

## Cross Party Group on Cycling

### Minutes of Meeting

Tuesday, 31 March 2015

5:30-7:00pm, Committee Room 5, Scottish Parliament

<b>1. Welcome and Introductions</b>	Alison Johnstone, MSP welcomed the group.	
	<p><b>In attendance were:</b></p> <p>Alison Johnstone MSP, Co-Convener (AJ) – CHAIR Jim Eadie, MSP, Co-Convener (JE) [after start] Sarah Boyack, MSP, Deputy Co-Convener (SB) Donald Urquhart – CTC (DU) Chris Thompson – Living Streets (CT) John Lauder – Sustrans (JL) Dave du Feu – Spokes (DdF) Keith Irving – Cycling Scotland (KI) Nathan Kaczmariski – Cycling Scotland (NK) Kim Harding – Pedal on Parliament (KH) Tricia Fort – GoBike (TF) Rod Mitchell – Cycle Law Scotland (RM) Ben Miller – MSP Staff (BM)</p> <p><b>Apologies were received from:</b></p> <p>Claudia Beamish, MSP Greg Chauvet – Glasgow Bike Station Ian Findlay – Paths for All Hugh Thomas – Pedal on Parliament Maureen Kidd – Cycling Scotland Chris Oliver – Road Share Dave Frew – SCOTS Craig Burn – Scottish Cycling Neil Langhorn – Transport Scotland Karen Furey – Transport Scotland</p>	
<b>2. Minutes of the previous meeting and Matters Arising</b>	<p><b>2.1 Previous Minutes</b></p> <p>DdF noted two amends – one relating to the discussion surrounding Waverley and Action 2; another relating to request for written correspondence from DdF to Derek Mackay, MSP, Minister for Transport and Islands regarding garden sheds and rail integration issues. DdF also noted that he had received a reply from Alex Neil, MSP, Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Communities and Pensioners’ Rights, but that this did not specifically cover cycling.</p>	

	<p><i>These amends incorporated into previous minutes.</i></p> <p>AJ and SB agreed to follow up with the Minister for Transport and Islands on these matters.</p> <p><b>ACTION 1: CPG Co-Conveners and Deputy Convener to follow up with the Minister for Transport and Islands on matters surrounding domestic bike storage and planning as discussed at previous CPG meeting</b></p> <p><i>All other actions were accounted for and minutes approved.</i></p> <p>Proposed: KI</p> <p>Seconded: RM</p> <p><b>2.2 Matters Arising</b></p> <p>There were no further matters arising.</p>	<p>CPG (AJ, JE, CB, SB)</p>
<p><b>3. AGM</b></p>	<p><b>3.1 Consideration of Office Bearers</b></p> <p>The Group was asked to consider Alison Johnstone, MSP, Jim Eadie, MSP and Claudia Beamish, MSP as Co-Conveners of the Cross Party Group on Cycling.</p> <p><i>The Group was content for AJ, JE and CB as Co-Conveners. Proposed: SB; Seconded: KI</i></p> <p>The Group was asked to consider Sarah Boyack, MSP as Deputy Convener of the Cross Party Group on Cycling Scotland.</p> <p><i>The Group was content for SB as Deputy Convener. Proposed: DU; Seconded: TF.</i></p> <p>The Group was asked to consider Cycling Scotland (Nathan Kaczmarski) as Secretariat of the Cross Party Group on Cycling Scotland</p> <p><i>The Group was content for Cycling Scotland (NK) as Secretariat. Proposed: DU; Seconded: JL.</i></p> <p><b>3.2 Consideration of Annual Return</b></p> <p>AJ presented the Annual Return for consideration.</p> <p><i>The Group was content with the Annual Return.</i></p>	

	<p><b>3.3 AGM other business</b></p> <p>TF asked about support from other parties and representatives to encourage them to attend the CPG on Cycling. DdF suggested contacting those who spoke during the debate on Active Travel in January (7 January 2015).</p> <p><b>ACTION 2: CPG (BM) to write to MSPs who spoke during the Active Travel debate to invite them to the CPG.</b></p>	<p><b>CPG (BM)</b></p>
<p><b>4. Exemplar Cycling Project Discussion</b></p>	<p>AJ introduced a discussion surrounding an exemplar cycling project. AJ explained that CB had pulled together a proposal and JE had secured a meeting with the Minister for Transport and Islands and the Co-Conveners wished to discuss this with the CPG.</p> <p>AJ noted that during the Active Travel debate she referenced Søren Rasmussen, Danish architect and member of Denmark’s Cycling Embassy, who, in a presentation to Parliament noted Scotland could invest in an exemplar project that would have a notable impact.</p> <p>BM noted that one thought was surrounding a competition that LAs could bid into.</p> <p>DdF noted some key considerations surrounding the meaning behind ‘exemplar’ – for example what is the overriding criteria that would be required to be regarded as exemplar (e.g., number of people cycling, etc.)</p> <p>KH noted that for an exemplar project, accessibility needs to be for all, not just existing users.</p> <p>CT noted the Cycle Superhighways in London and that Living Streets was involved in discussions and planning for them – highlighting that a broad spectrum of users need to be involved in the discussion so that no one is losing out. For example, CT noted discussion on bus layby solutions, consultation was critical, but the focus was not solely on cycling.</p> <p>KI noted the timescales for implementation of such</p>	

