

## **Cycling delivery plan web chat – 17 November 2014, 7pm-8pm**

### **Transcript**

#### **7:01: DfT post**

Good evening, we are delighted to welcome you to the Cycling Delivery Plan webchat.

#### **7:04: Comment From Dave Prince (cycle harrogate)**

Having spent a couple of years trying to get local government to provide increased levels of cycling infrastructure, will there be any compulsion inherent in this plan on local government to raise it game in terms of infrastructure or participation or are we just hoping they will.

#### **7:09: DfT response**

Thanks for the comment Dave, and for kicking off the session! In terms of overall investment in cycling infrastructure, we believe working together with local government is the best approach. There is evidence supporting the benefits of cycling, which we have published recently which should support local authorities in their decision making about cycling. In addition, on the issue of high quality cycling infrastructure, the cycle proofing working group is making major progress on behalf of all local authorities.

#### **7:10: Comment From Richard Lovell**

I would welcome clarity on how achieving a spend of £10 per head per annum is to be monitored and ultimately allocated?

#### **7:14: DfT response**

Thanks for your message Richard and welcome to the debate. In terms of monitoring and reviewing the actions of the delivery plan - the Minister for Cycling and Walking, supported by his High Level Group (formed of key cycling and walking stakeholders) will monitor the plan and will ensure progress is reviewed annually (with a report produced every two years). The route to achieving £10 per head will vary by location.

#### **7:14: Comment From MJ Ray (KLWNBUG)**

How will the plan give priority to those authorities that actually maintain footways and cycleways instead of those that leave them to rot?

#### **7:16: DfT response**

Welcome MJ Ray to the discussion. The partnership model in theme 1 of the Delivery Plan will ensure authorities are able to reinforce their commitment to cycling and walking.

#### **7:17: Comment From Dave Prince (cycle harrogate)**

Rem yes, but without compulsion there seems to be little incentive for local government to do anything for cyclists. Although the LSTF funding has had some impact. Why not compel all road developments to always consider and if possible implement measure to facilitate walking and cycling for example?

#### **7:17: DfT response**

Thanks Dave for your suggestion, this is an issue that is being considered by the Cycle Proofing Working Group and I shall ensure they receive your feedback.

**7:18: Comment From Wilf Forrow, CTC, Sustrans & Cycle Hayling**

Some vital changes can only come from central government legislation - e.g. cycle lane priority over side roads at junctions and roundabouts, as in Holland and Denmark. I'm disappointed there's no commitment for the DfT to drive that - shouldn't there be?

**7:20: DfT response**

Welcome to the discussion Wilf. The Department is currently considering responses to the consultation on Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD), you may have seen the consultation document?

**7:21: Comment From Richard Lovell**

In terms of the proposed investment can assurances be sought that investment in market towns and more rural locations will be given similar to that invested in more urban conurbations?

**7:24: DfT response**

Thanks Richard for your comments. We are still shaping the Partnerships model in Theme 1 of the Plan, building on feedback gathered during this consultation phase. Of course all highway authorities (regardless of population density) would be eligible to express an interest in a partnership.

**7:24: Comment From Paul Humphreys**

It would be good if there were some specific requirement when new schemes are proposed that Councils state, probably using the DfT categories of cyclist types. Then on their schemes say whether for example it is suited for children and the less confident. Where routes are less than DfT guidance then why Councils have not even met these standards. For school kids only certain designs will work and make the targets you state reachable

**7:25: DfT response**

Welcome Paul Humphreys and thanks for your comments. We will look into this suggestion as part of the consultation.

**7:25: Comment From MJ Ray (KLWNBUG)**

Reinforce their commitment? So authorities with a "let it rot until dangerous" entry in their Transport Asset Management Plan for cycling and walking will get nothing?

**7:26: DfT response**

Thanks MJ Ray, you might be interested to hear about a newly published consultation from DfT on maintenance. It is available on the Gov.uk website (titled Local Authority Highways Maintenance Funding 2015/16 to 2020/21)

**7:27: Comment From Frauke Behrendt**

I have a question about the 'programme of work to maximise the potential for electrically assisted pedal cycles'. How is this going to be initiated and how could we get involved? I lead [www.smart-ebikes.co.uk](http://www.smart-ebikes.co.uk) and our project team is interested to provide input, drawing on our results.

