

## Cross Party Group on Cycling

**Minutes of Meeting Thursday, 6 February 2014**

**Committee Room 4, Scottish Parliament, 6:00 – 7:30pm**

<p><b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b></p>	<p>Alison Johnstone, MSP welcomed the group.</p>	
	<p><b>In attendance were:</b></p> <p>Alison Johnstone MSP, Co-Convener (AJ) – CHAIR          Jim Eadie, MSP, Co-Convener (JE)          Graeme Obree (GO)          Ian McNicoll – Andrew Cyclist Charitable Trust (IM)          Helen Todd – Ramblers Scotland (HT)          Donald Urquhart – CTC Scotland (DU)          Dave Frew – SCOTS (DF)          John Lauder – Sustrans (JL)          David Brennan – Pedal on Parliament (DB)          Karen Furey – Transport Scotland (KF)          Ian Aitken – Cycling Scotland (IA)          Janice Fenny – Sustrans (JF)          Colin Howden – Tranform Scotland (CH)          Jane Cullingworth – Stirling Cycle Hub (JC)          Janice Gray – Paths for All (JG)          Kim Harding – Pedal on Parliament (KH)          Hugh Thomas – Pedal on Parliament (HT)          Kyle Thomas – Pedal on Parliament (KT)          Maureen Kidd – Cycling Scotland (MK)          Dave du Feu – Spokes (DdF)          Rod Mitchell – Cycle Law Scotland (RM)          Tricia Fort – GoBike (TF)          Nathan Kaczmariski – Cycling Scotland (NK)          Ben Miller – MSP Staff (BM)</p> <p><b>Apologies were received from:</b></p> <p>Richard Lyle, MSP          Claudia Beamish, MSP          Sarah Boyack, MSP          Paul Timms – CTC Scotland          Jim Riach and Craig Burn – Scottish Cycling</p>	
<p><b>2. Minutes of the previous meeting and Matters Arising</b></p>	<p>AJ asked attendees to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p>DdF noted an amendment on Page 4, final para. replacing first sentence with “DdF noted that UK government statistics show 'A' roads to be much more dangerous than lesser roads, and rural roads more</p>	

	<p>dangerous than equivalent urban roads.”</p> <p>No further points of accuracy were raised.</p> <p>Action for discussing Cycle Champions was noted, but was suggested to postpone this to a later meeting.</p> <p><b>All other actions were accounted for and minutes approved:</b></p> <p><b>Proposed: IM</b> <b>Seconded: JL</b></p>	
<p><b>3. Graeme Obree</b></p>	<p>AJ introduced Graeme Obree.</p> <p>GO introduced himself and noted that, although a professional cyclist, he is also an everyday cyclist as he does not use a car at all.</p> <p>GO noted that he shares an aspiration for increasing cycling along with the other CPG members, but notes that this aspiration seems to be in the minority so hopes to find ways to encourage this aspiration across the general population.</p> <p>GO noted that most people when faced with a choice tend to take the path of lowest resistance – like a river – and therefore to truly be taken up by a majority, cycling needs to be as easy as possible.</p> <p>GO noted that it is an individual decision to cycle, but it is necessary to convince the people making decisions (e.g., politicians) that cycling is the right thing to do.</p> <p>GO noted that key to this is to get around departmentalisation of cycling. GO added that the benefits of cycling are cross-beneficial, so really should be taken seriously by health and environment as much as transport. GO noted the importance of evidence as well, pointing to cost:benefit analysis that takes into consideration all of the benefits, whether health, economic, personal or transport.</p> <p>GO suggested that the bicycle trade could support making cycling more accessible. For example, at the point of sale, appropriate bicycles should be available so as to overcome concerns about equipment and portability. GO said that there should be a standardly equipped bicycle and this would take away some of the</p>	