	<p>scheme. KI highlighted a recent example with the A81 project (segregated cycle lane) where the mandatory TRO process ensures that a year is added to the process. KI suggested identifying and tackling barriers to any cycling project, which include legislation, capacity and funding commitment, looking at a three year minimum when factoring in design and statutory processes. KI added that the ‘exemplar’ could be looked at as a wider network. KI also noted that any approach should be to help achieve the 10% vision CAPS.</p> <p>JL noted that there are over 180 projects going on this financial year and many could be considered ‘exemplar’. However, JL noted that often there are the same issues/barriers, some that KI noted. JL added that these tend to be in the urban realm and some existing rules and processes cause limitations – e.g., traffic management and phasings of lights/crossings. JL added that there could be an approach where these rules are looked at. JL also agreed that it projects should look at all ages and be about getting more people cycling and that it is better to be phased in, potentially over three years.</p> <p>TF noted urban realm and mentioned Glasgow City Council’s new City Centre Strategy that proposes ‘avenues’.</p> <p>JL added that it should not solely be about construction, but also incorporate behaviour change.</p> <p>SB noted that should there be an award, need to look at innovation and overcoming these barriers. SB added that a rolling programme increases best-practice and ambition.</p> <p>DU noted that the presentation previously from Edinburgh on the 20mph rollout showed a large lead in for the statutory processes. DU suggested that legislation should be looked at for some control in Scotland to allow flexibility to help deliver and overcome barriers. DU also noted electric bikes and other adapted bikes as something to consider with accessibility.</p> <p>RM noted that a competition element could be a good</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>carrot to get involvement.</p> <p>TF noted the new Southern General Hospital in Glasgow development and how there was an opportunity to build in better cycle access, but she noted that GoBike receives correspondence on concerns about cycling access from employees there.</p> <p>DdF noted the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary and that they put in advisory cycle lanes, but then added double yellow lines to remove parking.</p> <p>[JE arrived at meeting]</p> <p>JE noted that the Co-conveners had written to suggest an award and a bid to take that forward and that CB has been taking this forward lately, and has support from Co-conveners.</p> <p>AJ thanked the CPG for input and closed the item.</p>	
<p><b>5. Safer Cycling &amp; Presumed Liability</b></p>	<p>AJ introduced this topic and asked RM to update on the Roadshare campaign.</p> <p>RM noted the completion of the research report (that had been distributed to CPG members prior to the meeting) completed by Eachann Gillies and Derek Halden.</p> <p>RM hoped that the report would allow Transport Scotland and the Minister to have another look at Presumed Liability. RM noted that they had written to Transport Scotland regarding this and hoping to meet to discuss findings.</p>	
<p><b>6. Forward Planning for 2015/16</b></p>	<p>AJ introduced the agenda item and noted that she, SB and JE were at the launch of the e-bike scheme through several universities in Edinburgh. AJ noted that this may be a topic that should be discussed at a future date. JL also noted the pilot project in the Cairngorms that featured e-bikes in and around Aviemore.</p> <p>KH added that this could also include electrically assisted cargo bikes and cargo bikes could be a good topic. DdF noted that Nino Allenza (from b-spokes) spoke about cargo bikes at the Edinburgh Transport Forum and could be a good person to invite.</p>	

	<p>DdF also noted the spending review and there could be discussion on this.</p> <p>TF added potential to look at legislation and road signs and the potential that road sign legislation at the moment creates a barrier to cycling in some circumstances.</p> <p>DU noted the discussions previously about accessibility, and mentioned Quest 88 who design assistive technologies.</p> <p>KI noted the Near Miss Project from Rachel Aldred and that she expressed she could present this at a future CPG meeting.</p> <p>JL also noted the Quietways programme in London that Sustrans are working on with a Dutch design organisation.</p> <p>SB asked about ways to get more representation along. SB gave an example that if there were to be a topic on e-bikes and it involved the Cairngorms, then the local representatives could be invited to come along to hear about the initiative in their area.</p> <p><b>ACTION 3: Topics added to forward plan include, E-bikes, cargo bikes and freight carriage by bike, spending review/budget, accessible cycling, Near Miss Project and the Quietways programme in London. Future meetings to consider these topics and potential speakers/presentations on them.</b></p>	<p>NK / BM</p>
<p><b>7. AOCB</b></p>	<p>AJ asked whether there was any AOCB.</p> <p>TF noted the topic of CLOCS and FORS from the last meeting and identified that there had been an Institute of Civil Engineers (ICE) article on this in a recent magazine. TF suggested to contact the ICE working group to identify involvement and any further information.</p> <p><b>ACTION 4: TF to contact ICE working group to identify any further involvement or information</b></p> <p>DdF noted the funding announcement and further</p>	<p>TF</p>

	<p>analysis of the current state of funding for cycling and how it was still not clear on the makeup and amount.</p> <p>JE noted the £36m figure and that this was 12% higher than the budget at the start of the 2014/15 financial year, and that he was interested in correspondence on this. JE suggested that in the past the Barnett consequential did result in additional funding available for active travel, so there could be the possibility to make the case for this again.</p> <p>AJ noted that she spoke with the Minister for Transport and Islands and expressed her concern that the budget for active travel is not transparent and that this will still be a focal point.</p> <p><b>ACTION 5: CPG to ask for clarity in the budget for cycling and DdF to submit his calculations on this</b></p> <p>RM also noted that STUC/UNISON would be voting to support presumed liability at their 21 April meeting.</p> <p>AJ noted that BM would soon be moving on from his post, but wanted to wish him thanks for his work on the group.</p> <p><i>The CPG wished BM congratulations and thanked him for his important contributions to the Group.</i></p>	<p><b>CPG (BM) and DdF</b></p>
<p><b>8. Date of Next Meeting</b></p>	<p>The date of next meeting is to be confirmed.</p>	