TRANSPORT
SCOTLAND
CÒMHDHAIL ALBA

Active Travel Task Force Report
June 2018

Introduction by Minister

I am pleased to welcome this report from the Active Travel Task Force. I announced the establishment of the Task Force in November 2016, following individual decisions taken by two local authorities to halt the delivery of further phases of a segregated cycle path and the complete removal of one already in place.

Public correspondence to me in support of these two projects far outweighed those against and supported the Scottish Government's commitment to increase the proportion of people walking and cycling. The Task Force was established to look at what the barriers may be to delivering these and other similar projects and what can be done to overcome them.

It was important that the Task Force had the strategic support required to be as wide ranging in their evidence gathering as possible, which is why I asked the Chief Executive of Transport Scotland to chair it.

I asked the Task Force members to be bold and innovative in proposing their recommendations and to be frank and open in their discussions and conclusions. I thank them for holding true to this and for their time and effort in producing this report. I also thank all of those who provided evidence, both written and oral and which the Task Force was also asked to consider.

The Task Force considerations and recommendations have been laid out in this report in their entirety and without any policy or other filters. In the coming months we will have wider discussions with internal and external stakeholders in order to decide which recommendations to take forward and who will lead and support the implementation of these. In all of this, it is my intention to help make it easier for all stakeholders in Scotland to deliver new, innovative and popular infrastructure which supports and encourages walking and cycling. This includes behaviour change and place-making projects, and importantly, engaging communities to be involved at the very start of any new walking, cycling and public realm improvement projects.

We all recognise the contribution that walking and cycling can make to the National Performance Framework and the Active Scotland Outcomes Framework in the development of place, growing the economy and improving health and wellbeing. We have evidence that investing in walking and cycling more than pays for itself in its benefits and should not be looked upon as a 'nice to have' intervention.

In tackling transport poverty and inequality of access, public sector bodies now have a duty to consider what more they can do to reduce poverty and inequality when making key decisions. The Fairer Scotland Duty, the first action in the Fairer Scotland Action Plan and the first of its kind in the UK, came into force in April 2018. Public sector bodies including the Scottish Government, NHS and local authorities now have a duty to tackle social and economic disadvantage in local areas. The recommendations and actions in this report will help to do that.

2018/19 is an exciting time for active travel in Scotland as we have doubled our budget from £40 million to £80 million. There will be further conversations around this report to turn recommendations into actions.

I look forward to working with our wider stakeholders to ensure we learn lessons from the past. We all need to get to a place where innovative, ambitious, engaging and inclusive walking and cycling projects are the norm to help make Scotland an Active Nation.

Humza Yousaf
Minister for Transport and the Islands

CONTENTS

Executive summary and recommendations

Background

The Task Force was announced by the Minister for Transport and The Islands during the Active Travel Summit on 2 November 2016 in Stirling. The composition and remit of the Task Force was agreed following consultation internally and externally.

Members

James Fowlie, Director of Integration and Development at COSLA

George Eckton, Partnership Director of SEStran, representing Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs)

Daisy Narayanan, Deputy Director of Sustrans Scotland, representing Third Sector Organisations

Derick Murray, Director of NEStrans, representing the Society of Chief Officers of Transportation in Scotland

The Task Force was chaired by Roy Brannen, CEO of Transport Scotland. Roy Brannen's role in this Task Force was to enable discussion in a safe environment for everyone to be as forthright as possible in both giving and hearing evidence. The Secretariat support was provided by the Sustainable and Active Travel Team in Transport Scotland.

Remit

'To identify and make recommendations to the Minister for Transport and the Islands on ways to improve delivery of ambitious and inclusive walking and cycling projects in Scotland, helping to create high quality places and communities that support health and wellbeing.'

Courtesy of Sustrans Scotland

Courtesy of Glasgow City Council

Whilst some of the recommendations of the Task Force may be considered to extend beyond the original remit, they are included nevertheless as they are considered valuable to a wider understanding of the step change needed to realise the active travel vision.

