

**REACHING OUR ACTIVE TRAVEL POTENTIAL**  
**Inquiry on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy**  
**Submission from Cycling UK**

Cycling UK was founded in 1878 and has over 70,000 members. Historically known as 'CTC' or the 'Cyclists' Touring Club', Cycling UK's central charitable mission is to make cycling a safe, accessible, enjoyable and 'normal' transport option and leisure activity for people of all ages and abilities.

## **BACKGROUND**

We are pleased to contribute to this very timely inquiry by the All Party Parliamentary Group for Cycling and Walking into funding for active travel.

It comes as the Department for Transport (DfT) works towards [publishing a second Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy \(CWIS2\)](#), following the Treasury's multi-year Spending Review which is due to take place later this year. The Spending Review had originally been planned for Autumn 2020, but was postponed due to the funding uncertainties caused by both Brexit and the Covid pandemic. Hence DfT's plans for a new multi-year CWIS2 (as required by the [Infrastructure Act 2015](#)) were inevitably also delayed.

When the Government published its [first CWIS \(CWIS1\)](#) in April 2017, Cycling UK welcomed its vision, and particularly the [guidance it provided](#) to councils on planning comprehensive local cycling and walking 'networks' (rather than disconnected individual schemes), known as [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans \(LCWIPs\)](#). However, we voiced disappointment that CWIS1 comprised just £314m of earmarked funding for cycling and walking over the 5 years 2016/17 to 2020/21 (see [breakdown](#)). Apart from 8 cities which received '[Cycle City Ambition Grant](#)' funding, most councils received no earmarked funding to deliver their LCWIPs.

More positively, CWIS1 set out an initial aspiration to secure around £900m of additional non-earmarked funding. In practice DfT has done [much better than this](#), by securing funding from sources such as the Transforming Cities Fund, Housing Infrastructure Fund and Future High Streets Fund. However we have continued to [voice concern](#) that the level of funding available is insufficient to meet the targets set in CWIS1. Moreover, uncertainties over the funding available have hampered local authorities' ability to plan (let alone deliver) ambitions cycling and walking network plans.

## **TRANSPORT DECARBONISATION AND TARGET-SETTING**

Preparation for both the Spending Review and CWIS2 takes place against the background of the ongoing cross-departmental 'Net Zero' review (led by the Treasury), and the newly-published [Transport Decarbonisation Plan \(TDP\)](#) which will now feed into this.

In March 2020, DfT had paved the way for its '[call for evidence](#)' to inform the TDP, by publishing its document '[Decarbonising Transport: setting the challenge](#)'. The document's foreword from Transport Secretary Grant Shapps MP set out an admirable 6-point vision, including his aspiration that:

*"Public transport and active travel will be the natural first choice for our daily activities. We will use our cars less..."*

Cycling UK [strongly welcomed](#) this statement, and its apparent recognition of the clear [evidence-base](#) (which is [still growing](#)) that decarbonising surface transport, with the urgency demanded by the climate crises, cannot be achieved solely by electrifying our vehicle fleet. For this, we need fewer cars, not just newer cars.

[Cycling UK's response to the TDP consultation](#) therefore highlighted the need for:

- Traffic reduction targets that are in line with the Government's wider 'net zero' target;
- Targets for increases in sustainable alternatives (including not travelling, as well as cycling etc) that are in line with these traffic reduction targets; and
- Funding allocations that are in line with these targets.

There is much in the TDP that Cycling UK strongly welcomes – see [blog](#). Yet regrettably, these three key ingredients are missing, with the result that, overall, the TDP lacks clear direction. If its purpose was to pave the way for a future in which “We will use our cars less”, the TDP ought to have spelled out how much less, by when, and how transport funding would be reallocated to meet these goals.

