

Good Evening,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to belatedly respond to the CWIS - it is something which means so much to me even though I am aware it is for Professional groups input from those who walk/cycle/PT in their own lives is crucial.

My responses therefore are as a layperson who lives in Chiswick and not owning a car but when I did for the last 20 years of ownership used it as little as possible preferring to walk/cycle use PT (trains for journeys outside of London).

At 68 I have experienced the exponential rise in car ownership - esp 2nd cars and use of those for the school run not to mention deliveries either by van, motorbike or moped such that walking has become unpleasant and those with cars simply drive instead.

Targets:

As a layperson I cannot say whether the existing targets are on course to reach net zero by 2050 but a) even if so this is far too late and b) judging by the amount of work which has to be undertaken to get even small (by comparison with country-wide) schemes consulted on, agreed, funded and even built/created I would say absolutely not. I speak as someone who not only cycles locally but in to the Surrey Hills, the Chilterns and West to Berks.

I also spend at least 3 months of the year in The Netherlands as my partner is Dutch so when I visit it is a local and not a visitor.

I would not separate a walking target from a cycling target in infrastructure terms as the safer/nicer/easier it is to cycle the infinitely pleasanter it becomes to walk as long as the streetscene is designed to make it an aspiration - eg with benches to sit on esp for elderly or those who live solo.

Overall Level of Funding:

The current funding of £2billion over 5 years for the entire country and for both walking/cycling is simply not aspirational enough. The current infrastructure is such that it requires many more £billions to be spent every year to even achieve the bare bones of what would increase cycling/walking enough to achieve the targets.

It needs to be a per capita amount until we are at cycling levels as seen in the Netherlands - although driving kilometers there is actually far greater than here for long journeys, short journeys are much higher %age wise esp for older women and school children and students.

Capacity:

No - LAs and other bodies are too fragmented in skill base, experience and funding - not to mention Political Will where one Council will have Officers dedicated to Cycling/Walking but so many Councils do not. In some Councils many Councillors perceive members of other Councillors of cycling groups (eg Cycling UK and London Cycling Campaign) as making them biased. It is time to make cycling completely non-political such that Councillors make a Political Football out of it. Many Councillors will not support Cycling for fear of not being re-elected - this is nonsense and only when it is changed that every single Council/Borough/Parish has to include cycling in its Travel Strategy with specifically trained officers that Gear Change/Cycling/Walking Strategy will see the light of day. I have read many a Council's Strategy Report going back years only to see nothing acted upon for lack of either expertise or because of the 4yr turnaround in Councils.

The role of Active Travel England must be to set minimum levels of recruitment of cycling/walking officers and a funding stream which has to be spent with engineering designs set by experts in Walking/Cycling.

Only when these schemes are built for the benefit of those on foot or 2 wheels rather than bolted on to motor vehicle infra can it succeed. Far too often a safe cycle scheme stops exactly where it gets

dangerous such that those who would cycle/walk are too intimidated to do so.

#### Breakdown of Funding:

One key change has to be that Councils do not have to bid for funds against other Boroughs/Councils - eg as with Mini-Holland Schemes - every single village/town/city must have pro rata funding and with designs which come from an overall strategy to make cycling/walking the go to mode of transport. Eg in NL there are bi-directional cycle lanes in the middle of nowhere running parallel to A Rds to enable people to choose to cycle from one town to another rather than drive.

Eg think Windsor to Eton - flat and approx 3 miles each way - perfectly doable given the right layout. Currently only those who cycle already do it. With the advent of e-bikes this can become possible for all and all ages/abilities.

What has to be remembered is the infra built is to enable people to cycle and not for those who already do it.

Funding must go in to Planning such that any new housing/workspace has dedicated/secure bike parking with routes to access it - this needs to go in to Planning Law and for every single Borough to adhere to it when developers make applications.

All Rail and Bus Stations must have safe and secure bike parking at low cost.

Currently there are too many agencies fighting for the same funds - specifically in the 'voluntary' sector eg Cycling Uk, LCC, Sustrans, Living Streets - we cannot have these groups competing for the same risible funds when they are all trying to achieve the same thing.

#### Public and Political Acceptability:

As I have said previously once cycling/walking is removed from Politics such that it is cross party and no party can refuse to engage this will die down - esp as the younger generations (in urban and suburban areas) are driving less and less. Consultations are far too costly and the results are often based on a dislike of cycling as it is presented rather than the reality.

#### Behaviour Change:

Car ads need to be banned as smoking was plus more Public information based on every day cycling as the norm.

The law needs to recognise dangerous driving where it has previously be seen as careless and we need Presumed Liability Laws as in Europe. The Ministry of Justice has a key role in this. Driving for private cars should be seen as a privilege and not a right.

#### Wider Policy Support:

DfT needs to be brought in to line with the aspiration of walking/cycling and to change (as is really necessary) many of the now outdated signs and designs - eg Zebras without belishas as in most other countries. 20mph has to be the default speed limit for all residential/shopping areas such that the cost of implementing it reduces and it is properly policed and acted upon.

#### Walking as Much as Cycling:

If you improve cycling then walking benefits intandem as streets become quieter, calmer and cleaner. Current cars are so huge people cannot see round or over them and far too much space is given to them - the more difficult it is to walk places the more (esp) the elderly will stop going out which for mental and physical health is a disaster.

#### Levelling Up:

As I said all Councils must get funding with a standardisation of staffing levels with the right

expertise to spend it properly. Refusing money for a poor scheme simply impacts on those who would cycle/walk - the money can be given on proviso that the schemes are built properly.

#### Justice and Inclusion:

See in other answers - promotional material, stop car advertising and make driving for necessary journeys rather than whim. Include disabled groups who do know the benefits of cycling plus Govt needs to fund bikes which are adapted for use by those who have disabilities - eg hand cycles for those who cannot pedal. This has to be part of building applications too - storage for such.

Train travel has to have cycling as part of the Company's portfolio and properly designed not like the current batch of LNER or GWR trains which are hopeless for all but the fittest with road bikes and no luggage.

#### Decarbonising Transport:

This is a no-brainer and must be in the top tier - e-vehicles are fine for deliveries (tho cargo bikes can be used for last mile) but for private use need to be charged for as per weight and size - to deter purchase and second cars need to be taxed more heavily.

#### Relationship etc:

Look at the Dutch model which seems to be successful - Central funds and Local delivers but with mandated outcomes for uptake.

#### Programme and Proj Management:

We do have very skilled planners and engineers but they are frustrated by not having the money nor the time to deliver the schemes and most schemes are bolted on to existing road infra rather than stand alone and car use is built around it - or not if possible.

In conclusion walking/cycling needs to be seen for the benefits it brings to society in physically, mentally and spending terms. People who walk/cycle are fitter/healthier and often have less mental health problems. Plus although they may spend less per journey they journey more frequently and so spend more overall esp supporting local businesses.

The Streetscene needs to reflect the needs of children and the elderly such that they are safe to travel outside their homes and to be part of society.

As an addendum the real issue is lack of joined up infrastructure - in the same way as roads if people need to cycle from one place to another there has to be continuous cycle lanes. And the main issue with this is when different Counties/Boroughs have different set-ups, different funding etc - that has to change such that it is not a Borough by Borough/County by County issue but country wide or we will never have the take-up required - this is where localised consultations do not work.

Also if residential areas are all access only (not called LTNs which has become a poisonous name) then no need for expensive interventions for either walking or cycling.