Evidence gathering

During 2017, the Task Force received 55 pieces of written evidence from various organisations and individuals. Three oral sessions were held during the year, under Chatham House Rule to ensure a full and frank discussion. This Report is, therefore, un-attributable to individuals and organisations who submitted evidence. The oral sessions were held on 13 April, 24 May and 31 October 2017.

The evidence is gathered into the following four themes for which analysis is provided by the Task Force:

1. Infrastructure
2. Policies, processes and resources
3. Community engagement
4. Behaviour change and culture

Recommendations

The Task Force, taking into account the evidence submitted and following long discussions of a range of options, has made the following 18 recommendations.

1.   Infrastructure

1.1   Criteria for funding for walking, cycling and place-making projects must include the delivery of infrastructure combined with appropriate behaviour change programmes, in a way that is enforced and timely, sequential and coordinated, using planning policy and international best practice.

1.2   As a preventative spend measure, cross-portfolio policy investment (e.g. from Health, Transport, Environment and Education Directorates) should prioritise the delivery of a network of continuous and safe walking and cycling infrastructure routes, working in partnership with local authorities and other relevant stakeholders.

1.3   Formally approved, overarching design guidance for Scotland should be produced for local and trunk roads, and places, enabling people of all ages and abilities to access schools, workplaces and community destinations by foot, bike, public transport, ensuring accessibility for all users. National policy requirements should be reinforced for infrastructure, referencing Designing Streets, Cycling by Design and the Place Standard Tool.

1.4   Funding for long term maintenance for active travel projects, identified as a local or national priority, should be included as part of Community Links/PLUS projects.

2.   Policies, processes and resources

2.1   Increased, continuous, multi-year funding and resources, is required, along with simplifying the current bidding processes and conditions.

2.2   The match funding criteria should be reconsidered and the range of those organisations able to bid for active travel funding should be widened to ensure an open, fair and transparent process.

2.3   The collective impact of active travel strategies/plans, and related policies across national, regional and local levels, should be measured, and monitored longitudinally.

2.4   National, regional and local ownership and planning and delivery of active travel projects between policy departments must be more coordinated, and include as a minimum, planning, environment, health and education departments within central and local governments. Regional Transport Partnerships need to be better resourced to address cross-boundary issues, in partnership with other stakeholders.

2.5   There must be prominent and consistent national government and stakeholder support to enhance strong leadership at the local level to help make the often unpopular, but right decisions.

2.6   Professional training in community engagement and consultation and planning, delivering and maintaining active travel projects should be made available as CPD accredited courses to all public and private sector professionals, including elected members.

2.7   A policy of reducing urban traffic and transferring carriageway space to active travel should be considered, including workplace parking levy, road user charging and encouraging more car-sharing.

2.8   The National Transport Strategy Review must deliver the sustainable travel hierarchy, prioritising walking and cycling. Active travel should be mainstreamed into Regional and Local Transport Strategies.

2.9   The Strategic Transport Project Review should include Active Travel as a theme for nationwide projects, for example the National Walking and Cycling Network.

3.   Community engagement

3.1   The active travel message should be promoted clearly to the general public and politicians, as being primarily about 'place', and having pride in their communities and local environment. Infrastructure projects are not just about walking or cycling. Community Planning Partnerships and local communities need to be included from the outset and consider wider public transport requirements, such as walking routes to bus stops.

3.2   Delivery partners must ensure they conduct strong public consultation exercises and community engagement from the very start of design and planning. This must be inclusive and representative, using appropriate and innovative techniques that enable the target population to understand the project and processes and be properly involved. This will include community groups, businesses and Police Scotland and must follow the legislation in the The Fairer Scotland Duty.

4.   Behaviour change and culture

4.1   There must be investment in behaviour change programmes for the longer term, in order to normalise walking and cycling for everyday journeys, including walking to public transport venues as part of a multi-modal journey. These should be balanced and coordinated with infrastructure/place making, media campaigns and must include enforcement of road safety and parking legislation in favour of pedestrians and cyclists.