**7:28: DfT response**

Welcome Frauke, we would be interested to hear more about your project and suggest you email your details to [walking.cycling@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:walking.cycling@dft.gsi.gov.uk) so we can follow up with you once the consultation has closed.

**7:28: Comment From Wilf Forrow, CTC, Sustrans & Cycle Hayling**

I've only just started reading that, but I didn't see any reference to such requirements?

**7:30: DfT response**

Thanks Wilf - if you have a specific question on the content of TSRGD, I recommend you email [walking.cycling@dft.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:walking.cycling@dft.gsi.gov.uk) so we can set out for you the decision making process behind the proposals set out in the consultation document.

**7:30: Comment From Dave Prince (cycle harrogate)**

Whilst I agree £10 per head is a figure we should be aiming towards. I'm concerned that if this is only reached in some areas in 10 years time. We will face 10 more years of relatively poor infrastructure development. If this figure were implemented early in the next parliament, we could make some real progress rather more quickly.

**7:31: DfT response**

Thanks Dave Prince. We will include your comment as part of the feedback on the Delivery Plan.

**7:34 Comment From Allison Thomas, Derbyshire County Council**

\*Comment removed at the request of Ms Thomas\*

**7:35: DfT response**

Thanks very much Alison for your comments. We will take them on board as part of this consultation.

**7:35: Comment From MJ Ray (KLWNBUG)**

Can solving the problems with poor walking and cycling facilities on Highways Agency roads be addressed through projects under this Plan?

**7:36: DfT response**

Thanks MJ Ray for your comment. Our commitment to cycle proofing applies to both the strategic road and local road networks.

**7:41: Comment From MJ Ray (KLWNBUG)**

Thanks for the pointer to the maintenance consultation. Maintenance, design standards, funding and refusenik authorities need to be addressed more firmly and quickly than they seem to be in the draft Plan, don't they?

**7:44: DfT response**

Thanks MJ Ray. The draft Plan is a long term plan for walking and cycling and we are looking for ideas, comments and suggestions through this consultation. Your comments above will be considered as we shape the plan from its current draft form into the final version.

**7:48: Comment From MJ Ray (KLWNBUG)**

What encouragement will there be for schemes to join up across authority borders and form regional or national networks?

**7:50: DfT response**

Thanks MJ Ray for your comment about working across Local Authority borders and forming regional and national networks. Through the partnership model, local authorities can look to work more closely together, where appropriate.

**7:50: Comment From Allison Thomas, Derbyshire County Council**

Although new infrastructure is only one part of the solution it must be borne in mind that this often has long lead in times in terms of securing planning permissions, agreeing landowner compensation etc and often the short term nature of government funding doesn't take this complexity into account. There is also the ongoing issue of maintenance of routes with ever diminishing revenue. It would be helpful if the Cycle Plan recognised this and funding allocations factor in preparatory work and long lead in times as eligible expenditure.

**7:52: DfT response**

Thanks Allison for your comments, and feedback on lead in times. In terms on the ongoing issue of maintenance - you may be interested in DfT's recently published consultation:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-authority-highways-maintenance-funding-201516-to-202021>

**7:52: Comment From MJ Ray (KLWNBUG)**

But will partnerships be rewarded if their schemes connect with those of neighbouring partnerships?

**7:54: DfT response**

MJ Ray - on this question, local authorities are best placed to advise us on what will work best in their local area (and how they would want to link with neighbouring areas).

**7:54: Comment From Richard Lovell**

Would it be helpful to keep walking and cycling separate? Whilst infrastructure often lends to the benefit of both, walking often requires different approaches in terms of the promotion of behavioural change.

**7:58: DfT response**

Thanks Richard for your comments - we are looking for ideas, comments and suggestions through this consultation and your comments on walking and different approaches to behaviour change will be considered as we finalise the Plan.

**8:01: DfT post**

Thank you all for your very interesting and enthusiastic questions and comments. We will feed all of your thoughts into the next stage of Plan development. Best Wishes, the DfT Cycling and Walking Team!