lasting shift towards active travel?

Our Comments

-
-
- Provide good quality segregated safe cycle infrastructure alongside all road schemes. Our
- experience in Kent is that even recent schemes do not adhere to LTN 1/20.
-
-
-
- In common with many Local Authorities, Tunbridge Wells Borough Councils relies on car parking
- as its main source of income. This means that it has a financial interest in encouraging motor vehicles. Changing the local district funding model to ensure that such councils don't rely on town centre parking charges as being an important source of revenue would be a good start.
-
-
-
- Gravesham Borough Council offers a town centre parking permit to those that work in town,
- subsidising those that drive, but with no similar subsidy for those that walk, cycle or use public transport. Government could make it easier for local authorities to incentivise sustainable and active travel, rather than driving, through schemes such as
- ULEZ, Congestion Charging, road pricing, Workplace Parking Levy, etc.

-
-
- **Wider policy support.**
- What else do DfT and other government departments need to be doing in order to maximise the impact of CWIS 2?

Our Comments

-
-

- Make all funding contingent upon an LCWIP, which has been written to a high standard.

-
-

- **Walking as much as cycling.**
- The differences between the two modes are significant and cycling has been shown easier to “cater to” than walking. How can CWIS 2 exploit the shared characteristics of walking and cycling whilst at the same time ensuring that both modes receive appropriate
- attention and emphasis?

Our Comments

-
-
- Walking needs to be positioned as a transport mode in transport planning. The same criteria
- of safety and convenience need to be applied to walking infrastructure as to cycling infrastructure. E.g., when Highways Authorities make lane rental charges, this often leads to pavements being used by developers in order to avoid the levy.

-
-

- **Levelling up.**
- How can CWIS 2 assist with the delivery of the levelling-up agenda? In particular, what can be done to correct the pattern that councils with a strong track record in active travel receive disproportionately large shares of the funding?

Our Comments

-
-

- It is much easier to own and use a bike if you live in a semi-detached house in the suburbs
- than it is if you live in a flat in the town centre. Safe secure cycle parking is crucial.
-
-
-
- Councils with a strong track record are good at delivery (by definition). We need an intensive
- programme of education for those councils that (1) do not have the skills or (2) lack the knowledge to give political support in order to make them equally as good.
-
-
-
- Our local experience is that, as well as underfunding, the problem is the lack of holistic
- solutions. Bits of poorly designed infrastructure, insecure bike parking in the wrong places etc

-
-
- **Justice and inclusion.**
- Walking and cycling are the most accessible modes of transport but the profile of those travelling by these modes does not reflect this. How can the priorities of justice and inclusion be “baked in” to CWIS 2?

Our Comments

-
-
- The experience of those in Kent is that it’s mostly the brave, young and male that cycle,
- compared with places such as London, where the right infrastructure brings more diversity.

-
-

- **Decarbonising transport.**

- Given the extraordinary contribution active travel can make to tackling the climate emergency, how should CWIS 2 be positioned within transport and wider climate policy? More specifically, how should CWIS 2 fit with the anticipated transport decarbonisation plan?

Our Comments

-
-
- When we speak to local people, they say that they want to make a difference to climate change and air quality and that they want to be fitter and healthier. The main barriers that they give to using a bike to get around this are (1) safety / lack of cycling infrastructure and (2) convenience of motor vehicles. With personal transport being one of the biggest choices they can make, we need to deliver the support and the right infrastructure to make that the easier choice .

-
-
- **The relationship between central and local government.**
- Given that most “on the ground” delivery will fall to local government whilst funding and oversight will lie at the centre, how can CWIS 2 provide successful mechanisms to support this? What can be done to support transport/highway authorities that may not have a strong record in promoting walking and cycling?

Our Comments

-
-
-

-
-
- **Programme and project management.**
- Complex programmes require skilled management and certainty about funding. How can CWIS 2 help to create a culture of successful planning and delivery of investment?

Our Comments

-
-
- By making active travel infrastructure a design criteria that has to be encompassed in any
- development or road scheme. Our experience in Kent is that active travel is often an afterthought. This is not helped by the fact that the planning authority is the local district council and transport planning is a county council responsibility. The county
- council is limited to commenting on whether the incremental impact of each development would significantly impact local road infrastructure. It cannot object on the basis of a lack of active travel infrastructure.

.

--

Best wishes

Adrian

07767 664 999

Twitter @adrianberendt1

UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.