

Cycling and local transport

THIS BRIEFING COVERS

Commitment to cycling; cycle-friendly physical environments; promoting cycling - attitudes, awareness, opportunities to cycle; resources - funding and staff; targets, evaluating and monitoring.

HEADLINE MESSAGES

- Cycling is healthy and environmentally-friendly. It also helps people of different ages, backgrounds and abilities get about; contributes to safer and more pleasant streets; and is a financially sound investment for individuals, employers and councils.
- Cycling deserves a central place in local authority transport policies, spending plans and wider strategies to promote active and sustainable travel. The returns of investing in it are impressive.
- Many councils recognise the benefits of cycling and work with local partners to maximise them.

KEY FACTS

- In the Netherlands, where 43% of the population cycles daily, around £24 goes on cycling per person, per year. In England (outside London), where only around 4% of the population cycle every day, it's under £2 per head;
- £10,000 invested in cycling only needs to generate just ONE extra cyclist over 30 years for the monetised benefits to equal the costs;
- The eight cities and four national parks awarded Cycle City Ambition Grants for 2015/16 – 2017/18 are expected to deliver around £5 of benefits for each pound invested;
- Doubling cycle use would probably result in only a 25-30% increase in cycle fatalities, representing a 35-40% reduction in risk per cyclist;
- With a funding boost and infrastructure changes, cycling can grow quickly from a very low base: from 2007 to 2011, commuter cycling more than doubled in New York; and Seville saw the proportion of cycling journeys jump from 0.2% to 6.6% in under six years.

Cycling UK VIEW: Local authorities should:

- **Commit to cycling by:** fully recognising its environmental, health and other benefits; linking cycling with the wider aims of local transport and other policies, especially by aiming for *more* as well as *safer* cycling and tackling the deterrents (e.g. speeding, bad driving, hostile road conditions and lorries); linking cycling plans with other strategies/policies (e.g. planning, health, education and the economy); and forging partnerships with other local partners in health, education, business public transport, the police and voluntary sector groups.
- **Make the physical environment cycle-friendly by:** ensuring that developments are accessible and permeable by cycle; that highways are engineered, laid out, signed and maintained with cycle users in mind; and enhancing provision for recreational and off-road cycling.
- **Promote cycling by:** making national standards cycle training (Bikeability) available to people of all ages; supporting school and workplace travel plans and incentives; and encouraging cycling with promotional materials, campaigns and personal advice.
- **Resource their commitment to cycling well by:** raising and investing capital, revenue and staff resources; training staff appropriately; and harnessing the support of the voluntary sector.
- **Evaluate and monitor the results effectively by:** setting substantial targets to increase cycle use; measuring cycle casualties per mile or per trip; monitoring how safe people think cycling is; identifying suitable data collection and reporting mechanisms; and seeking feedback from key partners, including local communities and the voluntary sector.





BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Commitment to cycling

Cycling UK view:

Local authorities should commit to cycling by:

- Fully recognising its environmental, health and other benefits;
- Linking cycling with the wider aims of local transport and other policies, especially by aiming for *more* as well as *safer* cycling; and tackling the deterrents (e.g. speeding, bad driving, hostile road conditions and lorries);
- Linking cycling plans with other strategies/policies (e.g. planning, health, education and the economy);
- Forging partnerships with other local partners in health, education, business public transport, the police and voluntary sector groups.

a. Benefits of cycling

Promoting cycling offers many benefits at both local and national level:

The environment

- A person making the average daily car commute of four miles each way would save half a tonne of CO2 by switching to cycling – 5% of the average UK carbon footprint.¹
- Doubling cycle use through switching from driving to cycling would reduce Britain's total greenhouse emissions by 0.6 million tonnes, about as much as switching all air travel between London and Scotland to the rail network.²
- Cycling is one of the easiest and cheapest ways for individuals to reduce their contribution to climate change on a day-to-day basis.
- Converting as many driving trips as possible to cycling helps reduce the harmful impact of outdoor air pollution, particularly in urban areas.

Health

- A study that examined data for 14 countries, all 50 US states and 50 of the largest US cities, found that walking and cycling help tackle physical inactivity, obesity and diabetes.³
- By 2030, a ten-fold increase in cycling and a doubling in walking would prevent 530 premature deaths per million people in London each year.⁴
- Cyclists have a very low rate of involvement in collisions where another road user is injured. Hence, more cycling is good not just for cyclists' safety but for other road users too.⁵

NICE (the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) has published guidance on how local authorities can promote walking and cycling: <http://www.nice.org.uk/advice/lgb8>

Economic value and vitality

- Cycling helps tackle congestion, which impacts on local business: a typical road lane can carry seven times as many bicycles as cars.⁶
- Making town centres and residential areas cycle-friendly enhances their attractiveness, adding value to them, and contributing to retail vitality.
- There are also economic benefits due to better health (see above), e.g. reduced health-care costs and absenteeism, and improved productivity.

For more on cycling and climate change, air quality, health and the economy, see Cycling UK's briefings on each at: www.cyclinguk.org/campaignsbriefings



Equality of opportunity

- Cycling provides independent mobility for many people who do not or cannot drive, including children, people on lower incomes, older and many disabled people.

Quality of life

- More cycling reduces the nuisance of traffic noise, and means that far less land needs to be allocated for roads and parking. It therefore has a much lower negative impact than motor transport on townscapes, rural landscapes and biodiversity.

b. Links with the wider aims of local transport and road safety policy

Most people want to see less traffic and safer road conditions, and replacing driving trips with cycling is a means to achieve both. However, a 'cycling revolution' is unlikely to happen unless authorities actively tackle the deterrents, i.e. high traffic volumes and high speeds. This two-way relationship between boosting cycling levels and reducing traffic volume and speed needs to be explicitly recognised.

More as well as safer cycling – 'Safety in Numbers': a growing body of evidence suggests that cyclists benefit from the 'safety in numbers' effect, i.e. as cycle use increases in an environment that is increasingly favourable to it, the risk per km cycled goes down.⁷ It is estimated that doubling cycle use would result in only a 25-30% increase in cycle fatalities, representing a 35-40% reduction in risk per cyclist.⁸ Local authorities should therefore aim for *more* as well as *safer* cycling. www.cyclinguk.org/safetyinnumbers

The benefits of increased cycle use and improved road safety – for cyclists and for other road users – can and should be seen as entirely complementary aims. As mentioned above, cyclists cause negligible harm to other road users, so the more people who choose to cycle rather than drive, the safer road conditions become. The emphasis then should be on tackling the fears that deter people from cycling (and not, as so often in the past, being concerned that more cyclists might mean more cycle casualties). See also section 6, 'Evaluation and monitoring' below.

