



ALL PARTY PARLIAMENTARY  
**CYCLING GROUP**

# **‘Stuck in first gear - the Government’s Cycling Revolution’**

**Report of the Inquiry by the All Party Parliamentary Cycling  
Group into the Government's draft Cycling and Walking  
Investment Strategy - A plan to get Britain Cycling.**

**June 2016**

## **Background Information and Acknowledgements**

This inquiry and response to the Government's draft CWIS was an initiative by the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group (APPCG), a cross party body with members in both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. The aim of this report produced by the officers of the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group was to assess the progress the draft CWIS offers against the 2013 'Get Britain Cycling' report's overall aim of "enabling more people across England to take up cycling, cycle more often and cycle more safely".

The members of the group who served as the inquiry panel were as follows:

### **Co-Chairs**

Ruth Cadbury MP and Alex Chalk MP

### **Panel Members**

Baroness Barker and Fabian Hamilton MP

Lord Berkeley provided advice on the final Report

### **Coordinator**

Adam Coffman

### **Report Authors**

Michael Nattrass and Christopher Peck

This report was published after taking evidence from an expert panel and additional written evidence. The APPCG wishes to thank the contributions offered by: Rachel Aldred, University of Westminster; Chris Boardman, British Cycling; John Forbes, John Forbes Consulting LLP; Roger Geffen, Cycling UK; Lilli Matson, Transport for London; Jason Torrance, Sustrans; and to Robert Goodwill MP, Minister of State with responsibility for cycling and walking, for providing oral evidence and the guarantee this report will contribute to the draft CWIS consultation.

Thanks to the Union Cycliste Internationale for its support.

Published in June 2016 by The All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group (APPCG), House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA.

## Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Executive Summary and Recommendations</b>	<b>4-5</b>
<b>1 Introduction and Inquiry Objectives</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.1</b> Background	<b>6</b>
<b>1.2</b> Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy	<b>7</b>
<b>1.3</b> Focus of this inquiry	<b>8</b>
<b>2 Stronger Ambition</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3 Greater Investment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4 Robust Monitoring of Progress</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5 Improving street design</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6 Safer streets for all road users</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Annex A</b> Timeline of developments in English cycle funding	<b>20</b>
<b>Annex B</b> Progress against the 'Get Britain Cycling' Recommendations	<b>22</b>

## Executive Summary

Following the APPCG's 2013 'Get Britain Cycling' report, the Prime Minister expressed his intention to start a "cycling revolution which will remove the barriers for a new generation of cyclists."<sup>1</sup> This inquiry examines the extent to which the draft Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) issued in March 2016 will be able to meet the Government's stated ambition to "make cycling and walking the natural choice for short journeys" in England.<sup>2</sup>

We welcome the Government's recognition that substantial increases in cycling would provide solutions to a wide range of pressing policy issues, at the same time as creating more liveable and healthy places to live and work. The evidence provided to this inquiry raises concerns about the current levels of funding and ambition outlined in the draft CWIS.

As the renaissance of cycling in other Northern European countries show,<sup>3</sup> substantial increases in cycling can be achieved through long-term commitments to a modal shift towards cycling. To achieve a similar renaissance in England, this report calls for sustained investment combined with a stronger strategic ambition that makes cycling a clear national priority for all levels of government. We look forward to the Department giving careful consideration to the recommendations outlined below that enjoy cross-party support.

Our recommendations:

1. **Strong ambition to "see a cycling revolution."**<sup>4</sup> The Government's proposed target to double cycling trips by 2025 is unambitious.<sup>5</sup> At present, just 2% of trips are taken by bicycle.<sup>6</sup> This compares with nearly 27% in the Netherlands.<sup>7</sup> Government should adopt a national target to increase cycle usage to 10% of all trips by 2025, with the broader aim of matching our European neighbours over the longer term.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prime Minister's Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.

<sup>2</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, pp. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Data from the European Commission (2013) shows significant differences in the percentage of people cycling on a daily basis between EU member states. Unsurprisingly, the lead nations against this benchmark are the Netherlands (43%), Denmark (30%), Finland (28%), Germany (19%), whilst the levels seen in the UK on 4% compare to Spain and Luxembourg. Source: European Commission (2013) Attitudes of Europeans towards urban mobility.

<sup>4</sup> Prime Minister's Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.

<sup>5</sup> Cycling activity for the purpose of this document is defined as a trip. A trip is the basic unit of travel in the National Travel Survey, but the draft CWIS defines cycle activity as a stage to count journeys where cycling is used for part of the journey but not the main form of transport. Source: Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy.

<sup>6</sup> Department for Transport (2015) National Travel Survey, 2014.

<sup>7</sup> Ministerie van Verkeer en Waterstaat (2009) Cycling in the Netherlands.

