

Cross Party Group on Cycling

Minutes of Meeting Tuesday, 3 December 2013

Committee Room 5, Scottish Parliament, 5:30 – 7:30pm

1. Welcome and Introductions	Claudia Beamish, MSP welcomed the group.	
	<p>In attendance were:</p> <p>Claudia Beamish MSP, Deputy co-convenor (CB) - CHAIR Alison Johnstone MSP, Co-Convenor of Group (AJ) Cllr Frank McAveety, Glasgow City Council (FM) Bruce Whyte, GCPH (BW) Sarah Ainsworth, Progressive (SA) Ian McNicoll – Andrew Cyclist Charitable Trust (IM) Dave Frew – SCOTS (DF) David Brennan – Pedal on Parliament (DB) Kim Harding – Pedal on Parliament (KH) Peter Hayman – CTC (PH) Jim Riach – Scottish Cycling (JR) Tricia Fort – GoBike (TF) Rod Mitchell – Cycle Law Scotland (RM) Brenda Mitchell – Cycle Law Scotland (BrM) John Lauder – Sustrans (JL) Ian Findlay – Paths for All (IF) Janice Gray – Paths for All (JG) Iona Shepherd – Stirling Cycle Hub (IS) Bill Wright – Cycling Scotland (BW) Maureen Kidd – Cycling Scotland (MK) Nathan Kaczmariski – Cycling Scotland (NK) Andrew Pankhurst – Cycling Scotland (AP) Dave du Feu – Spokes (DdF) Keith Irving – Living Streets (KI) Ben Miller – MSP Staff (BM)</p> <p>Apologies were received from:</p> <p>Jim Eadie, MSP Sarah Boyack, MSP Ian Aitken – Cycling Scotland Paul Timms – CTC Scotland Chris Oliver – CTC Scotland Craig Burn – Scottish Cycling Helen Todd – Ramblers Scotland Karen Furey – Transport Scotland</p>	

<p>2. Minutes of the previous meeting and Matters Arising</p>	<p>CB asked attendees to approve the minutes of the previous meeting. No points of accuracy were raised.</p> <p>Action for AJ to explore proposal to suggest appointment of Cycle Champion was noted, but AJ agreed that discussion on this could be moved to AOB.</p> <p>All other actions were accounted for and minutes approved:</p> <p>Proposed: TF Seconded: JL</p> <p>DdF had a query for JL relating to the previous minute on whether JL has looked into incorporating commitment of a local authority's own capital budget in relation to receiving funding for cycling infrastructure funding through Sustrans. JL noted that this was discussed when determining the criteria, but development of wording resulted in commitment of a LA's own capital not being a requirement, but being looked at more favourably. JL noted that there is further discussion on this to see if this can be tightened up further.</p>	
<p>3. Cllr Frank McAveety, Glasgow City Council – Cycling in Glasgow</p>	<p>CB introduced Cllr Frank McAveety (FM), Glasgow City Council.</p> <p>FM introduced the topic of cycling in Glasgow and noted that he would cover context, recent developments and opportunities going forward for increasing cycling in Glasgow.</p> <p>FM started by indicating that politicians have a key role to play in promoting cycling and it is important that they are involved to ensure there is a champion in the political setting.</p> <p>FM noted that a key tool for cycling in Glasgow has been the development of the Cycling Forum. This consists of a number of stakeholders, from campaign groups and community groups to council officers and politicians. FM highly recommended establishment of a Cycling Forum in order to support cycling in each local authority area. Key to success and establishment of these forums is to identify key politicians to become involved in, and potentially lead, the forum.</p>	

