

This submission is on behalf of the Road Danger Reduction Forum by Dr Robert Davis. Information about the history and objectives of the RDRF can be found on our web site www.rdrf.org.uk .

Below our points are made with reference to the questions posed by APPGCW.

- **Targets.** Are the existing targets for cycling and walking consistent with getting transport on course to reach net zero by 2050? More specifically, do we need a new walking target for 2025, and do any other targets need to be revised or added?

We note the targets made by Government in [Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk) for **half of all journeys in towns and cities to be made by Active Travel (henceforth AT) by 2030**. This is a reiteration of the targets made in “Gear Change” and repeated by the Minister since then. This target should be the headline target with relevant milestones set by all Highway Authorities (HAs) with urban areas under their control. This headline target is the central one around which transport planning of all kinds – not just that specifically related to AT – should be directed. HAs that do not publish in CWIS2 or other documents plans realistically based on achieving the headline target should know that there will be claw back not just of funds specifically directed at AT, but of all funds from Government, including from Highways England.

- **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?

The consensus we see is that funding for AT schemes should be approximately quadrupled to £8 billion by 2030. However, it would be possible for half of this money to be spent after 2030 to provide genuinely world class walking and cycling networks. The principal issues are (a) to ensure that all schemes are compliant with Local Transport Note 1/20 and (b) that funding does not go to competing modes.

- **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?

Active Travel England has a role which is central to the fulfilment of Government objectives. We believe the senior posts at ATE should be salaried at c.£160,000 to indicate the seriousness of the role, and to attract high calibre candidates.

ATE officers at all levels must be experienced highway engineers, or transport planners, and others with an understanding and experience of Direct Support for Cycling schemes (see below).

ATE should have at least 20 (or equivalent full time) Field Officers who will each monitor developments in approximately 20 HAs to check that appropriate measures are taken to achieve the headline target, both in submission of ATF and CWIS2 bids and also with regard to other transport planning and highway engineering decisions.

- **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?

My suggestion is that once appropriate funding is secured, approximately 25% should be directed at Direct Support for Cycling (DSC) schemes.

DSC funding should ONLY be allocated to those Local Authorities that have made an obvious and successful commitment to installing LTN 1/20 compliant infrastructure schemes. DSC can NOT be used as an alternative to implementing good quality cycle and walking friendly infrastructure.

DSC refers to programmes trialled by some LAs in England such as London Borough of Ealing 2001 – 2013.

DSC programmes include:

1. Good quality on-road cycle training for children, adults and families up to Bikeability Level 3, with the aim of building confidence and teaching cyclists their rights and responsibilities.
2. Secure and convenient home storage/parking, including that off the public highway.
3. Schemes designed to provide people on low incomes with accessible roadworthy bicycles, often including support for pop-up cycle maintenance centres, bike recycling and similar schemes such as Cycling UKs “Big Bike Revival”.
4. Provision of cycle maintenance teaching programmes.
5. Partnerships with local roads police to encourage 3rd party reporting of offences by cyclists.
6. Provision of roadworthy bicycles and accessories for those on low incomes.

7. Support for local bicycle retailers if necessary to provide adequate supply of bicycles and accessories (if necessary, 2nd hand) in the event of supply problems such as those due to the current COVID-19 pandemic.

It must be emphasised that DSC is NOT any kind of alternative to provision of good quality infrastructure and funding should be dependent on progress in this area.

- **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?

This is an absolutely critical area. We note that many of the objections to LTNs, cycle schemes and other areas are based on nothing less than dangerous bigotry. Many prejudices, such as those surrounding the non-existent “road tax”, driver licensing and other ideas which may give drivers false ideas about their rights and responsibilities and the rights and responsibilities of people walking and cycling, are widespread and impede the progress to Government’s objectives.

Ideally such prejudices could be tackled by good quality driver training. However the objectives of driving instructors are essentially about securing successful driving licence acquisition. Similarly, effective road safety programmes could and should have spread knowledge about the legal rights of people and walking.

However, due to the failure of both sets of professionals, and the consequent long term prejudice against cyclists in particular and also objectively against pedestrians, it is necessary to have a radical launch of programmes making the well being of AT users and the necessity of far higher levels of AT for society’s requirements.

This launch should be based on a wholesale change in the programmes offered to members of the public in general, and drivers in particular. It will be closely associated with a launch of roads policing based on the principles of Road Danger Reduction (reducing danger at its source, namely the inappropriate use of motor vehicles), and featuring widespread use of 3rd party reporting, policing of close passing of cyclists, pavement parking etc.

These changes are required basically to enforce existing road traffic law and the principles underlying the Highway Code (and should have been introduced already). There is an additional need for initiatives of this type if we are to see the Government’s objectives achieved.

ROAD DANGER REDUCTION FORUM SUBMISSION on CWIS2 to APPGCW 16th July 2021

- **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?

See previous section. There is a clear need to reach out to prospective cyclists to provide support as in DSC programmes.

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

The central requirement is direction from Government on the need to reduce motor vehicle usage. Note statements such as "Our path to net zero transport" which contains "We will use our cars differently and less often" and "Public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities" ([Decarbonising transport: a better, greener Britain \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk)). This message needs to be backed up by a review of RIS2 showing a commitment to reducing car usage.

These are the principal suggestions we have with regard to CWIS2 and I hope they are considered by APPGCW.

Dr Robert Davis, 16th July 2021