In this respect, the UK government is lagging behind the Scottish and Welsh governments, not to mention the advice it is receiving from its statutory advisors on climate change, and indeed the views of think-tanks from across the political spectrum. It is also lagging behind public opinion:

- The [Scottish Government](#) recently announced a target to reduce car-kilometres by 20% by 2030, while the Welsh Government's recent [Wales Transport Strategy](#) aims to increase the proportion of trips made by walking, cycling or public transport from 32% in 2019 to 47% by 2040.
- The [6<sup>th</sup> Carbon Budget report](#) from the Committee on Climate Change (CCC, the Government's statutory advisory body on meeting its climate targets) called for action to reduce demand for car travel by 6% by 2030, increasing to 17% by 2050. Its more recent [2021 Progress Report to Parliament](#) calls for funding “to be rebalanced away from cars ... and towards public transport and walking and cycling”.
- Think tanks ranging from [IPPR](#) to [CEBR](#) and [Policy Exchange](#) have all published reports calling for various forms of road pricing, as has [AA President Edmund King](#).
- The [Climate Assembly](#), a demographically representative 'citizens jury', supported action to reduce road traffic levels in absolute terms.
- Recent [polling by Ipsos MORI](#) found that public support for urban road user charging has increased hugely over the past 13 years, from 33% in 2007 to 62% in 2020. Support is roughly equal among drivers and non-drivers, and is even higher among 'captains of industry'. Public support rises higher still if the receipts are used to improve air quality or public transport, or to tackle climate change – whereas it falls sharply if they are simply returned to drivers in the form of lower vehicle taxes.

## **FUNDING: HOW MUCH IS NEEDED AND HOW SHOULD IT BE SPENT?**

More positively, the TDP restates a commitment, announced in May 2020, to allocate [£2bn of funding for cycling and walking](#) over the next 5 years. This was drawn from a wider [£5bn of funding for “cycling and buses”](#), which the [Prime Minister had announced](#) in February 2020.

The £2bn amounts to a very welcome 6-fold increase in earmarked funding for cycling and walking compared with the £314m allocated in CWIS1. Nonetheless, it still falls a long way short of what is needed to meet DfT's own CWIS1 targets to double cycling trips and increase walking by 2025. We understand that unpublished research, commissioned by DfT from consultants Transport for Quality of Life, finds that meeting these targets would require spending of between £6bn and £8bn by that date. DfT has previously promised to publish this research (initially [in February](#), then more recently [in June](#)), but has now declined a FoI request to do so, saying that this could pre-empt funding decisions to be made in the Spending Review.

We urge the APPGCW to support Cycling UK's calls for ministers to [release this report, and act on it](#). We believe it will spell out the case for securing at least £6bn for active travel over the period 2020/1 to 2024/5.

Achieving this level of funding need not require an overall increase in transport spending – nor does all of it need to come directly from central Government. Increased investment in cycling and walking (and other sustainable transport options) can be achieved by:

- Using fuel duty and other pricing measures, both to reduce demand for road travel and also as an income stream to invest in healthy and sustainable alternatives; and
- Rebalancing transport spending, away from large road and other major infrastructure projects, and towards clean, healthy and low-carbon alternatives. The latter are generally much better value for money, providing far greater benefits and far fewer disbenefits. These benefits include tackling urban congestion and pollution; creating safer, more efficient and more vibrant streets and communities, promoting healthy living and a better quality of life, as well as tackling the climate crisis. The TDP promises to review the 'National Networks' National Policy Statement (NN-NPS), which effectively allows Ministers to grant themselves planning permission for major road and rail infrastructure projects. Given the overwhelming [economic](#), [environmental](#) and [legal](#) case for scaling back the [£27.4bn Roads Investment Strategy](#), a review of the programme cannot come soon enough.
- Drawing on non-ringfenced funding schemes. As noted previously, DfT has proved very adept at securing additional active travel funding from sources such as the Transforming Cities Fund etc. One disadvantage of these non-ringfenced funding-streams is that they do not provide the long-term continuity and certainty that local authorities need to draw up and adopt ambitious long-term cycling and walking network development plans. However, they are a pragmatic way forward.

The majority of investment in cycling and walking (around 70-80% of it) needs to be capital spending, earmarked for local authorities to implement their [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans \(LCWIPs\)](#). These should include protected cycle lanes, 20mph schemes, 'low traffic neighbourhoods', 'mini-Hollands' and 'school streets' schemes (all of which are advocated in 'Gear Change'), as well as urban realm improvements.