2. **Greater investment in cycling.** The draft CWIS shows current spending of £6 per head of UK population. With most investment currently taking place in the few Cycle City Ambition Grant cities and London, this leaves the majority of towns and cities across England with limited levels of investment in cycling. The Government should ensure a minimum investment of £10 per person per year rising to £20 per person.
3. **Clear direction that cycling is a national priority.** Local Authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships need stronger direction to ensure that modal shift to cycling is central to their future strategic investments targeting local economic growth and increased wellbeing.
4. **Robust measures to gauge progress nationally and locally.** We welcome the proposed Expert Committee outlined in the draft CWIS, but this needs to be adequately resourced to monitor and benchmark the performance of local partners in implementing the Government's strategy.
5. **Improving quality of cycle infrastructure design.** The Government should do more to disseminate good practice changes in infrastructure design from cities that have invested in good quality cycle facilities, and endorse a single set of national design standards.
6. **Deregulation of street design.** The Government has taken welcome steps to allow more innovative cycle infrastructure to be implemented, but further progress is still required around simplifying many aspects of street design, particularly the layout of pedestrian and cycle crossings.
7. **An updated Highway Code.** In light of recent changes in street design, the Government should give careful consideration to updating the Highway Code to give clearer priority to pedestrians and cyclists, particularly where cycle infrastructure meets side roads.
8. **Action to improve enforcement of traffic laws.** The Government needs to make progress on the promised review of road traffic law<sup>8</sup> to address dangerous and inconsiderate road user behaviour, alongside improved vehicle safety.

---

<sup>8</sup> This was promised on page 15 of the DfT's Cycling Delivery Plan (2014), with a review, led by the Ministry of Justice, supposed to run from 2014-2015, leading to a further review of the Sentencing Guidelines for traffic offences. The President of the APPCG has recently written to the Minister of Justice for assurances of when the review will commence.

## 1 Introduction and Inquiry Objectives

### 1.1 Background

The 'Get Britain Cycling' report, commissioned by the APPCG in 2013, offered 18 recommendations that were seen as essential components for increasing the modal share of cycling to 10% of all trips by 2025. It was clear then, as it is now, that achieving such a target is dependent upon a commitment to invest a minimum of £10 per person per year that should in the longer-term rise to £20 per person.

In August 2013, the Prime Minister outlined his strong desire to initiate a "cycling revolution which would remove the barriers for a new generation of cyclists."<sup>9</sup> To achieve this ambition, the expressed intention of the Prime Minister was to place cycling infrastructure in England "on a level-footing with countries known for higher levels of cycling, like Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands."<sup>10</sup> As part of this announcement, the Government committed to reducing the "red tape stifling cycle-friendly road design" and placed a greater expectation upon local partners to "up their game in delivering infrastructure that takes cycling into account."<sup>11</sup> These aims parallel the stated commitment in the Conservative Party Manifesto 2015 of "doubling the number of journeys by bicycle and investing over £200m to make cycling safer, so we reduce the number of cyclists killed on our roads every year".<sup>12</sup>

The need for a genuinely supportive strategy to deliver the high-quality cycle infrastructure across England envisaged by the Prime Minister, is all the more significant given two-thirds of all personal trips in England are less than 5 miles, yet only 2% are currently undertaken by bicycle.<sup>13</sup> This compares rather unfavourably to the modal share currently observed in the Netherlands (27%), Denmark (19%) and Germany (10%).<sup>14</sup> As the Prime Minister correctly demands,<sup>15</sup> a similar renaissance of cycling experienced by these European countries can be equally achieved in

---

<sup>9</sup> Prime Minister's Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> The Conservative Party (2015) The Conservative Party Manifesto 2015.

<sup>13</sup> Department for Transport (2015) National Travel Survey, 2014.

<sup>14</sup> Ministerie van Verkeer en Waterstaat (2009) Cycling in the Netherlands.

<sup>15</sup> Prime Minister's Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.

England. The evidence provided to this inquiry, however, calls into question the deliverability of this ambition given the limited strategic ambition and levels of funding currently outlined in the draft CWIS.

## **1.2 Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy**

The Government published its draft Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) in March 2016. This states the Government is seeking to both double the number of cycling trips by 2025 and make cycling and walking the natural choice for short journeys in England by 2040.<sup>16</sup> The draft CWIS sets out the competitively accessed investment streams the Government currently makes available to local partners tasked with delivering these ambitions.<sup>17</sup> In an era of close scrutiny over public expenditure, robust evidence consistently shows cycle infrastructure improvements across the road network continue to provide significant cost-benefit returns on the initial capital investment.<sup>18</sup>

In this report, we welcome the publication of the CWIS and the Government's acceptance that substantial increases in cycling would provide solutions to a wide range of pressing policy issues. As research by the Department for Transport shows, cycling contributes towards significant reductions in physical inactivity and air pollution alongside increasing the economic prosperity and social well-being of people, businesses and places.<sup>19</sup> By its very nature, it has been estimated the physical activity associated with cycling levels currently seen in Denmark could translate into a saving of £17bn for the NHS within 20 years.<sup>20</sup>

In line with the wider devolution of transport decisions across England, the Government believes these ambitions can only be achieved by empowering local partners to deliver interventions tailored to the needs of their local area. The core purpose of the CWIS is to outline the investment streams, however limited, that local partners can draw upon to deliver the Government's cycling and walking ambitions.