	<p>fears that people have of the unknowns of buying a bike. In addition, GO noted the potential of supporting electric bicycles (e-bikes). GO said that e-bikes are potentially a way of making cycling more accessible, removing barriers such as hills and inhibitions on fitness levels. GO stressed the importance of a user-friendly bicycle.</p> <p>GO also noted the importance of high-profile people being seen to support cycling, whether this is a 'Commissioner for Cycling' who is an overseer of cycling in the political sphere, or general champions or high-profile people just being seen to cycle indicating that it is a normal thing to do.</p> <p>AJ thanked GO for his presentation and opened the floor for questions.</p> <p>AJ queried GO on safety issues and people potentially being afraid to cycle.</p> <p>GO replied that even simple changes could help with this, e.g., changes to road layouts such as pedestrian islands and other pinch points. GO added that without experience, these types of situations can be frightening for people cycling.</p> <p>AJ followed up by asking if GO had ideas on how to make cycling seen as a 'normal' activity.</p> <p>GO noted that cycling should be easy as possible, so cycling gear should help with this ease, not prove a hindrance. GO also noted that electric bikes could be useful in getting people on bikes who think that they would not be able to otherwise due to fitness / hilly terrain.</p> <p>DB and JL focussed on longer term benefits of cycling, with JL adding that obesity is a huge problem with rising costs and health could take a part in promoting cycling. AJ added that this is a longer term 'transport justice' consideration, noting the recent RAC research that approximately 1/3 of wages are spent on running a car.</p> <p>JG noted the importance of other physical activity, such as dog walking, but also that it is important to consider</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the different needs for those that use paths, including those cycling, where provision needs to be considered for everyone along with potentially adding an educational element. GO agreed that space needs to be discussed, and potentially there is a lack of knowledge that some paths are shared space.</p> <p>DdF raised the issue of pedestrian islands and pinch points, and that although there is guidance, this is perhaps substandard and there is a lack of willingness to put in facilities that would be better for both pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>A member of the public who did not provide their name or contact details asked GO on thoughts around getting kids and schools more involved in cycling. GO noted that there is huge potential in getting cycling more integrated into School Expo sports days, linking with local clubs and other local enthusiasts. KH noted the potential to introduce cycling to preschools through balance bikes.</p> <p>IA asked GO whether he sees cycling shops and retailers having a role to play to encourage people to cycle. GO replied that it does not seem that retailers and the bike trade promote cycling widely.</p> <p>TF noted that many other countries provide bicycles that have all required accessories as part of the initial purchase (e.g., lights, mudguards, etc.) but in the UK these seem to be extra accessories that need to be purchased, making it less straightforward when going out to buy a bike and instantaneously receiving something completely fit for purpose. GO agreed, and added that although Glasgow 2014 should inspire people to cycle more and be more active, there could be a situation where people look into cycling and are put off by the cost or the difficulty in getting a bike fit for purpose.</p> <p>AJ closed the session with GO and thanked him for his attendance and his contributions to encouraging cycling in Scotland.</p>	
--	---	--