	<p>FM referenced that he took part in the study visit to the Netherlands earlier in 2013 and it was enlightening to see the Dutch approach and to see the 'Rolls Royce' models of cycling infrastructure and provision. FM noted that in the Netherlands, consideration for cycling is simply seen as the 'right thing to do' and this feeling has reached very broad consensus.</p> <p>FM noted that reaching this broad consensus is a challenge in the UK, and is no different in Glasgow. FM noted that there is already a heavy focus on road maintenance/development. Therefore the opportunity is to identify how to find a level of resources to address this whilst potentially transforming cycling at an early stage of development of roads and neighbourhoods.</p> <p>FM explained some approaches to accessing and building resources as highlighted by Audit Scotland, but key is ensuring that the discussion on cycling happens at the beginning as resources are identified and brought in.</p> <p>FM noted an example with Sighthill regeneration project; ensuring that cycling and active travel are built in at the earliest stage possible to get the discussion going.</p> <p>FM finished by highlighting some key opportunities in Glasgow, including the Commonwealth Games in 2014 and the venues and key facilities for cycling: Cathkin Braes and the Sir Chris Hoy Velodrome.</p> <p>CB thanked FM for his presentation, noted that there are potential synergies with local and national government working together to improve cycling. CB also noted opportunities relating to planning and development, highlighting the NPF3 and whether there needs to be clearer messages within strategic documents such as this. CB then opened the floor for questions.</p> <p>KH asked whether Glasgow is looking at other comparable cities elsewhere that have seen improvements and what could be learned from them. FM noted that the Future Cities team is looking at equivalent cities elsewhere. FM added that it is important to look at other places outside of</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Copenhagen and Amsterdam that are not quite as well-developed for cycling, such as in Germany, to see how the step-change could work.</p> <p>JL noted that the motorway system that surrounds and cuts through Glasgow is not under Glasgow City Council control; does this pose a problem in that the motorway system makes it easier to access the city centre by car, whilst also trying to encourage active travel and public transport; and have GCC considered congestion charging to address this issue. FM recognised the issue that JL raised, but noted that there are no plans to consider congestion charging.</p> <p>DB noted the potential benefits from regeneration schemes such as Sighthill, but noted that a focus on key arterial routes is critical. FM noted that a cycle route is only as good as its weakest link and therefore it is important to look at the wider network. FM revisited the importance of resourcing for this approach and added that the evidence base for economic and social benefit from cycling is increasing and this is crucial for gaining political interest.</p> <p>KI noted the ‘smaller battles’ to ensure that active travel is considered, highlighting the Fastlink impact on Govan Road as an example.</p> <p>AJ noted the tax on cars in Copenhagen is very large, recognising the emphasis that Copenhagen has placed on trying to ensure that the city is a place where people want to live in, not sprawled out and congested with traffic; the city has made a connection that a place that is pleasant to live with good quality of life will attract people to it.</p> <p>DdF noted that there are trends in safety statistics that show A-roads and rural roads are experiencing an increase in cycling casualties. As some A-roads would be considered key arterial routes for cycling, there is a safety issue and noted that it is important to consider different requirements for safety on the different types of roads.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>4. Bruce Whyte, GCPH – Can Cycling (to work) Benefit Health?</p>	<p>CB introduced Bruce Whyte (BW), GCPH.</p> <p>BW introduced his presentation that would cover the perception of cycling, the benefits, the situation in Glasgow and the impact demonstrated by the application of the HEAT tool to current and potential cycling levels in Glasgow.</p> <p>BW introduced the topic by showing various examples of how cycling has been ‘normalised’ in other cities across Europe, with particular emphasis on Gothenburg.</p> <p>BW continued to show the changes in Glasgow, with a clear increase in numbers of people cycling to/from the city centre over the last three years. In addition, BW noted positive increases in children cycling to school. However, in context with other European cities this is still very small.</p> <p>BW provided more in-depth analysis into how cycling rates vary by neighbourhood and ‘region’ of Glasgow, based on Census 2001 data and the Scottish Household Survey.</p> <p>BW highlighted that active travel amongst adults across the city is still very low, and is primarily seen as a necessity rather than a positive choice. BW added that facilities, infrastructure and safety need to be improved to encourage a shift.</p> <p>BW then introduced the HEAT analysis of cycling in Glasgow. This was done to explore the potential health economic benefits of cycling in an urban Scottish setting. BW provided an overview of the HEAT tool and stressed that it only considered a reduction in mortality, not morbidity; therefore it is likely that the tool is an underestimation as the health benefits of cycling for morbidity are well established.</p> <p>Using the HEAT tool, BW presented that health benefits based on cycling in and out of the city centre of Glasgow went from £3,133,530 in 2009 to £4,235,393 in 2012 (note: some caveats apply). BW added that if there is a 10 fold increase in cycling in Glasgow, roughly in line with the CAPS vision of 10% of journeys by bike by 2020, this could realise approximately £43,482,820</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>in health economic benefit (again, caveats apply).</p> <p>BW added some further analysis on impacts of some infrastructure improvements in Glasgow, such as the Tradeston Bridge showing increases in cycling and walking.</p> <p>CB thanked BW for the presentation and noted that the HEAT tool appears to be extremely useful for politicians in identifying health economic benefits from cycling and walking. CB opened the floor to questions and comments.</p> <p>IF noted that this is a clear benefit for the health sector, but how can this be used to lever in funding contribution to improving cycling from the Health sector. BW indicated that it is important to bring in the Health sector due to the clear benefits, and Health Boards should be very interested in these benefits.</p> <p>TF asked about the methodology for asking school children about their preferred mode. BW noted that this came from another study by the Health Board, but understands that it was a large sample (estimating approximately 9,000).</p> <p>DB asked whether there is any steer on how the figure may change if morbidity is incorporated. BW noted that there is no clear answer on this, but there are clear benefits physiologically so there is hope this can be incorporated in the future for HEAT analysis.</p> <p>JR asked whether there is scope from this study to influence cross-departmental plans to aid in delivery and partnership working. FM commented on this by noting health inequalities and the opportunities to invest in interventions such as cycling; FM suggested this could be approached from a different angle by noting that investment in cycling means savings elsewhere in the Health sector.</p> <p>DdF noted that the amount of cycling has flatlined at a national level for some time, but there is a rise and fall in more local areas. DdF noted that investigating more rural areas, where cycling levels have dropped, would show the health savings lost due to less cycling.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>JL asked whether the study looked at suburban cycling into Glasgow from further afield and if it factored in bike ownership; JL noted that in projects in Fife, Sustrans' research showed that a huge barrier was not owning or having access to a bike. BW noted that approximately 20% of people commuting into Glasgow come from outwith GCC area and these were taken out of the total.</p>	
<p>5. Nice Way Code Evaluation</p>	<p>CB introduced Sarah Ainsworth, Progressive to present on the Evaluation of the Nice Way Code Campaign.</p> <p>SA introduced the evaluation of the Nice Way Code (NWC) and noted that the evaluation included a 'pre-' and 'post-' campaign sample that consisted of drivers, cyclists and driver/cyclists. The evaluation looked at behaviours and attitudes for each of the subgroups as well as impact of the campaign in terms of messaging and recall. SA went through the evaluation results in detail.</p> <p>SA summarised that post-campaign findings show slight increases in levels of comfort, slight decreases in feelings of intimidation and significant decreases in feeling unsafe when cycling on the road. SA added, in terms of likelihood to change behaviour, 37% of cyclists and 26% of driver/cyclists indicated that they would be quite or very likely adapt or be more aware of their cycling behaviour on roads in light of seeing the NWC adverts. Furthermore in terms of likelihood to change behaviour, 32% of drivers and 24% of driver/cyclists indicated that they would be quite or very likely adapt or be more aware of their cycling behaviour on roads in light of seeing the NWC adverts.</p> <p>SA concluded that there are indications of positive shifts in attitude across some key areas, some behavioural shifts in a positive direction; with some significant changes and that the campaign appears to have influenced a positive move in people's thinking and behaviour with these shifts occurring for cyclists and drivers equally.</p> <p>CB thanked SA and opened the floor for questions.</p> <p>TF asked whether the pre- and post-campaign samples were the same people. SA noted that they were not</p>	