Further capital investment should be earmarked for: cycling and walking improvements along and across the corridors of the [Strategic](#) and [Major Road Networks](#) (the SRN and the MRN) and the [HS2 rail scheme](#); the [National Cycle Network \(NCN\)](#); for improved provision for combining [cycling and rail](#) or [bus](#) travel; and to support the introduction of [bike share schemes](#). We also highlight the opportunities to use post-Brexit agricultural subsidies to invest in improvements to the quality and extent of the [rights of way network](#), particularly by filling gaps in the network (or the parts of the network that are available for cycling), and by improving the lighting and surfacing of parts of the network which are most useful for day-to-day (as well as recreational) cycling and walking.

This capital investment should be complemented by revenue investment, accounting for around 20-30% of total spending on cycling and walking. This should be used to support:

- [cycle training](#) for people of all ages and abilities;
- programmes to promote cycling and walking in [schools](#), [workplaces](#) and [community settings](#) (including '[social prescribing](#)' schemes under which GPs 'prescribe' cycling or walking for patients needing increased physical activity);
- purchase subsidies for electrically assisted pedal cycles (or '[e-bikes](#)'), [cargo-bikes](#), bikes for school pupils on free school meals, and [non-standard cycles for people with disabilities](#); and
- support for [bike share schemes, particularly in more disadvantaged areas](#).

The 'Behaviour Change' section of this submission (below) outlines evidence of the effectiveness of these measures, not only in boosting cycle use but also in broadening the demographic diversity (age, sex, ethnicity, health, physical and mental abilities etc) of those who are attracted to take up cycling.

See Appendix B for a detailed proposed 5-year breakdown of funding.

## **LOCAL AUTHORITY CAPACITY: BOOSTING AND 'LEVELLING UP' DESIGN AND DELIVERY STANDARDS**

We understand that one obstacle to increasing active travel investment to the level required is a concern in the Treasury that local authorities may struggle to spend even £2bn, let alone the £6bn or £8bn we believe is needed. This is understandable, particularly in areas which have low cycle use and which have historically failed to invest in the staff capacity to plan and deliver high-quality walking and cycling networks, let alone in the infrastructure itself.

It has not helped that, having announced the Government's intention to spend £2bn over 5 years and allocated £250m of that funding in year 1 of that period (2020/1, along with £50m of carried-over revenue funding), the Government then announced a total of just £257m of funding (£190m capital plus £67 revenue) for year 2. This was effectively a [15% cut in funding](#), at a time when the Government really needed to be ramping up its funding allocations to achieve the annual average of £400m per year implied by the £2bn announcement, and hence the capacity of local authorities to spend this level of funding.

Hence we now fear that a failure by the Treasury to allocate the £6-8bn needed to meet DfT's targets could prove self-fulfilling (by depriving local authorities of the opportunity to boost their active travel delivery capacity), with the result that these targets may now not be met. Worse still, if the Government only realises mid-way through next year that it is not on course to meet its 2025 targets (having allocated insufficient funding in years 1 and 2), it will then have missed its one 'fiscal event' opportunity (i.e. this autumn's Spending Review) to redress this situation.

A crucial step for resolving this situation is to establish Active Travel England as quickly as possible, allocating a small proportion of the £2bn for this purpose. It could then start fulfilling its role in supporting local authorities to spend the rest of the £2bn and more, and to spend it well (e.g. on infrastructure that accords with DfT's excellent [Cycle Infrastructure Design guidance](#)).

Meanwhile, Cycling UK is partnering with charities Sustrans and Living Streets to deliver a DfT-funded programme to support local authorities in preparing and delivering strong LCWIPs. As part of this, we will be drafting a revision to the current LCWIP guidance. Whilst the original guidance was mostly very good, there are now several improvements that can be made in the light of subsequent developments and experience: With more funding now available, we want to encourage local authorities to plan more ambitious LCWIPs. They need to extend beyond the 'easy wins' of city-centric, commuter-focussed networks, partly to meet a wider range of journey needs (e.g. shopping and school travel – and in the process to address the needs of a wider demographic range of would-be cycle users), partly to extend into more rural areas (particularly as DfT prepares to launch a substantial e-bike support project). We also want to strengthen the guidance on community engagement and the presentation of LCWIPs.