<p><b>4. NPF3, SPP and Town Centre Action Plan</b></p>	<p>AJ introduced the agenda item on the National Planning Framework 3 that has recently been laid before Scottish Parliament for consideration.</p> <p>AJ noted that the NPF3 was laid before Scottish Parliament on 14 January 2014, commencing a period of 60 days for consideration, with a Parliamentary debate following. AJ added that several Committees are also taking evidence on this. AJ also noted a letter written on behalf of the CPG to Derek Mackay, Minister for Local Government and Planning regarding the NPF3 and also the Town Centre Action Plan. AJ added that the Minister replied regarding the continued process on developing these documents, but also noted that he would be happy to consider an invitation to attend a future meeting of the CPG.</p> <p>AJ asked CPG members to provide a short summary of any evidence or responses that they have submitted as part of the NPF3 process to date.</p> <p>KF noted that Keith Brown, Minister for Transport and Veterans, has been involved in cross-departmental discussions that have fed into strategic documents and is committed to continuing cross-portfolio meetings to discuss methods to deliver on cycling and active travel in different delivery areas.</p> <p>DdF referred to the Long-Distance Cycle Network proposals in the NPF3 and noted that these are a welcome inclusion, however: 1) these seem to be rural and tourism focussed, and do not specifically link settlements, towns and cities that should be encouraged to be cycle friendly; and 2) the timescales for some suggested improvements (such as cycle friendly towns) are slow and not necessarily joined up, e.g., the aim for each local authority to designate a cycle friendly town by 2030 is a very long-term vision, when this should be dealt with in the much more immediate future.</p> <p>JL noted that Sustrans provided written and oral evidence to the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee. JL noted that one of the queries raised was on the 2030 timescale, but as of yet have not received indication on thinking behind this. JL noted that</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>although the Long Distance Cycle Network proposal is not perfect, there are huge opportunities to make a exemplars out of the network, e.g., by improving the National CycleNetwork and connections to settlements – 25% of journeys on NCN are commuting. JL noted some other opportunities throughout the NPF3 that support improving cycling networks, including references to ‘green infrastructure’ and the CSGN (para 4.13) and also the walking and cycling friendly settlements (para 5.26), but did note the long-term nature of the current wording. JL also noted that some of the references to active travel are vague and therefore it is difficult to see the specific outcome from the wording as it is now. JL suggested that other strategies could be considered for an update, for example looking at the active travel elements of the Transport Strategy.</p> <p>DdF noted the Parliamentary debate surrounding the Town Centre Action Plan where Sarah Boyack (SB) and AJ raised points about the lack of cycling innovation in the Action Plan, and Derek Mackay, Minister for Local Government and Planning, noted that extra thought would be put into this. DdF asked whether there had been any follow-up on this, and AJ replied that there hadn’t been a response yet, but that she would pursue this.</p> <p><b>ACTION 1: AJ to follow-up with Derek Mackay on any progress relating to cycling innovations within the Town Centre Action Plan</b></p> <p>DdF also noted that there have been discussions with some interested parties on developing demo projects in relation to the Town Centre Action Plan.</p> <p>AJ asked the group for some suggested next steps.</p> <p>JL suggested clearer links between the Long Distance Cycling Network proposals and active travel improvements within settlements so as to avoid potential for silo delivery. AJ noted that the Long Distance Network could act as a spine that other projects could be linked to.</p> <p>DF noted that the NPF3 is not necessarily specific in certain areas, but rather provides a framework of key</p>	<p>AJ</p>
--	---	-----------

	<p>principles while allowing local delivery leeway to build on those principles.</p> <p>AJ noted that this discussion could inform some potential Parliamentary Questions or Debate Questions about both the NPF3 and the Town Centre Action Plan.</p> <p><b>ACTION: AJ and other MSPs – Consider submitting PQs relating to the NPF3 and/or the Town Centre Action Plan</b></p>	<p><b>MSP CPG Members</b></p>
<p><b>5. Safer Cycling</b></p>	<p>AJ introduced this topic and asked RM to update on the Roadshare/Strict Liability campaign and any developments on the Strict Liability working group discussion.</p> <p>RM noted that there is a group of interested organisations and that the Parliamentary reception provided a positive reaction towards the idea. RM added that Chris Oliver has been appointed Chair of the Road Share working group and a framework has been developed. RM noted that the next step is to invite individuals/organisations to take part in the working group.</p> <p><b>ACTION 2: RM to write to individuals/organisations with regard to establishment of a working group on Strict Liability.</b></p> <p>KF queried whether the focus of the working group will be on ‘strict’, ‘presumed’ or other version of civil liability. RM noted that ‘strict’ was considered, but not prescribed to be this and the principle should be the focus.</p> <p>JL questioned whether there had been any further research by the Road Share campaign into the concept to build upon what they have presented before and the Transport Scotland research. RM referred back to initial research presented at the outset of the campaign.</p> <p>IA asked whether the principle of civil liability should be the focus, or whether it should be considered along with criminal aspects such as through the Scottish Road Justice Group. DU noted that he chairs the Scottish Road Justice Group and added that the group was set</p>	<p><b>RM</b></p>