	<p>the same people, but were similar in socio-demographics so that they are comparable.</p> <p>IF noted that the behavioural shifts and attitudinal changes seem positive, but how do the results compare to other similar campaigns. AP noted that they have asked Carat – the planning and media buying specialist – to identify how these results compare, and they are comparable to a campaign of this size, length and scope.</p> <p>DF asked if there was data on how many people had seen the campaign and whether there are results from the sub-sample that had seen the campaign. SA noted that the recall data show the proportion of the sample had recalled seeing the campaign (both unprompted and prompted). SA added that the subset would be a limited sample and it would not be possible to extract results from the sample of this size.</p> <p>AJ asked whether it is possible to gather whether people actually behave the way they say they do as shown in the results. SA noted that the campaign is claimed behaviour and it was not possible within this scope to track actual behaviour.</p> <p>DB asked whether there were any other factors that could influence the results, e.g., the survey and campaign taking place when schools were not in session. SA noted that it is impossible to identify the impact of all factors on the results, as there are many variables that could impact outside of the campaign.</p> <p>CB then moved on to the workshop exercise to provide some further feedback on the campaign and asked attendees to form groups while AP explained the structure of the workshop. AP asked each group to: <i>1) name two things that were positive about the campaign and two things that could be improved; 2) Should awareness-raising around road users started with the Nice Way Code be continued, why?; 3) If so what type of activity would you like to see? Keep existing campaign or develop a new one, what messages should it cover?</i></p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The groups took 10 minutes to discuss, after which CB asked each group to provide one comment, but to ensure that their full notes are provided to AP either at the end of the meeting or following the meeting by email.</p> <p>Each group provided brief feedback on one element of the questions provided.</p> <p>Group 1: Positives included cross-agency opportunities and a funding source different from the cycling budget; learning points on ensuring longer lead-in and balance should lean in cyclist's favour</p> <p>Group 2: A campaign on awareness-raising should continue as there have been some positive results; messages should be fine-tuned more, potentially focussing on the fact that streets are for everyone.</p> <p>Group 3: It was positive that money was spent on raising awareness of cyclists and there have been some positive results; a further campaign would be supported but not in its current form.</p> <p>Group 4: The engagement with a wide cross-section of partners was important. The style of the campaign may trivialise the importance of the message and perhaps the tone should be more serious and human focused.</p> <p>Group 5: The messages need to be right, with more recognition of vulnerability of cyclists and pedestrians and less emphasis on collective culpability for cyclists.</p> <p>Group 6: There needs to be a more in-depth look at the behaviour change results and the light-heartedness of the campaign needs to be rethought perhaps with a more serious tone.</p> <p>CB asked for any brief final comments. DB asked whether the results will be published and publicised. AP noted that the slides from the presentation can be distributed to attendees with the minutes.</p> <p>ACTION 1: NK to distribute the presentation slides for the Nice Way Code Evaluation to the CPG with the minutes.</p> <p>CB closed the discussion and asked all groups to</p>	<p>NK</p>
--	--	-----------

