

Cross Party Group on Cycling

Minutes of Meeting

Tuesday, 1 April 2014

1pm-2.30pm, Room Q1.03, Scottish Parliament

1. Welcome and Introductions	Alison Johnstone, MSP welcomed the group.	
	<p>In attendance were:</p> <p>Alison Johnstone MSP, Co-Convener (AJ) – CHAIR Jim Eadie, MSP, Co-Convener (JE) Tracey Robinson, Police Scotland (TR) Ian McNicoll – Andrew Cyclist Charitable Trust (IM) John Lauder – Sustrans (JL) Ian Aitken – Cycling Scotland (IA) Nathan Kaczmarek – Cycling Scotland (NK) Dave Frew – Fife Council (DF) Ian Findlay – Paths for All (IF) Janice Gray – Paths for All (JG) Alan Rehfish – SPICe (AR) Karen Furey – Transport Scotland (KF) Jim Oliver – Transport Scotland (JO) Kim Harding – Pedal on Parliament (KH) Chris Thompson – Living Streets (CT) Dave du Feu – Spokes (DdF) Tricia Fort – GoBike (TF) Richard Davison – Scottish Cycling (RD) Denis Johnston – MSP Staff (Fiona McLeod, MSP) (DJ) Calum Smith – MSP Staff (Claudia Beamish, MSP) (CS) Eachann Gillies – Cycle Law Scotland (EG) Brenda Mitchell – Cycle Law Scotland (BrM) Patrick Hogan – IndigoPR (PH) Ben Miller – MSP Staff (BM)</p> <p>Apologies were received from:</p> <p>Richard Lyle, MSP Claudia Beamish, MSP Sarah Boyack, MSP Keith Irving – Living Streets Paul Timms – CTC Donald Urquhart – CTC Craig Burn – Scottish Cycling Jim Riach – Scottish Cycling Helen Todd – Ramblers Scotland Jane Cullingworth – Forth Environment Link / Stirling Cycle Hub Greg Chauvet – Glasgow Bike Station Maureen Kidd -- Cycling Scotland</p>	

<p>2. AGM</p>	<p>In the interest of ensuring the meeting to be quorate, AJ asked the Group to allow the AGM element to be brought forward whilst JE was in attendance. The Group agreed.</p> <p>2.1 Consideration of Office Bearers</p> <p>The Group was asked to consider Alison Johnstone, MSP and Jim Eadie, MSP to continue as Co-Conveners of the Cross Party Group on Cycling.</p> <p><i>The Group was content for AJ and JE to continue as Co-Conveners</i></p> <p>The Group was asked to consider Sarah Boyack, MSP and Claudia Beamish, MSP to continue as Deputy Co-Conveners of the Cross Party Group on Cycling Scotland.</p> <p><i>The Group was content for SB and CB to continue as Deputy Co-Conveners.</i></p> <p>The Group was asked to consider Nathan Kaczmarek, Cycling Scotland to continue as Secretariat of the Cross Party Group on Cycling Scotland</p> <p><i>The Group was content for NK to continue as Secretariat.</i></p> <p>The Group was asked to consider additional Members to the group: GoBike – Strathclyde Cycle Campaign; Transport Scotland; Cycle Law Scotland; and Forth Environment Link/Stirling Cycle Hub.</p> <p><i>The Group was content for GoBike, Transport Scotland, Cycle Law Scotland and Forth Environment Link/Stirling Cycle Hub to be added as Members.</i></p> <p>2.2 Consideration of Annual Return</p> <p>AJ presented the Annual Return for consideration.</p> <p><i>The Group was content with the Annual Return.</i></p> <p>[JE departed the meeting]</p>	