Tackling the fears: the main issues to focus on are: the volume and speed of traffic, irresponsible driving; hostile roads and junctions; and lorries. The provision of good cycle training and other 'smarter choice' measures can also help encourage more as well as safer cycling through the 'safety in numbers' effect (see above).

Motor traffic restraint: reducing motor traffic volume is an effective means of supporting cycling:

- Academics who studied 100 years of urban cycling policy, use and practice in 14 European cities found that: *"Inspired by the environmental movement and urban activists' campaigns, investments in public transit, cycling, and walking combined with car-curbing policies have had the greatest positive impact in increasing urban cycling and overall livability."*⁹
- Introducing 'congestion charging' and using some of the revenue to fund cycling measures has had very positive results in London, Milan and Gothenburg, according to an ECF report. The authors conclude that it is important to plan to support sustainable mobility like this right from the beginning, *"... both to make the reduction in car traffic more effective and permanent, and to win public support for the scheme. Cycling should play an integral role in this process."*¹⁰

For more on cycling & road safety, bad driving, goods vehicles and smarter choices, see Cycling UK's briefings on each at www.cyclinguk.org/campaignsbriefings



c. Links with other policies and strategies

Making commitments to cycling in other policies and strategies can contribute significantly to achieving their aims too, for example:

Planning: there is a two-way relationship between planning and cycling: not only do planning decisions affect the level of cycling in an area, but more cycling can be beneficial for local communities. If cycling becomes a more convenient and attractive option for local travel than driving, neighbourhoods become more pleasant places to be because they are less swamped by motor traffic.

Wider policies to reduce the need to travel, especially by private motorised transport, should therefore be incorporated in all planning frameworks, accompanied by a specific commitment to make sure that all developments are easily accessible and permeable by cycle. Equally, all new developments (residential, office, retail etc.) should provide well for cyclists, so all relevant planning documents/frameworks should also adopt standards for cycle parking and other facilities.

'Planning gain' (Section 106 agreements, Community Infrastructure Levy etc. – see 'Funding' below), is also a useful way of acquiring money from developers for high quality links and cycle parking, for example. As a condition of planning consent, developers should also be required to support a travel plan to reduce car use.

All these measures help ease the burden on local highway infrastructure and reduce the requirement to use up land for car parking.

Health sector policies: cycling is 'active travel' and helps keep the local population healthy, so a commitment to promote and support the activity for utility and leisure purposes should be a key theme of any health policy/strategy. In England, closer working partnerships between health and transport professionals at local level should facilitate this, particularly with Directors of Public Health working within local authorities to help them discharge their public health functions. This puts them in a strong position to engage more effectively with transport and planning departments.

- Research into travel habits in London found that: people living in non-car owning households were between two and three times more likely to travel actively for 30 mins on a given day than people in multi-car owning households; and those who own and use a bicycle were around twice as likely to travel actively for at least 30 mins compared to those who do not own a bicycle.¹¹

In Cycling UK's view, transport professionals and health care providers should:

- Make explicit links between local health and transport policies;
- Develop travel plans for both patients and staff;
- Promote cycling to patients and the wider public as a healthy activity, both to help prevent ill-health and cure it.

The Faculty of Public Health has produced evidence-led guidance for local authorities on designing towns and cities that encourage active travel.

See [Local action to mitigate the health impacts of cars](#) (2016).





Education policy: concerns about the volume of car traffic generated by the 'school run', children's fitness and their ability to travel independently mean that the way they get to school is perennially scrutinised. Indeed, English local authorities have a duty to produce an annual *Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy* for schools (*Education and Inspections Act 2006*, section 76). Encouraging children, parents and schools to embrace cycling – and providing well for their likely journeys – can help deal with the negative impact of the school run, transforming it into an opportunity to improve children's fitness and independence, and reducing 'transport harm' in the locality.

For more on cycling and national planning policy, health and cycle-friendly schools, see Cycling UK's briefings at www.cyclinguk.org/campaignsbriefing

d. Partnerships

To help ensure that policies and strategies that support cycling in some way, either directly or indirectly, have the necessary local backing, councils are well advised to forge partnerships with other bodies working in the community, e.g.:

- Health sector, as mentioned above (section 1c).
- Local business (to produce travel plans that encourage cycling and reduce car use);
- Education (encouraging students to cycle, engaging in 'Bikeability' training, and providing for cyclists at school and college sites);
- Public transport operators (providing for the carriage of cycles on their services and offering secure parking at stops and stations etc.);
- Police (enforcing the law against bad driving; supporting schemes to reduce speeds etc.);
- Voluntary sector groups (e.g. Cycling UK, Sustrans and local campaign groups, who are not only able to provide useful support and feedback, but may also be in a position to help deliver projects and activities to get more people cycling (see sections 4 & 5 below)).

2. A cycle-friendly physical environment

Cycling UK view: Local authorities should make the physical environment cycle-friendly by: ensuring that developments are accessible and permeable by cycle; that highways are engineered, laid out, signed and maintained with cycle users in mind; and enhancing provision for recreational and off-road cycling.

Probably the greatest barrier to getting more people cycling is traffic conditions because the prospect of cycling in heavy, fast-moving traffic is so daunting. The challenge is to re-organise the traffic and road layout in our towns and rural areas, so that both motorised and non-motorised transport can co-exist safely and efficiently. Fortunately, experience from other countries such as the Netherlands and Germany, has shown that this is achievable.

See next page for a summary of the principles discussed in Cycling UK's overview briefing on cycle friendly design and planning:
www.cyclinguk.org/campaigning/views-and-briefings/cycle-friendly-design-and-planning-overview



Cycling UK's key points for a cycle-friendly environment

General principles: • An overall aim of transport planning should be to increase cycling as part of a strategy to halt and reverse the growth of motor traffic, through pricing mechanisms (e.g. road user charging), the availability or cost of parking, or by regulations and physical road closures to limit motor vehicle access whilst maintaining access for cyclists.

Urban streets and rural lanes: • In built-up areas, 20 mph limits should be the norm for most streets, with exceptions identified and agreed with local communities. • 40 mph speed limits or lower should be the norm for rural single carriageways, with 20 mph in villages. • Achieving low traffic speeds on both residential streets and rural lanes is best done through high quality design that makes the street or lane feel like it is primarily for people not motor vehicles. Cruder forms of traffic calming, such as road humps and narrowings, can be unpleasant and unsafe for cyclists. • On busier urban roads, cyclists should be given some form of well-designed dedicated space, built to a high standard. This includes: the use of decent width bus lanes and on-carriageway cycle lanes, preferably with coloured surfacing; and cycle lanes created from carriageway space that are physically segregated from both motor traffic and pedestrians. Where there is not enough space for this, the aim must be to reduce traffic volumes and/or speeds, so that cyclists can share the road safely with the other traffic using it.