---

<sup>16</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy.

<sup>17</sup> Further information about the evolution in funding streams since 2010, including CCAG cities can be found in Annex A.

<sup>18</sup> SQW (2007) Valuing the Benefits of Cycling: A Report for Cycling England; HM Treasury (2006) The Eddington Transport Study: The case for action: Sir Rod Eddington's advice to Government.

<sup>19</sup> Department for Transport (2014) Claiming the Health Dividend.

<sup>20</sup> Aldred, R. (2014) The Benefits of Investing in Cycling.

### 1.3 Focus of this Inquiry

This inquiry was launched to provide a response by the APPCG to the Government's draft CWIS. The evidence session focused upon the CWIS as the Government's action plan for growing cycling. This should not, however, be read as cycling being more important than walking rather it reflects the specific expertise of the APPCG and the expert panel providing oral and written evidence.

Evidence was taken on 23 May 2016. During this session, oral evidence was taken from a panel of five experts, which was complemented by written evidence submitted by Dr Rachel Aldred, Westminster University. The panel consisted of:

- Chris Boardman, Policy Advisor, British Cycling;
- John Forbes, Independent Consultant, John Forbes Consulting LLP;
- Roger Geffen, Campaigns and Policy Director, Cycle UK;
- Lilli Matson, Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, TfL;
- Jason Torrance, Policy Director, Sustrans UK;

This was then followed by oral evidence provided by Robert Goodwill MP, Minister of State with responsibility for cycling and walking.

In this report, we consider the need for bolder ambitions to be at the heart of the Government's draft CWIS, which reaffirms cycling is a national priority. We have concerns about the current levels of investment allocated in the draft CWIS because sustained central Government funding incentivises local investment in cycling. We go on to consider the Government's role in supporting a robust monitoring regime of national and local progress. We then investigate the actions the Government can take to improve cycle infrastructure design standards, further deregulate street design alongside improving the enforcement of traffic laws. The recommendations offered by this report enjoy cross-party support and seek to inform a CWIS that is equipped to realise the Prime Minister's desire to place cycling in England on a "level-footing with countries like Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands."<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Prime Minister's Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.



## 2 Stronger Ambition

As part of the 'Get Britain Cycling' report, one of the key recommendations was to grow the level of cycling in England to 10% of all trips by 2025, rising to 25% by 2050. This realistic, yet ambitious, target sought to place England on a long-term trajectory that would match the cycling levels currently enjoyed in Denmark and the Netherlands. This is in line with the Prime Minister's own ambitions for cycling.

In contrast, the draft CWIS offers three vague ambitions to be delivered by 2040, none of which have any direct measurable outputs. These include: 'Better Safety' providing "a safe and reliable way to travel for short journeys"; 'Better Mobility' defined as "more people cycling and walking - easy, normal and enjoyable"; and 'Better Streets' as "civilised places where people come first."<sup>22</sup> To deliver and monitor progress towards these national ambitions, the draft CWIS sets out the target of "doubling cycling activity by 2025, from the 2013 baseline."<sup>23</sup>

There was broad consensus amongst the expert panel that this target was unambitious and disappointing. As Roger Geffen highlighted, this is further compounded by the draft CWIS not accounting for the projected population increases up to 2025. According to TfL's Lilli Matson, the Government's national target should be higher as the current projections for cycling in London would account for a third of the cycle activity required to double 2013 levels. This view was shared by the majority of the expert panel.

The Minister suggested the real lesson from London and Cambridge is the "cycling has now become a real political objective amongst their local politicians." Although this points to the well-documented dilemma that low-levels of cycling translates into a reduced demand for local investment, Lilli Matson suggested that the draft CWIS should begin to address this by providing a strong "overarching strategy for all levels of government that can start to instigate the desired modal shift towards cycling."

---

<sup>22</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, pp. 11

<sup>23</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, pp. 15. The draft CWIS defines cycling activity as the estimated total number of cycle stages made each year, from 0.8bn in 2013 to 1.6bn in 2025. A new stage as defined by the National Travel Survey is when there is a change in the form of transport, which is seen to include journeys that are multimodal, for example cycling to the railway station and then cycling to work. For the purpose of this report, cycling activity is defined as a trip from A to B.

This parallels the evidence we heard from both John Forbes and Chris Boardman about the welcomed efforts by business to incentivise commuting by bicycle being currently curtailed by the limited ambition across all levels of government to substantially grow cycling across England.

In this regard, Jason Torrance, Sustrans, suggested the Government “should consider the concurrent Road Investment Strategy (RIS) as a ready-made structure for the CWIS to replicate in terms of having clear strategic aims and rigorous performance monitoring of targets.” From his experience, this would provide the “much need strategic message to all local partners about the importance of investing in cycling”, whilst still enabling the delivery of interventions tailored to the needs of a local area. From the evidence provided to this inquiry the good intentions expressed by the Prime Minister in seeking to instigate a “cycling revolution”<sup>24</sup> are not currently matched by the scale of ambition nor strategic direction given to local partners in the draft CWIS.