<p>3. Minutes of the previous meeting and Matters Arising</p>	<p>3.1 Previous Minutes</p> <p>AJ introduced the minutes from the previous meeting.</p> <p>Regarding ACTION 4 – DdF raised the possibility of inviting Professor Colin Pooley of Lancaster University regarding his <i>Understanding Walking and Cycling</i> research study.</p> <p>Regarding ACTION 7 – AJ noted that as the CPG is a public meeting, it is difficult to address the use of social media at meetings; however, as for protocol around social media, it should be understood by all Members and all those in attendance that the group should work courteously and respectfully.</p> <p>No further points of accuracy were raised.</p> <p>AJ asked attendees to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p><i>All other actions were accounted for and minutes approved.</i></p> <p>3.2 Matters Arising</p> <p>JL noted that Sustrans’ suggestion that sections 4.13 and 5.26 of the proposed NPF3 be combined was reiterated by the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Committee in their response on the proposed NPF3.</p> <p>ACTION 1: CPG to contact Derek Mackay/NPF3 to see if they have considered the points raised in I&CI’s response in paras 90 & 91, particularly amalgamation of 4.13 and 5.29 (KF Noted that she could provide contact details for NPF3 authors if needed)</p> <p>There were no further matters arising.</p>	<p>CPG (BM) / KF</p>
<p>4. Police Scotland</p>	<p>AJ introduced Tracey Robinson, Road Policing Unit – Police Scotland.</p> <p>TR introduced herself and indicated that she works within Edinburgh within the Road Policing Unit there. TR thanked the CPG for helping to bring about some of the positive changes now being seen with regard to road safety for vulnerable road users.</p> <p>TR noted that road safety is a key priority, particularly</p>	

	<p>at a local area level. In fact, through consultation with local communities, road safety was seen as second highest area of concern after Anti-Social Behaviour.</p> <p>TR described her Road Policing Unit, indicating that there is specialist support for serious and fatal road collisions, with the aim of reducing casualties. TR noted also that 11 of 14 Road Policing Plans directly cover road safety.</p> <p>TR noted Go Safe on Scotland’s Roads and that Police Scotland has a key role in this surrounding enforcement, integral to change driver behaviour.</p> <p>TR noted some statistics, particularly on those killed through road traffic accidents in Edinburgh, where in 2013 of the 8 killed, 4 were pedestrians and in 2012, of the 15 killed 10 were pedestrians. TR noted the analytical work that Police Scotland undertakes, linking with the council to look at incidents; however this is often difficult as many scenarios are atypical. TR noted that key to Police Scotland’s approach is an evidence-based approach.</p> <p>TR noted that more officers are being trained to use handheld lasers to analyse speed.</p> <p>TR also noted national campaigns relating to enforcement, particularly the vulnerable road users initiative in 2013. The vision is to continue to develop partnerships to help increase results on reducing casualties.</p> <p>TR covered some of the partnerships, including a Steering Group in Edinburgh to look at 20mph and the Transport Forum.</p> <p>AJ opened the floor to questions for TR.</p> <p>BrM noted that enforcement is key and suggested that the perception is that drivers are not being charged when they kill or seriously injure vulnerable road users – this is borne out of some research Cycle Law Scotland undertook that noted that 44 cases of 400 such incidents were taken to court.</p> <p>TR responded that if an offence had occurred, then this should be enforced noting Section 3 of the Road Traffic</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Act relating to careless driving. In addition, TR noted guidelines relating to level of injury and whether a report would be submitted (minor or no injury there is no report submitted).</p> <p>TF noted some issues in Glasgow, particularly parking on pavements subsequently blocking the way for those who are visually or mobility impaired, plus proposals for 20mph areas, and ensuring that these are enforced by Police Scotland.</p> <p>TR noted experience in Edinburgh regarding the 20mph Working Group set up. TR noted that although 20mph are not normally routinely enforced, they will be if there is a need and in certain locations (e.g., around schools). TR noted that areas that are 20mph, but with no traffic calming, are difficult and suggested that an approach could be to look at each road and identify the best method of reducing speeds – similar to an approach used in Bristol. TR noted that key is reversing the mind-set that it is acceptable to speed.</p> <p>AJ noted the Responsible Parking Bill proposal. CT noted that it is currently with a legal team to look into it further at this stage.</p> <p>KH noted the importance to ensure speeding is seen as unacceptable, citing other examples such as drink driving.</p> <p>IF noted that in 2012-13 there were 62 homicides in Scotland and 66 pedestrian or cyclist deaths on the roads. IF asked whether, in light of this statistic, there is a view in terms of relative priority for road traffic deaths, particularly vulnerable road users.</p> <p>TR noted that the focus on road safety has definitely increased recently but it is evolving.</p> <p>JL noted the design of infrastructure can potentially create a problem with speeding, such as with wide roads, and asked whether Police Scotland had any views on road design or a firm view on engineering improvements helping with speed reduction.</p> <p>TR indicated that Police Scotland is learning from other places, particularly noting Bristol, where particular</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>roads had specific interventions, such as layout of parking or other measures.</p> <p>JL also noted the variety of speed limits and asked if Police Scotland took a view on a city-wide single speed limit.</p> <p>TR noted that feedback from places like Bristol shows that a more consistent/standard speed was beneficial. TR added that Police Scotland could locally look more into this and can do this through working groups set up (such as those in Edinburgh).</p> <p>JL asked whether Police Scotland could be part of a wider group that signed up to initiatives such as these.</p> <p>TR noted that existing groups should be the focus for feeding back on these points rather than a new group.</p> <p>AJ noted that the variation of speed limits and potential for consistent/standard speed limits in certain places should be considered via the CPG.</p> <p>ACTION 2: CPG to add the topic of speed limits to a future agenda and consider potential for a review from a CPG point of view.</p> <p>IM raised the situation surrounding his son, Andrew, and that there was a 2 year wait following the incident until the case was heard in court. IM asked whether there was anything that could be done through CPS or COPFS regarding this lengthy delay.</p> <p>TR noted that she will speak to Superintendent Iain Murray regarding this.</p> <p>ACTION 3: TR to speak with Superintendent Iain Murray regarding potential to review reasons behind and potential solutions for bringing cases more expediently to court.</p> <p>AJ thanked TR and closed this agenda item.</p>	<p>CPG (NK)</p> <p>TR</p>
--	--	---------------------------