## BEHAVIOUR CHANGE: BROADENING THE DEMOGRAPHIC OF CYCLE USERS

There is [good evidence](#) that cycle training, and other behaviour-change programmes in schools, workplaces and community settings, can be highly cost-effective ways to boost cycle use, particularly among groups such as women, older people, BAME communities, health patients and people with disabilities.

Cycling UK's Big Bike Revival (BBR), Community Clubs and Cycling for Health projects, run with support from DfT, have consistently demonstrated their effectiveness – and cost-effectiveness – in boosting cycle use particularly among groups.

- The *Big Bike Revival* ([www.cyclinguk.org/bigbikerevival](http://www.cyclinguk.org/bigbikerevival)) has been run since 2015 in conjunction with local bike-recycling projects and similar social enterprises, with support from DfT. It involves open days where people are encouraged to bring along bikes that have lain unused, which often need a simple fix. They are offered free cycle checks, servicing, cycle maintenance workshops, cycle training and accompanied rides. 46% of participants in *Big Bike Revival* events in England were non-regular cyclists, almost half were women and 46% were from the top 30% most deprived areas in the country.
- *Community Clubs* ([www.cyclinguk.org/community-cycle-clubs](http://www.cyclinguk.org/community-cycle-clubs)) are run in partnership with a wide variety of community groups, whether for women, health patients, people with disabilities or other disadvantaged groups. They offer longer-term support for people interested in taking up cycling, for whatever reason. They can often be formed in the aftermath of a Big Bike Revival project. We have set up over 200 clubs in England and Scotland, which have attracted 50,000 participants. Half of them were women, 53% are from the most deprived three deciles of neighbourhoods, 56% are from BAME backgrounds and 50% of attendees are non-regular cyclists on joining. 20% of participants have a disability or long-term health condition and 30% are inactive, meaning they were not doing 30 minutes of exercise per week prior to joining the club.
- Our *Cycling for Health* project ([www.cyclinguk.org/community-outreach/health](http://www.cyclinguk.org/community-outreach/health)) is a potential prototype of how the Government's 'social prescribing' scheme could work. It has been run through 8 'cycling hubs' throughout West Yorkshire, with support from the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. It enables people with inactivity-related physical and mental health conditions to take up cycling as part of a sociable and supportive group. The majority of participants are now referred to the programme by local health professionals. Of the programme's 270 direct beneficiaries, 56% were from recognised areas of deprivation with 31% coming from the highest decile of deprivation. 78% were female and 28% identified as being of non-white ethnicity. 90% were previously non-cyclists, yet 68% were still cycling regularly (i.e. more than once a week) 6 weeks after the programme had ended. Participants said they felt more confident, more relaxed, closer to other people, better able to think clearly and deal with problems, and more optimistic about the future.

We urge DfT and the Treasury to reflect the importance of such revenue-funded behaviour change programmes, both in the Spending Review and the 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy which will follow it.

## CROSS-GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR CYCLING

Aside from policies and funding allocations directly relating to cycling and walking, there are a number of ways in which wider Government policy needs to support active travel, in order to maximise its benefits across a wide range of policy areas (health, climate, air quality, access to nature and strengthening the rural economy), as follows:

- [Wider transport policies](#) need to support the growth of public and shared transport, to promote traffic restraint both (through physical measures such as traffic calming and cycle-permeable road closures to reduce speeding and rat-running) and through various pricing mechanisms. Road user charging can help not only by directly reducing demand for road travel but also by yielding funding to invest in sustainable transport alternatives. Road pricing can therefore combine both ‘carrot’ and ‘stick’. As noted earlier, polling evidence shows substantial increases in public support for urban road pricing in recent years.
- *Integrating active travel with public transport.* In terms of cycling, this should involve:
  - Providing safe and convenient cycle access to, from within and through stations
  - Safe, secure, accessible and well-designed cycle parking at stations, together with hire and storage facilities at larger stations
  - Providing formal and informal cycle spaces on trains
  - Developing convenient ticketing and reservation systems
  - Information and publicity
  - Supporting large cycling events
  - Stakeholder engagement
  - Monitoring and review of what is working.
 For more, see Cycling UK’s [response to the Williams Rail Review](#).
- [Road safety policies](#) which support the growth of cycling and walking include: [lowering speed limits](#); proceeding with the [Highway Code revisions](#) that were recently subject to consultation; strengthening [driver education and training](#); reviewing [road traffic offences and penalties](#); and promoting [lorry safety](#) through [safer lorry cab designs](#) and through transshipment depots; as well as by promoting cargo-bikes for ‘last mile’ deliveries.
- *Home Office and Justice:* Cycling UK has long called for a [comprehensive review of road traffic offences and penalties](#) and a [strengthening of roads policing](#). We are pleased that DfT and the Home Office have consulted on a [Roads Policing Review](#) (see [Cycling UK’s submission](#)). We urge the Ministry of Justice and DfT to collaborate on strengthening road traffic offences and penalties, reflecting the [amendments to the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Bill](#) proposed by Cycling UK and several allies.
- *Planning.* The Government’s forthcoming planning reforms (as set out in its [Planning White Paper](#)) need amending to avoid entrenching car-dependence in new housing and other developments. This involves:
  - Ensuring that any new zoning, environmental assessment and other policies help concentrate development in locations with good access to public transport;
  - Building to relatively high densities, in order to reduce cycling and walking distances and create space for walking, cycling and a green and pleasant urban environment;
  - Creating high-quality pedestrian and cycle-friendly route networks within the development, good links with other key destinations nearby, and good access to green open space within the development and the surrounding countryside;
  - Ensuring that any new mechanisms for developer contributions secure the funding necessary to provide whatever cycling, walking and other sustainable transport infrastructure is needed to avert the risk of car-dependence.
 For more, see Cycling UK’s [response to the Planning White Paper](#) and [these three blogs](#).
- *Rural policy and outdoor access.* The [Environment Bill](#), and the [Environmental Land Management \(ELM\) schemes](#) which will follow it, present significant opportunities to improve off-road access for walking, cycling and horse-riding. This is timely, for three reasons. Firstly, the Government is about to announce funding to boost the uptake of

e-bikes. Secondly, it is also preparing to unveil its [Rural Transport Strategy](#), which was subject to consultation last year (see [Cycling UK's response](#)). Taken together, these 'hooks' provide opportunity to persuade people (and indeed councillors) in rural areas to consider cycling seriously as a rural transport option. Thirdly, the experience of lockdown has raised awareness of the physical and mental health benefits of having good access to nature. The [Environment Agency](#) has noted that "Equality of access to, and connection with, a healthy natural environment would save billions of pounds in healthcare costs and reduced economic activity every year." Meanwhile the Government-commissioned [Landscapes review](#) (also known as the Glover review, which considered the management of National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) called on the Government to "consider expanding open access rights in protected landscapes". The [25 Year Environment Plan](#) stressed the importance of improving public access to and connection with nature, while the [Agriculture Act 2020](#) cites "access to and enjoyment of the countryside" as one of the purposes for which the Secretary of State can allocate agricultural subsidies, bringing public access into the scope of the Government's aim to secure "public goods for public subsidies". Hence there is a significant opportunity to improve the linkages between the planning and delivery of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs, which have typically been focussed more on urban and utility cycling and walking trips) and Rights of Way Improvement Plans (RoWIPs, which are seen as more rural and more recreational). By linking the two more closely, it will become possible to make greater use of the rights of way network to address 'utility' journey needs (e.g. for children in villages to walk or cycle to the school in the nearest town), while also enabling people living or residing in a town to access the surrounding countryside.