**To realise the Prime Minister’s ambitions and ensure cycling is now a national priority, the Government should adopt a national target to increase cycle usage to 10% of all trips by 2025, with the broader aim of matching our European neighbours over the longer term. We recommend that the Government shows stronger direction to all local partners to ensure a modal shift to cycling is central to any future strategic investments targeting local economic growth and increased wellbeing.**

---

<sup>24</sup> Prime Minister’s Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.

### 3 Greater investment

The 'Get Britain Cycling' report called for a dedicated strategy to grow cycling in England through levels of investment equivalent to £10 per person. The draft CWIS, however, claims the investment streams currently available equates to a spend of £6 per person in 2015/16.<sup>25</sup> This consists of a dedicated investment of £316m in cycling (and walking) outside of London until 2021.<sup>26</sup>

According to the projections provided by Cycling UK, the current spending plans up to 2021 "will equate to just £1.39 per person outside London." We also heard from the panel that the levels of investment recommended by the APPCG in 2013 are currently only being achieved in the few locations with access to the Cycle City Ambition Grant (CCAG)<sup>27</sup>, while the vast majority of towns and cities across England receive just a fraction of the funding required.

It is clear to us Highways England have made progress in meeting the APPCG recommendation to reduce the severance and barriers to cycling associated with the Strategic Road Network (SRN), with its commitment to invest £100m into its own cycle strategy.<sup>28</sup> Attention was drawn to the disparity between the Government's £316m dedicated investment in cycling and the £15bn allocated to the concurrent RIS up to 2021. Indeed, Roger Geffen spoke for the other cycle organisations in calling for any increased capital and revenue investment in cycling to come from "access to a greater proportion of the roads and public health budget."

We heard the other significant source of funding available for cycling, like other transport investments, comes from application to the Local Growth Fund through the LEPs. Of the £3.4bn now allocated from the Local Growth Fund for 444 transport projects, just 1% (£36m) has been dedicated to cycling with £1.8bn being spent directly on new road capacity.<sup>29</sup> We also heard evidence from the Minister, who

---

<sup>25</sup> Letter from Robert Goodwill MP to Ruth Cadbury MP and Alex Chalk MP, providing a detailed breakdown of 2015-16 investment in cycling.

<sup>26</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy.

<sup>27</sup> Further information about the evolution in funding streams since 2010, including CCAG cities can be found in Annex A.

<sup>28</sup> Highways England (2016) Cycling Strategy: Our approach.

<sup>29</sup> Campaign for Better Transport (2016) LEP Watch: our work to change local transport spending priorities <http://www.bettertransport.org.uk/roads-nowhere/local-transport>

suggested recent evidence from LEPs shows an unexpected increase in cycling investment to nearer £7 per person. Both Jason Torrance and Roger Geffen acknowledged LEPs have increased the investment in cycling, albeit from a very low-base. They called for the Government to do more in addressing the significant variations in the strategic priority and therefore funding commitments given to cycling by LEPs across England.

The major exception to the limited investment in cycling across England is the commitment to spend £12.50 per person in the Mayor of London's Vision for Cycling. We heard from Lilli Matson that this ten year investment of £913m to provide a coherent and safe cycling network "on current projections would account for more than a third of the Government's target" of 1.6bn cycle stages by 2025. She contended this "gives an impression of the levels of funding required to meet even this modest target." Chris Boardman told us that the Government "needs to be match-funding local investments" seeking to emulate the modal shift to cycling in London because this is a "key incentive for local action."

**It is clear to us that realising the Prime Minister's ambition to place England on a "level-footing with countries like the Netherlands",<sup>30</sup> requires greater investment in cycling than currently committed in the draft CWIS. To build on the recent growth in cycling from investments in the few CCAG cities and London, the Government should ensure a minimum investment across England of £10 per person in cycling per year rising to £20.**

---

<sup>30</sup> Prime Minister's Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.

#### 4 Robust Monitoring of Progress

One of the key recommendations from the Get Britain Cycling report was the creation of a strategic action plan to grow cycling across England. With the publication of the draft CWIS fulfilling this action plan, this inquiry placed renewed attention upon the monitoring regime proposed by the Government to assess progress towards delivering its ambitions for cycling.