Dual carriageways, inter-urban main roads and major junctions: • Normally the best solution is a physically segregated, parallel cycle track. • High speed or multi-lane junctions should either have signalised crossing points, 'early advance' cyclists' traffic lights, and/or safe and convenient bypass routes, bridges or underpasses, so that cyclists can get round or through the junction safely and conveniently in all directions. • Bridges and tunnels designed to high standards should enable cyclists and walkers to get across major roads, linking up any 'severed' minor road or off-road route.

Off-road cycle facilities: • Parks and open spaces, canal and riversides should be opened up for cycling as motor-traffic free routes. These should form direct and convenient connections to the wider road network and to key destinations, and have good riding surfaces. • Traffic-free routes away from roads should add to, not substitute for, the creation of safe, convenient and pleasant cycling conditions on or adjacent to the road network itself, so that cyclists have easy access to the full range of destinations that are accessible to other road users.

Other cycling infrastructure: • Signing should point to suitable routes. • Sensibly-designed cycle parking (long and short-stay) should be available at key destinations, and reflect not only current levels of demand but potential increases.

Maintenance and funding sources: • Roads and off-road routes used by cyclists should be surfaced and maintained to a high standard. Cyclists' needs should be reflected in procedures for reporting, inspecting and repairing defects, managing street works, winter maintenance, debris/vegetation clearance and lighting policies. • The costings of off-road cycle facilities should include provision for their maintenance. • Funding from new developments and highway maintenance budgets should be maximised for cycle provision. • When resurfacing, local authorities should take the opportunity to 'cycle proof' the road, i.e. systematically consider improving cycling conditions as part of the project.

Ensuring high and consistent quality: • Planners and engineers should be given professional training in the principles of cycle-friendly planning and design. • The highway network and alterations to it should be subjected to a cycle audit and review process.

4. Funding resources

Cycling UK view: Local authorities should raise and invest both capital and revenue funds in cycling.

a. Optimum spend per person, per year

For UK cycling to match the levels seen elsewhere in Europe, the resources allocated to the sector need to be far more substantial. In major European cities with high levels of cycling, the average *per capita* investment in cycling infrastructure has been two to three times that in Britain, and maintained for longer: Denmark and the Netherlands have been investing in cycling since the 1970s, with people in Dutch cities now enjoying an average spend per head of £24 a year. In the Netherlands, 43% of the population cycles every day – in the UK, this figure is only 4%.¹⁴

The *Cycling City and Towns* programme in England is a good example of the difference that relatively substantial investment can make to cycling levels. Before the first six Cycling Towns were established in October 2005, local authorities on average were investing around £1 a head annually on cycling. A combination of funding from Cycling England and match-funding from the authorities, meant that the Towns all started investing at least £10 per person p.a. In November 2009, data from automatic cycle counters showed that the mean increase across all six was 27% relative to the 2005 baseline.¹⁵

Another project, the *Sustainable Travel Towns* (Darlington, Peterborough and Worcester, England, 2004-2009), saw an investment of about £5.65 per person per year in smarter choices (which include cycling). The number of cycle trips per head grew substantially, by 26%-30%, while car driver trips by residents fell by 9% per person, and car driver distance by 5%-7%, according to aggregated household survey results for the three towns (compared with a fall of about 1% in medium-sized urban areas over the same period).¹⁶

Despite these exemplary results, research that looked at a representative selection of LTP3s (see 'Policy Background', p18) to find out how much money English local authorities were proposing to invest in smarter travel choices, discovered that it was on average only about 70p per person, p.a.¹⁷ This was just 8% of the average integrated transport block allocation and 3% of total LTP funding. The researchers recommended that much higher levels of investment were justified and necessary for transport to deliver its contribution to the *Climate Change Act's* CO2 targets, not to mention the health and other wider benefits of active travel.

The City of Edinburgh is a good example of a local council that has recognised the benefits of cycling and made a strong budget commitment of its own to it. In February 2012, the council agreed to spend 5% of its transport budget on cycling and increase this amount each year by 1%. Hence, cycling is due for an allocation of 9% in 2016/17.¹⁸

The *Get Britain Cycling* report (All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group, 2013) recommended that public funding for cycling should be at least £10 per person p.a., rising to £20 as cycle use grows.
<http://allpartycycling.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/get-britain-cycling1.pdf>





b. Value for money

Investment in cycling produces very high returns. A study of both urban and rural situations found that £10,000 invested in cycling needs to generate just ONE extra cyclist over a 30-year period for the monetised benefits to equal the costs. In other words, if £1m is invested in a cycling project, it needs to generate only an additional 100 cyclists (three short return journeys a week over a 30 year period) for the project to pay for itself; and, if more are generated, the project is in surplus of course.¹⁹

Benefit to cost ratio (BCR): Government guidance on the evaluation of major projects says that a 'medium' value-for-money project will have a BCR of between 1.5 and 2, and a 'high' value-for money project a BCR of at least 2.²⁰ Cycling investment – if done properly – is one of the most cost-effective forms of transport investment available, as these examples illustrate:²¹

- **'Cycle Cities':** The Government confidently expects the eight cities and four national parks awarded Cycle City Ambition Grants in 2013 to deliver around £5 of benefits for each pound invested, with BCRs for individual schemes' ranging from just above 2:1 to 30:1+. Increased physical fitness accounts for the majority of these benefits.²²
- **Cycle training** appears to have the highest benefit-cost ratios: a case study of cycle training in London funded by TfL found that the overall BCR was 7.44, which is very high indeed.²³
- **Cycling infrastructure investment** also produces very high rates of return. An assessment of the London Cycle Network+ programme gave it an overall BCR of 3.94, which is excellent for a transport project, far surpassing most major road or public transport projects.²⁴
- **Cycling Demonstration Towns:** an estimation of returns on the investment in the six first CDTs (2006-09) suggested a BCR of 2.6 – 3.5 (over 10 years, in terms of reduced mortality, decongestion, reduced absenteeism, amenity and road casualties).²⁵

- For more on the economic value of cycling, see Cycling UK's briefing at: www.cyclinguk.org/campaignsbriefings
- See also *The Value of Cycling* (2016), an independent rapid evidence review: www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/509587/value-of-cycling.pdf

c. Government funding

Funds that can be channelled into local cycling come from a variety of sources, but mostly from national government:

- **In the devolved nations,** decisions about how local authorities spend money on local transport are, by and large, steered by government or its agencies, i.e. by the Welsh Assembly, Transport Scotland and the Northern Ireland Assembly. While authorities have a larger degree of discretion over small scale improvements, if they want central government to grant them money for major projects, they have usually had to bid competitively for it. **Transport for London** does very much the same in the capital with the money it allocates to the London boroughs.
- **England - Single Local Growth Fund (SLGF):** in England, however, the Government has been de-centralising local transport funding and the DfT's role is essentially be advisory:²⁶
Much of the money for transport from 2015 onwards has been absorbed into a 'Single Local Growth Fund' which also provides money for housing and skills training. This fund is not ring-fenced, and how it is spent is a decision not just for local transport authorities, but also for the business sector via the 39 Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) throughout England.