	<p>provide feedback to AP either with their written notes from the night or by email.</p> <p>ACTION 2: All groups to provide notes to AP; if not provided in paper form at the end of the meeting, PLEASE NOTE: Please send any notes to Nathan@cyclingscotland.org</p>	<p>ALL CPG members</p>
<p>6. Safer Cycling</p>	<p>CB introduced this topic and asked BrM to update on the Roadshare/Strict Liability campaign.</p> <p>BrM noted the upcoming Parliamentary Reception on Strict Liability. BrM added that she did not feel that the report from Transport Scotland provided enough evidence to take Strict Liability off the table and that the topic should remain in debate. BrM thanked AJ for initiating the Member’s Debate on Strict Liability on 29 October.</p> <p>AJ noted the Member’s debate had many contributors and was one of the longest Member’s debates there has been and congratulated the Road Share Campaign for lobbying for it to happen. AJ noted that there is a way to go on the debate surrounding Strict / Presumed Liability but she felt it was worth continuing.</p> <p>The CPG noted that an action to set up a sub-group to look at this further should be considered.</p> <p>ACTION 3: NK to add discussion on setting up a sub-group for further discussion on Strict / Presumed Liability at the next meeting under the Safer Cycling/Strict Liability standing item.</p> <p>CB noted that the Parliamentary Reception on Strict Liability will be held on 12 December. JL asked whether the Road Share campaign has written to MSPs to ask if they are attending. RM noted that they have not co-ordinated anything formally but would look into doing so.</p>	<p>NK</p>
<p>7. AOB</p>	<p>CB asked whether there was any AOB.</p> <p>DdF noted the recent Town Centre Review Action Plan report from the Scottish Government. DdF indicated that although there is brief mention of walking and cycling, it is not emphasised as a tool to help transform</p>	

	<p>town centres and is also treated as a ‘long-term’ measure. DdF distributed the letter that Spokes has written to Derek Mackay, Minister for Local Government and Planning on the matter, asking for a Parliamentary Debate on to discuss the actions within the report and concerns surrounding them. DdF asked if the MSPs who contribute to the CPG on Cycling could support this letter and follow-up on this.</p> <p>The CPG discussed whether this would be better done through correspondence from each member’s organisation/group or from the CPG; however, it was decided that a response from the CPG would add weight to the feeling of concern. CB asked for a letter to be developed from the CPG regarding this matter.</p> <p>ACTION 4: CPG (BenM) to write to Derek Mackay, Minister for Local Government and Planning regarding the concerns on the Town Centre Review Action Plan and the level that walking and cycling features within this.</p> <p>CB noted that the topic of a cycling champion was due to be covered in AOB as well, but recognised time constraints. AJ agreed that this could be moved to the next CPG and added as an agenda item then.</p> <p>ACTION 5: NK to add an agenda item for the next meeting on discussion surrounding a cycling champion.</p>	<p>CPG (BenM)</p> <p>NK</p>
<p>8. Date of Next Meeting</p>	<p>CB closed the meeting and noted that the next meeting date will be circulated as soon as possible.</p>	