The draft CWIS states the Government will be “creating a Department for Transport sponsored independent Expert Committee” that will review the implementation of the current CWIS, plan a second CWIS, as well as making links with local authorities to help them draw up their own Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans.<sup>31</sup> As part of this governance structure, the draft CWIS states the Expert Committee will be assisted in this role by the Department’s own delivery team, who will have the broader “responsibility for enabling the delivery of the Strategy at a local level.”<sup>32</sup>

Most of our witnesses were supportive of the Government’s desire to create an Expert Committee because they recognised its potential role in providing much needed oversight over delivering the Government’s national ambition for cycling, whilst retaining direct ministerial responsibility. Chris Boardman argued that the effectiveness of the Expert Committee, like the draft CWIS more broadly, is dependent upon any evaluation being based upon “a detailed set of measurable targets to drive the overall approach.” He went further by saying his sporting and business experience emphasised the fundamental role of “key performance indicators in enabling the regular and consistent monitoring of progress against the targets.”

When asked about measuring the length of cycle infrastructure, John Forbes told us businesses were far more interested in the quality of routes rather than their quantity. Relatedly, Lilli Matson referred to the largely successful level of service assessment of new cycle infrastructure in London, which is based upon a “composite of existing datasets depending upon the specific target, which included the London

---

<sup>31</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, pp. 28.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

Cycle Design Standards.”<sup>33</sup> She was in agreement with Roger Geffen, that simply totalling the length of cycling infrastructure is not always appropriate and fails to discriminate between facilities of differing qualities, suitable for different environments.<sup>34</sup>

The Minister acknowledged the formulation of “key performance indicators, whether at the local or regional level, was something the Department would be considering in light of the consultation process and in conversation with the Expert Committee”, but went on to argue that “examples from the Health Service show arbitrary targets can quickly lead to perverse incentives in local implementation.” In order to evaluate both national and local progress, however, the evidence we received from Dr Rachel Aldred suggests there is significant potential for the National Travel Survey, combined with more detailed local information, to provide a high-quality and comparable dataset to monitor targets for cycle infrastructure across England. Incorporating user satisfaction and perception of road safety surveys, similar to those in the RIS, would provide a key part of the composite monitoring regime many of the expert panel felt was necessary to compare and benchmark the performance of the Government and local partners in implementing the ambitions for cycling.

**We welcome the proposed Expert Committee which will be charged with the remit to oversee the formation, implementation and evaluation of the Government’s cycling strategies. The Government should ensure the Expert Committee has sufficient independence and resources to enable it to monitor local authority performance, and, in collaboration with the Cycle Proofing Working Group,<sup>35</sup> improve the design of local cycle infrastructure.**

---

<sup>33</sup> In the oral evidence about monitoring progress in the quality of cycle infrastructure that was provided by Lilli Matson, specific reference was made to the Cycling Level of Service assessment set out in the London Cycling Design Standards, alongside the Stats 19 Data and National Travel Survey for evaluating progress in reducing casualty rates amongst all road user groups in London.

<sup>34</sup> TfL (2014) London Cycling Design Standards.

<sup>35</sup> The Cycle Proofing Working Group is a collection of experts in cycle infrastructure design, coordinated through the Department for Transport and Highways England: <https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/cycle-proofing-working-group>

## 5 Improving Street Design

A key part of the 'Get Britain Cycling' recommendations was to consolidate existing good quality cycle infrastructure guidance into a single set of national design standards. The draft CWIS restates the principle that the specific design of cycle facilities are the responsibility of the local transport authorities, but the Government has assisted innovation in this area through cycle-friendly revisions to the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD).<sup>36</sup> The draft CWIS also makes reference to cycle-proofing of the strategic road network under Highways England's Cycling Strategy, which is to be aided by their own set of forthcoming standards on cycle infrastructure design.<sup>37</sup>

Most of our witnesses were supportive of the Government's efforts to accommodate ongoing innovations in cycle infrastructure as part of a more dynamic TSRGD. According to Roger Geffen, combining these improvements with a single set of national design standards is the logical next step "to ensure that minimum national standards are followed and to avoid wasting money on poor quality infrastructure." He went on to say this is exactly the kind of direction being sought by local authorities rather than having the freedom and cost burden of "reinventing the wheel, by having their own bespoke set of design standards."

We heard evidence from Lilli Maston, that the experience of designing cycle infrastructure in London shows it is a dynamic process that requires "national regulations that are sufficiently flexible to accommodate innovation and champion good practice interventions." She suggested that the "London Cycle Design Standards and associated Level of Service assessments, were now seen as a good practice for doing just that; and these could easily form the basis of a Department for Transport endorsed national set of design standards." As mentioned previously, Chris Boardman told us, given sufficient mandate, this would be "logical role for the Expert

---

<sup>36</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy.

<sup>37</sup> In collaboration with the Cycle Proofing Working Group, Highways England is working on a set of design standards suitable for the strategic road network. The Cycle Proofing Working Group has also produced good practice examples of local authority design, which should be more widely disseminated. See: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/cycling>

Committee” as part of its broader remit of ensuring the local implementation of high-quality cycle provision across England.

Relatedly, both Jason Tarrant and Roger Geffen acknowledged the Government was taking steps to instigate the sharing of both knowledge and the lessons learned from the CCAG with local partners from across England. Cycling UK told us that this would be “insufficient without the national design standards that are needed to define the minimum standard of cycle infrastructure.” The Minister confirmed his “interest in further exploring how experimental design, if it works, could be spread across the country as a best-practice”, which would need to be done in conversation with the forthcoming Expert Committee.