- **LEPs** are voluntary partnerships between local authorities and businesses. Their role is to help determine local economic priorities, lead growth and create jobs within their local area. Between them, LEPs have £12bn of Local Growth Fund money to spend between 2015-16 and 2020-21.²⁷
- **Local major transport schemes and Local Transport Bodies:** major local schemes have, traditionally, been approved and funded individually by central Government under a centralised, competitive bidding process and applied to schemes of £5m or more. From 2015 onwards, however, the DfT provides per capita funding directly to 'Local Transport Bodies' (LTBs) for them to spend as they wish, and the £5m threshold no longer applies (which could benefit walking and cycling projects).
Established in 2013, LTBs are voluntary partnerships of local transport authorities and LEPS (see above) and their geographical remit generally follows LEP boundaries. Other bodies may be represented on LTBs (e.g. district councils and NGOs), but this is decided locally. The governance, financial management and accountability of LTBs are subject to a 'central assurance mechanism.'
- **Integrated Transport Block** is for smaller scale interventions, including walking & cycling schemes.
- **Local Sustainable Transport Fund – 2011/12-2015/6 (LSTF, outside London):** in 2011, local authorities were invited to bid for a share of the LSTF worth £560m (£350m of which was 'revenue funding' – see below). In approving successful 2011-2015 first tranche bids (some of which were made in conjunction with the voluntary sector, including Cycling UK (then as CTC), the Government appeared to give greater weight to economic benefits than to reducing carbon or improving health. However, some cycling-related bids were funded, e.g. Greater Manchester's 'cycle centres' (£4.9m); and Suffolk's cycling bridge for Lowestoft Harbour (£5m). In the second tranche (2012-15), 'Cycle Coventry' was amongst the successful bidders (£3.5m).
The LSTF was originally expected to close in 2013/14, but was extended to 2015/16, thanks to £100m capital funding included in the SLGF (see above).
- **Combined Authorities and 'Devolution Deals':** Combined Authorities (provided for under the *Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009*) are legal structures, with or without a directly-elected mayor. All existing and proposed Combined Authorities have negotiated a bespoke 'Devolution Deal' with the Government. This gives them specific devolved powers (some transport-related) along with additional long-term funding, including a consolidated, multi-year transport investment budget. In some cases, Combined Authorities will take on responsibility for a network of key local roads network.²⁸

Concerns about the SLGF, LEPs funding devolution:

- The SLGF is not ring-fenced, allowing new housing and/or skills to be prioritised over transport and, in turn, roads over cycling and walking. LEPs are, after all, business and growth orientated, so sustainable transport may be of less interest to them than, for example, building roads to maximise the flow of goods and motor traffic, including car access to the new housing developments that the SLGF is also intended to fund. The Campaign for Better Transport's 'LEP Watch' for 2015 found 36 LEPs between them had decided to spend £3,424.74m of their planned projects budget on 444 transport schemes, with just over 54% on new road capacity, and only 1% on cycling.²⁹
- The relative powers of LEPs and LTBs over funding and their relationship with each other is not particularly clear. For example, ensuring that all transport decisions in an area remain in line with the local transport authority's stated objectives may prove challenging if business representatives feel that the objectives undermine their own goals.
- Also, LEP members are not democratically elected, yet exercise a significant influence over the future of their localities, while their accountability and transparency has been called into question. In 2016, a report on LEPs from the National Audit Office stated that: "*LEPs themselves are not as transparent to the public as we would expect given that they are now responsible for significant amounts of taxpayers' money.*"³⁰

- The NAO report mentioned above also suggested that: “Our work shows that LEPs themselves have serious reservations about their capacity to deliver and the increasing complexity of the local landscape, and there is a risk that projects being pursued will not necessarily optimise value for money.”

For more on current and future national funding for cycling and walking see our briefing on national transport policy:

www.cyclinguk.org/campaigning/views-and-briefings/national-transport-policy-cycling

d. Other funding sources

There are many other ways of raising funds for cycling, even when government money is short. It is, in fact, essential not to neglect cycling because of other budget pressures - maintaining the momentum may help attract new financial backing, galvanising both private and voluntary sector.

Amongst the many other sources are:

- **Developers' contributions** (e.g. through s106 *Town and Country Planning Act, 1990*, and s278 of the *Highways Act 1980* in England & Wales; s75 *Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997*); and the community infrastructure levy (CIL, England & Wales).³¹
Much developer funding currently goes towards public transport or local road schemes, but it could be used to support cycling more often. In Horley, for example, every dwelling in a 2,600 housing expansion has had to provide from £2,000+ to £6,000+ towards major bus improvements, and £669 for cycling and pedestrian facilities.³²
Pooled developer contributions could also be applied over a wider area (e.g. to provide high quality cycle access not only to and from the site being developed, but also for infrastructure for cycling with a fixed radius of it).
- **Road and public transport projects:** in total, local authorities spend £billions on major and minor roads and public transport schemes each year; diverting even a small, fixed percentage (say 5-10%) of this to cycling and walking would have a significant impact.
- **Other government funding streams:** health, education, sport and business both involve massive funding programmes. Some of the projects they finance could legitimately incorporate and finance a cycling element (e.g. to boost levels of physical activity, tackle childhood obesity, create jobs etc.).

The following could also be used to finance cycling-related projects:

- **Regeneration budgets** – e.g. for bike recycling schemes to boost skills and create jobs
- **EU regional development funds (Objective 1 grants)**³³
- **Lottery funds** – although much of the money from the Lottery goes to voluntary and community organisations, grants for ‘good causes’ are made to local authorities (but not for projects that the authority has a statutory responsibility to deliver).
- **Private Finance Initiative (PFI)** – for schemes commissioned by the public sector from a predominantly private sector body via a long-term contract, and paid for over the contract’s life.
- **Tax Increment Financing (TIF)** – borrowing against future income streams from the project.

e. Revenue funding

'Revenue' funding pays for staff and the running costs of a project, whereas 'capital' funding is for significant assets with a long life-span (e.g. physical infrastructure). Historically, however, revenue funding has been much harder to extract from central government than capital funding, although progress has been made on stressing the importance of revenue funding for smarter choice measures that typically employ staff and need to keep going (e.g. cycle training initiatives).