	<p>up on the back of the Audrey Fyfe case and is similar to a group established in England (Road Justice Campaign) that looks at vulnerable road user road justice. DU noted that the Scottish group has written to the Cabinet Secretary for Justice to arrange a meeting, but this was not accepted. The Group hopes to meet with the Crown Office and will continue to speak with MSPs to discuss opportunities surrounding road justice for vulnerable road users. DU noted that discussions with Police Scotland are also integral and decisions impacting road traffic enforcement made by Police Scotland should be open for discussion/consultation, yet noted there are very few opportunities to feedback on these decisions.</p> <p>RM felt that discussing criminal law may cloud the issue of civil law. KI noted that the White Paper on Scottish Independence specifically notes road traffic criminal law and the potential to consider laws and whether they protect at risk road users and pedestrians. KI noted that this is an opportunity to focus on the criminal side as it has entered the debate in the white paper.</p> <p>DU noted that criminal law has been the focus thus far of the Scottish Road Justice Group, but it is important that any progress on both civil and criminal law should be very closely aligned.</p> <p>RM noted that some organisations that support pedestrians have not put support behind the campaign. DdF queried the reasoning behind this and KI responded by indicating that Living Streets have not put all resources behind the campaign and feels that criminal law should be considered as well.</p> <p>RM addressed concerns surrounding commercial interests by noting that they hope to move the campaign to more of a partnership, under the name of “Road Share”.</p>	
<p><b>6. Future CPG Topics</b></p>	<p>AJ noted the following potential topics for the CPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Police Scotland; Derek Mackay, Minister for Communities and Local Government; Cycling retailers and businesses; ScotRail; Walking organisations; Motoring organisations such as</li> </ul>	

	<p>RAC/AA/IAM.</p> <p>AJ asked the members to discuss the potential topics.</p> <p>HT noted support for walking organisations to be involved, potentially covering the Walking Strategy as well as to address any potential conflicts (e.g., shared space, etc.).</p> <p>IA noted preference to invite Police Scotland as soon as possible. RM noted some issues in terms of reporting accidents between Police Scotland and the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Scotland (COPFS) reporting. DU noted that he could provide a contact for COPFS.</p> <p><b>ACTION 3: DU to provide BenM with contact for COPFS.</b></p> <p>DdF suggested inviting Derek Mackay soon as well, to ensure we are able to influence the recently released planning documents (NPF3, Town Centres Action Plan, etc.)</p> <p>JL suggested another theme could be health, and the Chief Medical Officer could be invited.</p> <p>IM noted Operation Safeway recently completed in London which was an enforcement drive for road users to obey signals. IM noted that this could link to topics posed to Police Scotland. DU added that target-setting methodology could also be raised if Police Scotland attends.</p> <p>DU added that academic research could be a future topic, bringing in evidence to support evidence-led influence. DU suggested that the CPG could ask for data and information to support MSPs and members in establishing evidence bases.</p> <p><b>ACTION 4: CPG (BenM/NK) to consider potential sources of academic research and experts to be invited to provide evidence to support MSPs and CPG members</b></p>	<p>DU</p> <p>BenM/NK</p>
--	---	--------------------------

<p><b>7. AOB</b></p>	<p>AJ asked whether there was any AOB.</p> <p>TF explained that she noted that bicycles in the UK are not sold with important accessories included, e.g., lights, mudguards, integrated lock, etc. This differs from other countries that do sell bicycles with all accessories included to make the bicycle fit for purpose. TF queried what was needed legally for a bicycle to be sold in the UK and how this differed from other countries. IA noted the Bicycle Association and Association of Cycle Traders as organisations that should be able to provide what is legally required to be included on a bicycle for sale.</p> <p><b>ACTION 5: CPG (NK) to add standards for bicycles as potential future topic of discussion (potentially if inviting bicycle retailer associations to the meeting).</b></p> <p>IA noted the recent adjudication on by the Advertising Standards Authority Council on the ‘See Cyclist, Think Horse’ advertisement. The advertisement was initially banned due to five complaints received relating to the cyclist in the final scene not wearing a helmet or other safety attire and appearing to cycle in the middle of the lane. After a large reaction from the cycling community on the day the adjudication was released (including a petition calling for review signed by 4,500 people). Cycling Scotland has requested the ASA to suspend its adjudication – which it has, pending an Independent Review - and is pursuing the Independent Review Process, which involves submitting a request to the Independent Reviewer. This will then be considered and potentially referred back to the ASA Council to reconsider the adjudication. IA noted that the advertisement represented people with and without helmets to reflect the law as well as the reality of cycling in Scotland. In addition, the road positioning of the cyclist was correct and true to the National Standard. IA thanked partners for all their feedback and any information supplied as this has been helpful in pulling together the request for Independent Review. IA noted that the Westminster Parliament’s All-Party Parliamentary Cycling Group penned a letter to the ASA calling for a review and suggested that the CPG do the same.</p>	<p>NK</p>
----------------------	---	-----------