The evidence provided by the expert panel emphasises national design standards are a key mechanism for proliferating high-quality cycle infrastructure across England, which reaches beyond the already good performing local authorities currently implementing such schemes. **It is clear to us the Government has made progress in deregulating street design to accommodate ongoing innovations in cycle provisions, but further progress is still required around simplifying many aspects of street design, particularly the layout of pedestrian and cycle crossings. This should be complemented by an improvement in the overall quality of cycle infrastructure being implemented across England. To do so, the Government should consolidate recent good practice changes in infrastructure design from cities that have invested in good quality cycle facilities, and endorse a single set of national design standards.**



## 6 Safer streets for all road users

The stated aim of the Prime Minister is “to alleviate the safety concerns many people have about cycling” in England.<sup>38</sup> In this regard the APPCG’s 2013 recommendations are all the more important in suggesting the best way to overcome such concerns is through a combination of: high-quality cycle infrastructure appropriate to the road function, such as those being constructed in London and some of the CCAG cities; cycle training open to all age groups; and a strengthening in the enforcement of existing road traffic law.

The draft CWIS states ‘Better Safety’ is one of the Government’s three ambitions to be delivered by 2040, with the intention of providing “streets where cyclists and walkers feel they belong and are safe.”<sup>39</sup> As part of this welcomed focus upon road safety, the draft CWIS places greater emphasis upon ‘Engineering’ high-quality cycling infrastructure and ‘Education’ through the Bikeability training schemes, which form two of the traditional three core elements of road safety programmes.<sup>40</sup> The draft CWIS, however, offers very little around the third element of ‘Enforcement.’

In March 2014, the Transport Select Committee raised concerns about the substantial decrease in the traffic offences, from 4.3m in 2004 to 1.6m in 2013, as being more indicative of the lack of overall enforcement than a sudden improvement in road user behaviour.<sup>41</sup> We heard from Roger Geffen that slow progress in undertaking a review into the operation of traffic offences in England, promised in the 2014 Cycling Delivery Plan, was “continuing to send the wrong message about road safety to people cycling” and walking.<sup>42</sup> He goes further in his written submission, saying that the views of relevant road safety groups should be incorporated into a broader review of the laws governing the operation of the road space rather than just dealing with sentencing.<sup>43</sup> We heard from Chris Boardman that reviewing these legal aspects

---

<sup>38</sup> Prime Minister’s Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.

<sup>39</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, pp. 11.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Transport Committee, *Road Traffic Law Enforcement*, HC 2015-16, 518.

<sup>42</sup> Department for Transport (2014) Cycling Delivery Plan

<sup>43</sup> See the letter from Lord Berkeley to Rt Hon Andrew Selous MP, 26/1/16 (<https://allpartycycling.org/2016/02/23/598/>) and reply from Rt Hon Andrew Selous MP on 11/2/16 (<https://allpartycycling.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/x160223-from-andrew-sealous293.pdf>)

around the operation of the road network is necessary to support a broader cultural and legal shift in England “towards a greater duty of care shown to more vulnerable road users.”<sup>44</sup>

We also heard from John Forbes that it took the death of cyclists in London to instigate a minimum safety standard, such as guard-rails, for construction vehicles operating in the capital.<sup>45</sup> Although the draft CWIS states the Government is keenly “watching these safety initiatives” and “will consider the impact of rolling out these nationally” in due course,<sup>46</sup> John Forbes suggested the Government should “work with private sector partners” as “these measures are working and have the industries’ support.”

Most of our witnesses suggested the Highway Code needs updating to reflect recent innovations in street design and the growing provision of cycle tracks parallel to major roads that have priority over the side roads they cross. We heard from TfL’s Lilli Matson that evidence from implementing several of these parallel cycle tracks in London suggests the “Highway Code needs amending to assist all road users in negotiating these new cycle provisions.” She went on to stress that the Government must do more to reduce “the current ambiguity and contradictory advice in the Highway Code on how to negotiate cyclists (and pedestrians) at side roads”, which we feel would benefit from illustrations of how to negotiate new cycle infrastructure. As Chris Boardman suggested, this calls for a clearer duty of care to be shown towards people cycling and walking. There are other recent changes in street design and road traffic law that also need including into any revisions of the Highway Code.

**It is clear to us that realising the Prime Minister’s expressed desire “to make it safer to cycle”<sup>47</sup> in England, the Government should give careful consideration to updating the Highway Code to give clearer priority to pedestrians and cyclists,**

---

<sup>44</sup> It should be noted that during the oral evidence session this call for a “duty of care” was accompanied by a clarification from both Chris Boardman and Martin Key, Campaigns Manager, British Cycling, that a “duty of care” is not, nor should be interpreted as, calling for “presumed liability in favour of more vulnerable road users.”