Revenue funding can also come from non-Government sources and make a significant contribution. In England overall, a study found that about 38% of local authority expenditure on integrated transport and maintenance came from external sources.³⁴

- For Sheffield's LTP2 cycling strategy, around 45% of the five-year programme was funded by developer contributions and regeneration funds;
- Developer contributions helped Cycling UK deliver a Workplace Cycle Challenge programme in Tiptree.

f. Managing funding diversity

The complexities of investigating, securing and managing multiple funding sources, however, can cause problems for local authorities, e.g.:

- It takes up a considerable amount of officer time;
- Non-government sources may be piecemeal and irregular, making it hard to plan a long-term programme with confidence;
- Late (or non-) arrival of funds can cause delays and/or compromise quality;
- Opportunities can be neglected or missed altogether.

Case Study: Diversity of funds

The Colliers' Way Project, Somerset is part of Route 24 of the National Cycle Network, running for 19 miles between Bath and Frome along a disused railway and quiet country lanes. A partnership project between local councils, Sustrans and others, the funding for it was diverse and complex – the £2m it cost came from 25 different sources and ranged from £250 to £250,000. This caused problems, including:

- The large amount of effort needed to prepare funding applications;
- Delays with individual funding components;
- Shortfalls which meant that compromises had to be made;
- Uncertainty about revenue funding for future maintenance.

Source: *Local Transport Funding Toolkit for Local Authorities*, TRL Report PPR 326, via DISTILLATE, Project E: <http://www.distillate.ac.uk/outputs/products.php>





g. Spending funds

The allocation of the Cycling Demonstration Towns' budgets is a useful example.

Cycling infrastructure was the main area of investment in Shrewsbury, which allocated its three-year budget (2008-2011) as follows:³⁵

- Workplace promotion – 4%
- Workplace promotion (grants) – 2%
- Schools promotion – 1%
- School promotion (cycle parking) – 4%
- Bikeability – 1%
- Other marketing & promotion – 8%
 - **TOTAL smarter choices = 20%**
- Connect 2 project – 2%
- Other infrastructure – 67%
 - **TOTAL infrastructure = 69%**
- Monitoring – 3%
- Project management – 8%

Bristol Cycling City initially allocated 68% of its £26 million three-year cycling plan to infrastructure, and a higher proportion (than elsewhere) to promotion – 17% for smarter choices and PR, and 11% to cycle training. The remaining 4% was for project management and evaluation.³⁶

Thus the higher-spending local authorities tended to put most of their 'cycling' money into infrastructure and, usually, the bigger the urban area, the greater the proportion they spend on 'hard' measures relative to 'soft' measures (such as cycle training and promotion). There is a sensible rationale for this: in places without a history of high cycle use or interest in cycling, and where political support for it is low, 'smarter choice' measures will often be the most cost-effective way to boost cycle use from a low base (even though their potential effectiveness is limited by the lack of good infrastructure). If cycle use grows and the 'cyclists' vote increases, so does the political support for cycling. This in turn encourages and incentivises decision-makers to increase their investment in it, and put money into high quality infrastructure schemes.

Major cycling schemes: in previous Local Transport Plans (LTPs, England), major schemes of £5m+ accounted for about a quarter of capital funds. Half of these were for local road projects and another third for public transport. It is entirely possible to develop cycling schemes on a similar scale (e.g. a dedicated cycle bridge), but reap greater benefits (see BCR section 4b above).





5. Human resources

Cycling UK view: Local authorities should commit staff resources to cycling and to training them appropriately; and they should also harness the support of the voluntary sector.

a. Local authority cycling teams, cycling officers and 'member champions'

If local authorities really want to boost cycling, they must give it a high profile and resource it properly, not just with funding, but also with adequate and well-managed human resources.

Staffing

London is a useful case study. Soon after Transport for London (TfL) was established in 2000, a dedicated Cycling, Walking and Accessibility team was formed with approximately 30 staff to implement programmes and provide technical support. In addition, a separate project management team of 12 cycling specialists was set up to co-ordinate implementation of the London Cycle Network+ (LCN+).

However, while this strengthened London's *strategic* cycling capabilities (and cycling levels rose substantially), the same did not happen at the lower, borough level. There, only a few staff were allocated to cycling programmes, and sometimes just a single officer. Consequently, some boroughs found it hard to spend all their cycling funding. A report from the London Assembly (2005) looked at the problems in detail.³⁷ By 2016, staffing problems were still evident:

"The Superhighways and junctions programmes have worked so well because TfL has its own dedicated teams for each project whose job is to deliver the schemes, to monitor contractors, to keep to timelines, to manage stakeholders and to anticipate problems."

"The people at TfL doing the Quietways are just as good, but there are far fewer of them and they do not have the capacity to manage the programme as directly or as proactively. This team should be expanded."

"At the borough level, many officers and members are equally keen and committed but all boroughs have taken massive cuts in resources and staffing."

"Without dedicated teams, many routine interactions simply take too long, problems which could have been nipped in the bud are not resolved quickly enough and 'Chinese whispers' build up between the various groups involved."

Extracts from *Human Streets: The Mayor's Vision for Cycling Three Years On*. March 2016.

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/human_streets_0.pdf

These difficulties were (and are) not unique to London. At present, some local authorities have only a single cycling officer to manage their cycling programmes, and others have none, taking the view that staff will look after cycling in their general work, where relevant.

Certainly, dispersing responsibility for cycling to all relevant teams (e.g. engineering, road safety, maintenance, development control etc.) may work as long as they have the necessary direction, training and skills (see 5b, 'professional training' below). This is better than no one being directed to 'think bike' at all or, if there is a lone, designated cycling officer, seeking their advice so late in the process that all they can do is suggest some 'bolt on' cycling provision, a situation that may lead to substandard design and mistakes that are expensive to rectify.



However, establishing a cycling team is beneficial too. Its staff can use their expertise to advise other teams; act as a point of contact with external stakeholders; provide co-ordination of cycling-related initiatives; and monitor progress.

The downsides of dispensing with a Cycling Officer/are:

- No-one is specifically responsible for overall cycling policy or programme co-ordination;
- Colleagues who lack cycling knowledge do not have anyone to turn to for expertise;
- Responsibilities become divided between different teams, compromising good communication.