- *Health, recreation and sport.* Recognition of the value of cycling as a non-competitive sport, from Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and [Sport England](#), has increased markedly in recent years. However the Department of Health has said nothing about the role of active travel in its recent [Obesity Strategy](#) or its [Physical Activity guidelines](#). This is a huge missed opportunity, particularly given the enthusiasm from the Department for Transport for an initiative to pilot cycling as a form of 'exercise on prescription' (see Gear Change page 36). There could be huge benefits from encouraging more GPs to encourage patients to take up cycling - and in some cases to refer them to 'exercise on prescription' schemes (such as Cycling UK's 'Cycling for Health' programme - see above). Further benefits could come from the NHS itself becoming a [Cycle-Friendly Employer](#), thus promoting cycling to its own workforce, and thus encouraging them to become role models of healthy travel.
- *Education:* At present, the '[Bikeability](#)' programme offers '[National Standard](#)' [cycle training](#) to around [half of all year 6 pupils](#), though the Government recently made a very welcome [commitment to boost this to 100% by 2025](#). However a key issue is making time within the curriculum to provide this training. Cycling UK calls for greater engagement from the Department for Education in making this happen.
- *Employers:* One of the really interesting ideas in the newly-published Transport Decarbonisation Plan is the proposed 'Commute Zero' initiative, to enlist employers in promoting low or zero-carbon travel among their employees. Cycling UK urges the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) to play an active role in supporting this, and are keen to explore how our [Cycle-Friendly Employer](#) programme can be integrated into it.

Roger Geffen  
Policy Director, Cycling UK  
[roger.geffen@cyclinguk.org](mailto:roger.geffen@cyclinguk.org)

## **APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Targets and Funding**

1. We support the current CWIS1 target to double cycling trips and increase walking to school by 2025. However we also support Living Streets's call for a strengthened target to increase walking overall, raising the ambition to reach 365 trips per person annually by 2025.
2. Gear Change set out an aim (repeated in the Transport Decarbonisation Plan) to increase walking to reach half of all trips in towns and cities by 2030. This sounds ambitious, however we are concerned that DfT has not managed to spell out how it will be defined or monitored, or what the current proportion of trips is (i.e. what is the baseline). We therefore urge clarity on the definition and baseline level of this aim, and evidence that it is in line with the levels of traffic reduction necessary to achieve net zero by 2050.
3. Future target-setting needs to be evidence-based, with targets to increase cycling, walking and other sustainable transport modes linked to traffic reduction targets, which should in turn be linked to the Government's wider 'net zero' targets.
4. We understand that unpublished research shows that the funding needed to meet the CWIS1 targets is £6-8 billion (with £8bn achieving the targets in a way that boosts walking and cycling among a wider range of demographic groups and geographic areas, thereby yielding greater health, equality and climate benefits. We call on the Government to publish this research and to act on it.
5. The ratio of capital to revenue funding should start at around 70:30, rising to 80:20 as the total amount of funding goes up (n.b. this means capital funding rises more steeply than revenue, it does not imply a cut in revenue funding). Detailed breakdowns are provided in Annex B, for 3 different funding scenarios.
6. If the Government fails to find the £6-8bn which is apparently needed, and therefore finds it cannot meet the 2025 targets, they should not be dropped, but should instead be deferred slightly. The implied level of cycling is still less than 4% of trips, which is very modest compared with many continental countries.

### **Boosting local authority capacity, design standards and delivery capability**

7. Active Travel England should be established as soon as possible and should be well resourced to fulfil the many roles allocated to it.
8. Meanwhile, DfT should make good use of the LCWIP support consortium (which comprises Sustrans, Living Streets and Cycling UK) to support local authorities in preparing increasingly ambitious Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs). These should now aim to meet a wider range of journey types, in a wider range of geographical areas (e.g. covering school and local shopping trips, and linking smaller towns with nearby settlements), rather than being focussed on city-centric commuting (which has largely been the priority up till now).
9. This in turn will require greater integration of the processes and funding streams which support the LCWIP and RoWIP (Rights of Way Improvement Plan) processes, thereby extending LCWIPs out beyond urban areas into their rural hinterlands, with benefits for both rural utility and recreational cycling and walking.

### **Complementary policies**

10. Our proposed funding allocations should be backed by complementary transport policies (traffic restraint, road pricing, integration with public transport) and support from other Government departments (planning, environment, health, sport, home office and justice), as outlined in the final section of this submission.



## APPENDIX B: FUNDING PROPOSALS UNDER 3 SCENARIOS

This appendix outlines proposals Cycling UK made in our submission to the (subsequently postponed) Spending Review in Autumn 2020.