<sup>45</sup> The TfL (2014) Safer Lorry Scheme: The Way Forward, was instigated after a spate of cyclist fatalities and serious injuries involving HGVs on the roads of the Capital. TfL through this scheme has worked with the haulage and construction industry to explore working around the current exemptions to National Safety Standards for certain HGVs in England, by requiring all HGVs to be fitted with side guards and extended view mirrors. Source: TfL (2014) Safer Lorry Scheme: The Way Forward.

<sup>46</sup> Department for Transport (2016) Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, pp. 34.

<sup>47</sup> Prime Minister’s Office (2013) Press Release: The Government shifts cycling up a gear.

**particularly where cycle infrastructure meets side roads. This needs to be complemented by the Government making progress on the promised review into the operation and sentencing guidelines for road traffic laws in England. Combined with improvements to vehicle safety, especially for HGVs, this would provide the Government with an additional tool to address the dangerous and inconsiderate road user behaviour that contributes to the safety concerns many people have about cycling.**

**Annex A: Timeline of developments in English cycle funding**

Year	Event
2011	<p>'Local Sustainable Transport Fund' (LSTF) launched by the Coalition Government with £560m over 4 years, topped up with £40m in 2012 and another £500m in local contributions. In total, DfT awarded funding to 96 Sustainable Transport Packages from 77 Local Authorities between 2011 and 2015, with estimated long term impact in the order of £3bn (DfT, 2015).</p> <p>Localism Act (2011) launched by the Coalition Government enabling Local Authorities and the newly created Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to 'respond to what local people want, not what they are told to do by central government' (DCLG, 2011: 4).</p>
2012	<p>LSTF starts; only around 10-20% goes on dedicated cycling related activities (&lt;£100-200m over 5 years).</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework sets out to promote sustainable transport, especially for the use of cycling and walking - aspiration, no funding commitment attached to this.</p>
2013	<p>Cycle City Ambition Grant (CCAG) announced until 2015 - worth £77m for 8 cities (Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Leeds, Manchester, Newcastle, Norwich and Oxford), £17m for 4 National Parks (Dartmoor, New Forest, Peak District and South Downs). On top of this £94.1m from the DfT, another £54.4m are contributions from local partners.</p> <p>£100m pledged for Highways England schemes to solve severance issues and improve the Strategic Road Network (SRN) for cycling and other vulnerable road users. Part of £250m fund ring-fenced for cycling, safety and integration on the SRN.</p>
2014	<p>Cycling Delivery Plan Published (DfT, 2014) - no additional funding offered, but calls for Local Authorities and LEPs 'to affirm their commitment to drive up cycling across the country'. Extension funding for CCAG announced until 2017/18.</p> <p>Revised London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) based upon extensive international study of established and emergent good practice, forms part of delivering the funding settlement attached to the Mayor's Vision for Cycling (TfL, 2014).</p>

<p>2015</p>	<p>CCAG continues in 8 cities (Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Leeds, Manchester, Newcastle, Norwich and Oxford), with extension funding confirmed in CWIS, totalling £191m for the 5 years to 2018.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Act (2015), applies to England only, is primary legislation that requires the Secretary of State for Transport to bring forward a Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, which has to include objectives and financial resources made available.</p> <p>Road Investment Strategy (RIS) for 2015/16 to 2019/20 presented as part of the Infrastructure Act (2015). Confirms funding commitment to SRN of £15.2bn for Highways England, to mainly fund 84 new schemes to address network hotspots. Confirms previous commitment of £100m being allocated to cycling until 2021, under one of the SRN's key local challenges - cycling, safety and integration (including inter-modal connections).</p>
<p>2016</p>	<p>Highways England Cycle Strategy - Confirms £100m ring-fenced funding for 200 Cycle Schemes until 2021. Obligation to promote interests of people cycling and walking and will be evaluated against key performance indicators of new or upgraded crossings to reduce severance and vulnerable user casualties.</p> <p>England's first Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy draft is put out for consultation, with Final CWIS 1 to be published in Summer 2016 and Oversight Committee to be in post late 2016.</p> <p>Traffic Signs, Regulations and General Directions 2016 (TSRGD, 2016) provides some welcomed changes for cycling, especially around assisting the ongoing innovations in the design of cycle infrastructure, particularly in London and Cambridge.</p> <p>The Cities and Local Government Devolution Act (2016) - enables further devolution of transport to local areas with the creation of Sub-national Transport Bodies, e.g. Transport for the North and Midlands Connect.</p> <p>Sustainable Travel Transition Year Revenue Competition provides a bridging of £20m for successful applications from Local Authorities that forms part of the £80m revenue of the Access Fund outlined in CWIS from 2016/17 to 2020/21.</p>