How to commit staff resources to cycling

- Appoint a senior manager and elected member as 'cycling champions' (and support them);
- Set up dedicated teams to work on cycling programmes (infrastructure and smarter choices);
- Improve the understanding, motivation and technical capability of wider local authority staff through training, site visits, involvement in cycle audits etc.;
- Co-ordinate cycling programmes strategically, particularly in larger urban areas.

b. Professional training and audit procedures

Although detailed guidance is available, there is no substitute for professional training to ensure a good understanding of the principles of cycle-friendly planning and design. Ideally, relevant staff should also be cyclists themselves or undertake national standard cycle training ('Bikeability'). This is important because the design of cycle facilities must support rather than contradict what the national standard teaches cyclists to do (e.g. remain visible to drivers by not riding in the gutter – some cycle lanes are so narrow that any cyclist trying to stay in them will be doing just that).

c. Harnessing the voluntary and NGO sector

The 3rd sector can and does contribute significantly to boosting local cycling, either unpaid as volunteers, or grant-supported for a specific project. For instance, individuals and organisations such as Cycling UK, local campaign groups, Sustrans and others may be able to help with:

- Promoting cycling by organising events, sport activities and bike rides, etc.;
- Delivering training programmes at schools, clubs and workplaces, etc.;
- Encouraging people to cycle to work (through workplace travel plans / Bicycle User Groups);
- Helping disadvantaged groups to take up cycling;
- Distributing information;
- Cycle counts.

It's also a good idea to enlist the voluntary sector and community stakeholder when planning strategies and programmes for cycling and proposing new cycling infrastructure (see 6d below).

If you would like to explore the services that Cycling UK offers to local authorities, please contact 0844 736 8450 / cycling@ctc.org.uk and ask to be put in touch with the appropriate Head of Development. Cycling UK's cycling programmes are designed to help with a range of local issues, including health, economy, community engagement and diversity.



6. Targets, evaluating and monitoring

Cycling UK view: Authorities should evaluate and monitor the plan effectively by setting substantial targets to increase cycle use; measuring cycle casualties per mile or per trip; monitoring how safe people think cycling is; identifying suitable data collection and reporting mechanisms; and seeking feedback from key partners, including local communities and the voluntary sector.

The requirement for local authorities to set cycling targets and monitor progress is now largely voluntary, but given that cycling helps achieve many wider transport and other objectives (e.g. health, economic, environmental etc. – see section 1a, ‘Benefits of cycling’ above), it makes sense to commit to substantial increases in cycle use and to monitor progress towards it efficiently.

a. Targets

From 2007 to 2011, commuter cycling more than doubled in New York,³⁸ while in Seville the proportion of cycling journeys jumped from 0.2% to 6.6% in under six years, and the number of people cycling daily increased from 2,500 to 70,000.³⁹ This shows that fast growth from a very low base is possible in cities with the political will to release funds and road-space for a rapid expansion of a high quality cycle network – and that challenging targets are perfectly feasible.

Local cycling targets:

- **London:** cycling’s modal share into central London during the weekday morning peak period increased by 203% between 2000 and 2014.⁴⁰ The Mayor’s target is to achieve a 5% modal share (currently around 2%) by 2026, which equates to an approximate 400% increase compared to 2000.⁴¹
- **Edinburgh:** in its refreshed *Active Travel Action Plan* (2016), the City of Edinburgh Council set targets to increase the modal share of all adult residents’ cycling trips from 3% (2014/15) to 10% by 2020; and cycling trips to work by residents from 7.3% (2014/15) to 15% (2020).⁴²
- **Birmingham:** Birmingham’s Cycle Revolution vision is to see “... 5% of all trips in the city to be made by bike by 2023 and to double this again to 10% by 2033.”⁴³

The *Get Britain Cycling* report (All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group, 2013) recommended that the Government’s long-term, national ambition should be to increase cycle use from less than 2% of journeys in 2011, to 10% of all journeys in 2025, and 25% by 2050.

<http://allpartycycling.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/get-britain-cycling1.pdf>

b. What to monitor

Local authorities who are genuinely committed to cycling need to devote more attention and significant resources to strengthening their cycling monitoring systems, and harmonising their approaches with other local authorities, and with the way it is measured nationally.⁴⁴

The main methods of monitoring cycling in a local authority’s area are:

- Annual traffic counts on selected roads (which are aggregated into an overall annual index for the local authority area);
- Surveys of mode of travel to schools, as part of the school travel planning process;
- Mode of travel to work – this comes from the national census, but only every 10 years;
- Sport England’s *Active People Survey* (England) for local area walking and cycling statistics;
- Road casualties, by type (but see 6c below).



Authorities also sometimes carry out monitoring activity for specific reasons – for example, before after surveys of town centre traffic schemes, new cycling provision, and so on.

c. Measuring cyclist casualties/safety

In the past, road safety professionals largely focused on reducing casualties in absolute terms. This made them reluctant to encourage cycling for fear of adding to the casualty toll and making their injury reduction targets difficult to achieve. However, national policy is rightly to encourage *more* as well as *safer* cycling, so it is important to adopt targets and indicators that do not make professionals unwilling to increase cycle use – or, worse, that incentivise them to discourage it.

Rate-based and perception-based indicators are the best way of doing this, and both were embraced by the Government in its *Strategic Framework for Road Safety, 2011*.⁴⁵

Rate-based indicators: Increases in cyclist casualties may still mean that cycle safety is improving if cycle use is going up more steeply than cyclist casualties. Therefore targets and indicators should adopt ‘rate-based’ measures for improvements in cycle safety, e.g. cycle casualties (or fatal and serious injuries) per million km cycled, or per million trips. This is an effective way of judging whether road safety policies are succeeding because they reflect whether a road user’s *exposure* to risk has improved or not. For instance, a target to halve the risk of serious and fatal cyclist and pedestrian casualties *per 100,000 km travelled* is better than aiming for a simple reduction in casualty figures, regardless of any increases in cycling.

Rate-based targets, however, are not always easy to monitor at local level, because reliable local data on cycle use is often difficult to gather. Where this data is lacking, and the objective is still simply to reduce the casualty figure, it is better to exclude pedestrians and cyclists from these simplistic targets.

Notwithstanding, authorities should seriously consider developing the capacity to monitor cycle use robustly enough for a rate-based target. In the meantime, there is nothing to stop authorities adopting perception-based indicators.

Perception-based indicators: These indicators, which show whether public perceptions of cycle safety in the area are getting better or worse, are easier to set and monitor locally. They can serve as a useful complement to rate-based indicators, because they focus an authority’s attention on tackling the source of people’s fears about cycling, rather than on scary, off-putting ‘road safety education’ campaigns that may undermine its targets to increase cycle use.