<p>5. Safer Cycling</p>	<p>AJ introduced this topic and asked BrM to update on the Roadshare/Strict Liability campaign and any developments on the Strict Liability working group discussion. BrM noted that the nomenclature for this campaign and topic should change to Presumed Liability.</p> <p>BrM noted that there was a meeting with the Minister for Transport and Veterans, Keith Brown, MSP on 5 March that was attended by Craig Burn, Brenda Mitchell and Karen Furey. It was agreed there that the Road Share campaign would conduct further research into Presumed Liability to contribute to the debate. Since this meeting, the Road Share Campaign had progressed with Chris Oliver acting as the new chair of the group and representatives on the group from CTC Scotland, Spokes, Scottish Cycling and the Andrew Cyclist Charitable Trust.</p> <p>BrM introduced EG as her colleague who would be undertaking the research.</p> <p>Clarification was requested on how the Road Share Campaign group differed from the Road Justice Working Group, and BrM noted that the Road Justice Working Group had a focus on policing and the courts and on the criminal aspect of road justice rather than the civil aspect of the Road Share Campaign.</p> <p>AJ asked what the situation would have been like for Andrew McNicoll's case if presumed liability were in place.</p> <p>BrM noted that civil lawyers have no access to investigation until the criminal case starts, so there could be a long delay on the civil side if a delay in criminal side.</p> <p>KF asked what would stop a driver from dragging out the process and how long could a civil case last.</p> <p>BrM noted that a civil case could be brought about in weeks or months.</p> <p>IA noted that DU chairs the Road Justice Working Group and that it would be worth having him present on the criminal side to better understand all the</p>	
--------------------------------	--	--

	<p>potential tools to bring about road justice for vulnerable road users – whether criminal or civil.</p> <p>ACTION 4: CPG to invite Donald Urquhart to present on the criminal side of road justice at a future meeting.</p>	CPG (BM)
7. AOB	<p>AJ asked whether there was any AOB.</p> <p>DdF raised the complaint regarding the Town Centre Action Plan (TCAP) on active travel being considered a ‘long-term’ consideration. Spokes met with Scottish Government Officials regarding this on 27 March. Notes from the meeting included feedback from Susan Brown, TCAP Manager, on the potential for demonstration projects to include active travel initiatives at an early stage. In addition, active travel would need to be supported by other funding streams, such as Community Links or elements from the new rail franchise. SB also was keen to hear ideas from the CPG on how active travel could be incorporated into town centre demonstration projects, bearing in mind funding constraints. KF noted that she could collate any thoughts if any CPG member had any to provide.</p> <p>ACTION 5: All CPG members to feed back to KF regarding thoughts on how active travel could be incorporated into town centre demo projects</p> <p>JL noted that a record number of Community Links bids were received. Sustrans capital allocation for 14/15 is £18.5m. Of this, £15.5m is dedicated to Community Links with the remainder for NCN and other projects.</p> <p>JL noted that the value of Community Link bids made to us for 14/15 was £18.6m, so with a budget of £15.5m we are £3.1m over-subscribed. The value of CL bids for 15/16 is £15.2m and we have a budget of £10m. So, £5.2m over-subscribed for 15/16. The entire programme is therefore £8.3m over-subscribed.</p> <p>JL added that Local Authorities are also putting in £34m of match funding.</p>	ALL
8. Date of Next Meeting	AJ closed the meeting and noted that the next meeting will be confirmed as soon as possible.	