Annex B: Progress against the 'Get Britain Cycling' Recommendations

Get Britain Cycling recommendation	Progress	Comments
1 Create a cycling budget of £10 per person per year, increasing to £20	Yellow	Very partial - only London and a few of the Cycling City Ambition Grants come close to this. Nationally funding is still very low.
2 Ensure local and national bodies, such as the Highways Agency, Department for Transport, and local government allocate funds to cycling of at least the local proportion of journeys done by bike.	Yellow	Partial - only a handful of local authorities receive funding at, or above, cycling levels.
3 Cycle spending that makes a tangible contribution to other government departments, such as Health, Education, Sport and Business, should be funded from those budgets, not just the DfT.	Red	No substantial investment in cycling other than through DfT/local authority investment.
4 A statutory requirement that cyclists' and pedestrians' needs are considered at an early stage of all new development schemes, including housing and business developments as well as traffic and transport schemes, including funding through the planning system	Yellow	No statutory requirement, but Highways England have taken some steps towards improving their processes. Transport assessments must be conducted at a local level, with reference to sustainable modes such as cycling, but proposed solutions are rarely effectively integrated with wider planning strategies.
5 Revise existing design guidance, to include more secure cycle parking, continental best practice for cycle-friendly planning and design, and an audit process to help planners, engineers and architects to 'think bike' in all their work.	Yellow	Some progress - draft Traffic Signs, Regulations and General Directions 2016 provides some of the requested simplifications and improvements to guidance, but local authority delivery is still highly variable in quality.
6 The Highways Agency should draw up a programme to remove the barriers to cycle journeys parallel to or across trunk roads and motorway corridors, starting with the places where the potential for increased cycle use is greatest.	Green	Highways England have produced a programme, with prioritised lists of schemes; however, the scale of investment (£100m) is dwarfed by proposed overall spending on the Strategic Road Network (£1.5bn) by 2021. Future schemes must ensure cycling is fully integrated into all new schemes.
7 Local authorities should seek to deliver cycle-friendly improvements across their existing roads, including small improvements, segregated routes, and road reallocation.	Yellow	Very partial progress. Some cities have made progress - particularly London and Cambridge but even here (and elsewhere) quality of design is still very low.
8 The Department for Transport should approve and update necessary new regulations, such as allowing separate traffic lights for cyclists and implementing Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.	Yellow	There have been several strides forward on the development of regulations to support new types of infrastructure, however, Part 6 of the TMA 2004, allowing civil enforcement of cycle lanes is yet to be implemented, despite being a very minor change.

# Design

# Funding

Leadership		Training		Safety	
9	Extend 20 mph speed limits in towns, and consider 40mph limits on many rural lanes			Yellow	Limited progress - responsibility is left to local authorities, only some of which have adopted 20 mph as the standard urban limit. Policy on rural limits similarly remains devolved and unchanged.
10	Improve HGV safety by vehicle design, driver training, and mutual awareness with cyclists; promote rail freight and limit use of HGVs on the busiest urban streets at the busiest times, and use public sector projects to drive fleet improvements			Red	While progress has been limited in many areas of improving driver training, there have been some positive improvements, for instance on High Speed 2, where higher standards are likely to be imposed part of project procurement, creating a cascade of improvements through the industry.
11	Strengthen the enforcement of road traffic law, including speed limits, and ensuring that driving offences - especially those resulting in death or injury - are treated sufficiently seriously by police, prosecutors and judges.			Red	Despite promises and the formation of working groups to deal with these issues, the Government has failed to make substantive progress on improving the way road traffic law operates, particularly in regard to enforcement, where levels of traffic policing continue to drop.
12	Provide cycle training at all primary and secondary schools			Green	Bikeability continues to be funded, with Bikeability Plus rolling out more advanced training and promotional events, such as training in maintenance.
13	Offer widespread affordable (or free) cycle training and other programmes to encourage people of all ages and backgrounds to give cycling a try, as evidenced by NICE.			Green	Bikeability Plus goes further than training for children, but provision is far from comprehensive across England.
14	Promote cycling as a safe and normal activity for people of all ages and backgrounds.			Green	The Government appears to have understood the need to promote cycling as an activity that should be for everyone, and doesn't require specialist clothing, equipment or bikes.
15	The Government should produce a cross-departmental Cycling Action Plan, with annual progress reports.			Green	The CWIS itself fulfils this even if many of the individual elements remain weak. Progress is still hampered by the lack of consistent data.
16	The Government should appoint a national Cycling Champion, an expert from outside the Department for Transport.			Yellow	The creation of the Expert Committee with a Chair may satisfy this recommendation, but only if the Committee has sufficient independence and the ability to implement changes in policy and direct programme spending.
17	The Government should set national targets to increase cycle use from less than 2% of journeys in 2011, to 10% of all journeys in 2025, and 25% by 2050			Yellow	Target set, but merely to double number of trips from 0.8bn a year to 1.6bn a year. This will likely equate to far less than a doubling in mode share of trips, as overall trip volumes will increase over this time.
18	Central and Local government and devolved authorities should each appoint a lead politician responsible for cycling			Yellow	Some local authorities have introduced cycling champions or commissioners, notably London (as above), where Andrew Gilligan has been very effective.