For more on targets, indicators and road safety objectives, see Cycling UK’s briefing on Cycling and Road Safety www.cyclinguk.org/campaignsbriefings

Stakeholder and community engagement

As mentioned above (section 5c), 3rd sector expertise from nationally and locally based cycle-interest groups is a valuable source of input and feedback. They can help with:

- Developing, delivering and monitoring a local authority’s strategies and plans;
- Ensuring that new cycling infrastructure will be a good investment by commenting on any proposal at the earliest opportunity; and reviewing how well it functions once built.



Case study: Stakeholder involvement & cycling infrastructure (London Cycle Network)

One of the LCN+'s most innovative features was the degree of stakeholder participation. Route inspections were conducted jointly by officers and cyclists for the whole 900km network. Also, questionnaires were sent to councillors, schools, colleges, major employers, town centre managers, transport agencies and the emergency services. As a result, the adopted routes usually reflected cyclists' preferences, and proposals were generally of a higher quality.

Local authorities should therefore involve stakeholders directly in the planning and development of schemes, adapting the *London Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan* (CRISP) approach to local circumstances. www.londoncyclenetwork.org.uk/ (CRISP documentation).

Interactive websites: Another method of harnessing local input is interactive websites that allow people to suggest cycling improvements at specific locations (e.g. a cycle contra-flow, or requests for cycle parking etc). www.bristolstreets.co.uk, for example, contains information on cycle routes, cycle parking, bus routes, road repairs, open spaces, and other subjects. Since it was launched in 2008, thousands of cycling-related comments have been posted.

Cycle Forums: These typically bring together representatives from the highway authority, district/borough council, cycling officers, local cycle campaigners, and large local employers, elected members, the police etc. The Forum acts as a channel of communication on cycling issues and makes suggestions on the future of cycling in the area and comments on specific proposals.

Properly facilitated, well-resourced Cycle Forums are important for developing cycling in a local area and often a good sounding board on progress for a council, at district, metropolitan and county level. Ideally, each significant town in the area should operate a Cycle Forum (or a local transport forum, if there is insufficient demand for one devoted to cycling); and, where appropriate, (e.g. at county level), an overarching forum should consider feedback from more local forums and review strategic cycling issues that affect the whole area.

Surprisingly, there are still towns that either do not have a Cycle Forum or, if they do, one that is not much more than a 'talking shop', perhaps as in consequence of the low priority given to cycling by the local authority.

Further reading on maximising the value of contributions from voluntary stakeholders:

- Cycling UK's *Effective Cycle Forums*: www.cyclinguk.org/guide/effective-cycle-forums
- Cycling UK's *Effective joint working with campaigners*:
www.cyclinguk.org/guide/cycling-officers-effective-joint-working-campaigners

POLICY BACKGROUND

National policy frameworks in each UK country differ to some extent (e.g. on planning), but the following summarises the situation with regard to local transport in England, London, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. (Road safety policy/strategy and its background are covered in Cycling UK's briefing on cycling and road safety – www.cyclinguk.org/campaignsbriefings).



England (outside London)

- **Local Transport Plans (LTP) 1 & 2: 2001-2011** (England, outside London)

The current local transport planning system was introduced in the late 1990s, to provide a longer-term framework and more integrated approach to planning transport at the local level. The first two rounds were between 2001-2006 (LTP1) and 2006-2011 (LTP2) and were, essentially, the way authorities made their bids for local transport funding from national government.

- **LTP3s** (April 2011 onward) have a more flexible timeframe because authorities can renew them whenever they choose. They are now expected to comprise a longer term strategy (lasting about five years), plus a shorter delivery programme (lasting about three years). Also, the plans are subject to less direct scrutiny from national government than in the past, because the national funding allocations are no longer made on the basis of them.

- **2011: Local Transport White Paper:** as authorities were preparing their LTP3s, the Government published its Local Transport White Paper, *Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon*. This focused on the need to 'nudge' people towards greener travel choices. At the same time, the Government also established the *Local Sustainable Transport Fund* (see section 4c above).

London: each borough prepares a Local Implementation Plan (LIP), setting out how it proposes to implement the *London Mayor's Transport Strategy* (MTS) in their area. They have mandatory indicators relating to, for example, mode share, casualties, cycle parking and cycle superhighways. Boroughs are expected to submit a programme each year setting out how they wish to spend their allocation of funding (about £3m). For more, see www.tfl.gov.uk / www.lcc.org.uk

Wales: Local transport plans in Wales are submitted by nine 'regions'. According to Welsh Government guidance, the current plans which were approved in May 2015, "... should describe the key transport issues relevant to the local authority and then set out specific priorities for the local authority to deliver in the five year period 2015 to 2020, and medium and longer term aspirations up to 2030." <http://gov.wales/topics/transport/planning-strategies/local-transport/?lang=en>

Scotland: each local authority develops its own Local Transport Strategy (LTS), but also feeds into the relevant *Regional Transport Strategy* (RTS) produced by one of the seven Regional Transport Partnerships: Shetland (ZetTrans); Highlands and Islands (HITRANS); North-East (NESTRANS); Tayside and Central (TACTRAN); South-East (SESTRAN); Strathclyde(SPT); South-West (Swestrans). The RTS lasts from 10-15 years, and are reviewed every four years. For more, see www.transportscotland.gov.uk

Northern Ireland: Local transport is the responsibility of the Dept for Regional Development. www.drdni.gov.uk/

Individual local authorities in the UK publish their official policies on their websites (e.g. those relating to transport, cycling-specific, or planning etc), together with information on how to get involved with any consultation process.