We reflected the fact that, then as now, the Treasury had only committed £2bn of earmarked funding for cycling and walking. As noted earlier, this is more than a 6-fold increase in earmarked funding compared with the previous 5 year allocation (covering 2016/7 to 2020/1 – there was a 1-year overlap between the two funding periods). However, unless further funding is secured (whether from ring-fenced or non-ringfenced sources), this could end up being a reduction compared with the £2.4bn (including non-ringfenced funding) that was invested in the 5-year period up to April 2021.

We also reflected our understanding that the unpublished research, commissioned by DfT to assess what funding was required to meet its CWIS1 targets, estimated that the answer is between £6bn and £8bn. £6bn allows the target to be met, but it does so in a way that focuses on ‘easy wins’, which are not necessarily the most ‘beneficial wins’. £8bn also achieves a doubling of cycling trips, but with more of a focus on boosting cycle use among a wider demographic range of users (thereby yielding greater health and equality benefits) and more rural areas (this yielding greater climate benefits).

We therefore developed 3 funding scenarios, as described below.

### Outline of scenarios

- *Scenario 1* considers how the £2bn already allocated could best be deployed to boost cycling and walking up to 2025, if no more funding were available. It focuses funding primarily in urban areas, particularly those which have a high capacity to spend it effectively. Inevitably though, these tend to be urban areas which already have relatively high levels of active travel, and populations who are relatively affluent and healthy. However we stress that it would not come close to meeting the Government’s LCWIP targets for 2025. It also performs poorly in terms of tackling economic and health inequalities.
- *Scenario 2*, amounting to £6bn, could be expected to meet the Government’s targets, but its benefits are still concentrated in areas where active travel is already relatively high, and among relatively healthy and affluent population groups. Hence it still does not perform well in terms of ‘levelling up’ access to the health, environmental, well-being and economic benefits of active travel.
- *Scenario 3*, amounting to £8bn, would meet the Government’s targets in a way that also distributes the benefits of active travel to more rural areas and to more areas of deprivation. It would therefore achieve significantly greater benefits for the health, wealth and well-being of disadvantaged areas, while achieving greater carbon reduction and other benefits by also boosting cycling in more rural areas.

The budget lines in all 3 scenarios are the same, with capital funding for local cycling and walking infrastructure attracting the lion’s share of the budget in all cases. However, we have assumed that the £2bn in scenario 1 comprises ring-fenced money only. Therefore the budget for this scenario does not show any provision for funding from the National Roads Fund (either for the Strategic or Major Road Networks, SRN or MRN), for HS2, or for Rights of Way improvements funded via the Environmental Land Management (ELM) scheme. Otherwise, the proportions of the available budget vary between scenarios, as set out overleaf.

	£2bn scenario	£6bn scenario	£8bn scenario
<b>CAPITAL: Local delivery</b>			
LCWIP implementation (incl. protected cycle lanes, low traffic neighbourhoods, mini-Hollands, school streets etc)	1,218	2,796	3,107
Major Road Network (MRN)	0	400	500
Rights of Way Improvement Plans (RoWIPs: funding through ELM scheme)	0	325	400
Cycle-bus measures	0	0	20
Bike share schemes	150	450	600
<b>CAPITAL: National delivery</b>			
Strategic Road Network (SRN)	0	500	750
HS2	0	40	52
National Cycle Network (NCN)	100	300	400
Cycle-rail	45	50	60
<b>CAPITAL: TOTAL</b>	<b>1,513</b>	<b>4,861</b>	<b>5,889</b>
<b>REVENUE: Local delivery</b>			
Cycle training: adults and children	150	300	400
School and workplace programmes	50	55	65
Social prescribing / health & community programmes	20	20	30
Bike share scheme support	47	134	191
<b>REVENUE: National delivery</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
E-bike / e-cargo-bike and inclusive cycle purchase subsidies	200	600	1,425
Active Travel England / LCWIP support	20	30	40
<b>REVENUE: TOTAL</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>1,139</b>	<b>2,111</b>
<b>TOTAL (£millions)</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>8,000</b>