- ¹ Calculated on the basis of 170 gm/km for an average car, around 200 trips per year.
- ² Committee on Climate Change. *Building a low carbon economy*. P 291, 2008
- ³ Pucher J. et al. *Walking & Cycling to Health: A Comparative Analysis of City, State, & International Data*. 2010. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20724675
- ⁴ Woodcock J et al. *Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions: urban land transport*. The Lancet. 25/11/2009.
- ⁵ Cycling UK, *Safety in numbers*. www.cyclinguk.org/safetyinnumbers
- ⁶ Botma & Papendrecht, *Traffic operation of bicycle traffic*. TU-Delft, 1991.
- ⁷ Jacobsen P. *Safety in numbers: more walkers and bicyclists, safer walking and bicycling*. Injury Prevention vol. 9 pp205-209, 2003 <http://ip.bmj.com/cgi/reprint/9/3/205>.
- ⁸ Wardlaw M, *Assessing the actual risks faced by cyclists*. Traffic Engineering and Control. 2002.
- ⁹ Ruth Oldenziel (et al). *Cycling Cities*. 2016. Foundation for the History of Technology. (Eindhoven, the Netherlands). www.cyclingcities.info/
- ¹⁰ ECF. *Congestion Charges and Cycling*. 2016. <https://ecf.com/sites/ecf.com/files/CONGESTION%20CHARGE%20internet.pdf>
- ¹¹ Fairnie, GA., et al. *Active travel in London: The role of travel survey data in describing population physical activity*. 2016. www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S221414051600013X
- ¹² Cairns et al. *Smarter Choices – Changing the Way We Travel*. DfT. 2004. "... on average, every £1 spent on well-designed soft measures could bring about £10 of benefit in reduced congestion alone, more in the most congested conditions, and with further potential gains from environmental improvements and other effects, provided that the tendency of induced traffic to erode such benefits is controlled." <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/smarter-choices-main-report-about-changing-the-way-we-travel>
- ¹³ Atkins/University of Aberdeen. *Mitigating Transport's Climate Change Impact in Scotland: Assessment of Policy Options*. Scottish Government Social Research. 2009. www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/282791/0085548.pdf
- ¹⁴ European Commission. *Attitudes of Europeans Towards Urban Mobility*, December 2013. (Special Eurobarometer 406) http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_406_en.pdf
- ¹⁵ DfT. *Analysis and synthesis of evidence on the effects of investment in six Cycling Demonstration Towns*. Nov 2009. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-the-cycling-city-and-towns-programme>
- ¹⁶ Sloman, L et al. *The Effects of Smarter Choice Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns*. Report to the DfT. February 2010 www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-effects-of-smarter-choice-programmes-in-the-sustainable-travel-towns-full-report
- ¹⁷ FoE/Sustrans. *Moving towards smarter travel?* 2011. www.foe.co.uk/resource/reports/towards_smarter_travel.pdf
- ¹⁸ http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20141/council_pledges/713/maintaining_and_improving_the_quality_of_life_in_edinburgh & http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/meetings/meeting/3899/transport_and_environment_committee (Report to Transport and Environment Committee 15 March 2016, Item 7.7, 9% Budget Commitment to Cycling)
- ¹⁹ SQW Consulting. *Planning for Cycling: A Report to Cycling England*. December 2008 (page 5) <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110407094607/http://www.dft.gov.uk/cyclingengland/site/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/planning-for-cycling-report-10-3-09.pdf>
- ²⁰ DfT. *Value for Money Assessments*. <http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/value-for-money-assessments-guidance/vfmguidance.pdf>
- ²¹ As further evidence of the cost-effectiveness of cycling investment, the BCR of road safety schemes in the first round of LTPs was estimated at about 2 – see DfT, *Long Term Process and Impact Evaluation of the Local Transport Plan Policy*, Final Report (prepared by Atkins, PWC and Warwick Business School), June 2007, Pages10-2 and 3.
- ²² DfT. *Value for Money Assessment for Cycling Grants*. Aug 2014. www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/348943/vfm-assessment-of-cycling-grants.pdf
- ²³ SQW Consulting. *Valuing the Benefits of Cycling: A Report to Cycling England*. May 2007 (page 75). <http://www.apho.org.uk/resource/item.aspx?RID=118319>
- ²⁴ *Ibid*
- ²⁵ DfT. *Cycling Demonstration Towns Development of Benefit-Cost Ratios*. Feb 2010. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110407094607/http://www.dft.gov.uk/cyclingengland/site/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/cdts-development-of-benefit-cost-ratios.pdf>
- ²⁶ For more on the new arrangements see: DfT: *Devolving local major transport schemes: Next steps*. Sep 2012. <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/devolving-local-major-transport-schemes-next-step>; House of Commons Library. *Local transport governance and finance in England, 2010-* (SN5735).June 2013. <http://www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN05735>
- ²⁷ National Audit Office. *Local Enterprise Partnerships*. March 2016. <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Local-Enterprise-Partnerships.pdf>
- ²⁸ See <https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/city-deals-and-growth-deals> for more on Devolution Deals. Essentially, they seem to be the successors to (or, arguably, a more full-blown version of) 'City and Growth Deals', also bespoke agreements conferring certain powers and freedom over business, growth, spending and other decisions that affect the area in question.

See also <http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06649> for a 2016 parliamentary briefing on Combined Authorities.

²⁹ <http://www.bettertransport.org.uk/roads-nowhere/local-transport>

³⁰ National Audit Office. *Local Enterprise Partnerships*. March 2016.

<https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Local-Enterprise-Partnerships.pdf>

³¹ CIL came into force in April 2010, but its rather tortuous history means that authorities are still in the process of adopting it.

www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/1897278.pdf

³² www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk

³³ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/thefunds/regional/index_en.cfm

³⁴ DfT, *Long Term Process and Impact Evaluation of the Local Transport Plan Policy*, Final Report (prepared by Atkins, PWC and Warwick Business School). June 2007. Footnote 94. (Note: this estimate was based on returns from 31 local authorities, and should be used with caution).

³⁵ Shropshire County Council, *Shrewsbury Cycle Town, Delivery Strategy* (2008-2011). Updated Jan 2010. p14

³⁶ *Greater Bristol Cycling City: The Delivery Strategy* (2008-2011), Feb 2009, page 4 Note: the proportions were slightly modified later in the process, but infrastructure still enjoyed a budget of over 60% of the total.

³⁷ London Assembly Transport Committee, *The London Cycle Network*. Nov. 2005, Section 4.22 (no longer online)

³⁸ New York DoT. *NYC Commuter Cycling Indicator*. 2011

www.nyc.gov/html/dot/html/bicyclists/nycbicyclescrct.shtml

³⁹ <http://lcc.org.uk/pages/seville-goes-dutch>

⁴⁰ TfL. *Travel in London. Report 8*. 2015. <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-report-8.pdf>

⁴¹ GLA. *Mayor's Transport Strategy*. May 2010.

<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/transport/our-vision-transport/mayors-transport-strategy>

⁴² City of Edinburgh. *Active Travel Action Plan*. 2016 (refresh).

<http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/7130/active-travel-action-plan-2016>

⁴³ Birmingham Cycle Revolution. <http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/birminghamcyclerevolution>

⁴⁴ See DISTILLATE programme C3, at: <http://www.distillate.ac.uk/outputs/Deliverable%20C3%20v9.pdf>

⁴⁵ DfT. *Strategic Framework for Road Safety*. 2011. www.gov.uk/government/publications/strategic-framework-for-road-safety