4.2   All spheres of governance, led by the Scottish Government, must ensure the benefits of active travel are widely promoted across all portfolios and integral to all relevant Scottish Government policy.

4.3   The Fairer Scotland Duty, which is a key component in changing behaviour in relation to active travel, will challenge all public sector bodies, including the Scottish Government, NHS and local authorities, to tackle social and economic disadvantage in local areas. This will include tackling transport poverty and increasing access to bikes.

Analysis of emerging top-level themes

The Task Force has endeavoured to analyse and interrogate the written and oral evidence (attached as Annexes 1 and 2) to identify the emerging themes and develop recommendations for the future. The following pages set out a summary and analysis of that evidence, highlighting key points for consideration which have provided much of the rationale for the Task Force conclusions and recommendations. The Task Force considered a range of issues and options, some of which were out with the original remit. These are included because they were highlighted in evidence and the Task Force members consider that they are of enough importance and potential impact to merit due consideration. These included deliberations on subjects such as road pricing, universal bike access and funding levels.

The four themes that emerged from the written and oral evidence sessions represent the preferred approach of the majority of the contributors to bring about long-term and permanent healthy behaviours, via active travel.

Specifically, there was consensus that there should be supportive policy/legislative conditions which enable the creation of infrastructure that encourages and facilitates walking, cycling and place making improvements to occur.

Wrapped around all of this, it was believed that there should be an information/education intervention that is focused on engaging communities and encouraging behaviour change at population level, through gradual but permanent changes in attitudes, perception and knowledge about active travel.

This approach also encompasses the point frequently made in the evidence provided that 'an infrastructure only approach is ineffective' and that behaviour change measures must be put in place in tandem with construction of infrastructure.

In summary the four themes are:

1. Supportive policy/legislative conditions
2. Supportive infrastructure
3. Walking and place making improvements
4. Information and education intervention

All of these together are required to bring about permanent change and are described in more detail below.

1.   **Infrastructure**

Throughout both the oral and written evidence contributions, there is an explicit request that active travel infrastructure should aim to put people and place first, with vehicles being a "guest" in an area. This assertion has implications for both the design and quality of delivery of active travel infrastructure projects.

Design

The initial focus of any planning and design of communities should first consider how people live and move around. This should be done at the inception stage of designing active travel infrastructure and the design of the infrastructure should then mirror this reality. For example, one local authority has undertaken a project that is designed to 'put people first and make cars feel like guests'.

The main point being articulated here is that where early thought and consideration are put into the design of a town, or a new housing estate, or a route to school - by thinking at the concept stage about who will be using the place and for what purposes - then considering how active travel infrastructure can be designed and built will have the best effect and impact for people and place. This compares favourably with trying to retrospectively fit measures to existing features.

Courtesy of Cycling Scotland

The planning stage is the point at which intended outcomes of the infrastructure project should be made clear, but this by no means needs to be single purpose. For example, the Task Force was given evidence about a local project which started off being about flood prevention, and then it became a cycle track to encourage active travel and finally a project to improve air quality. In reality, an active travel infrastructure project can achieve multiple outcomes when successfully

implemented, for example, in areas such as health, transport, economics and air quality. This means that a focus on active travel can deliver benefits across many policy areas, not least Healthier Nation activities and the Active Scotland Outcomes Framework, whilst being used as a positive message for delivery partners' communication strategies; providing a direct link between 'Infrastructure design' and other emergent themes from these evidence sessions, i.e. 'Policies' and 'Behaviour change' (see below).

Comprehensive Scotland wide design guidance standards are required outlining what the minimum standard could be for active travel infrastructure, whilst recognising that different projects will require different approaches. Although it may be difficult to measure what is a minimum standard, we should aim high and have cognisance of existing projects which are considered to be best practice in design and implementation. One suggestion from evidence submitted to the Task Force was to create a national design advisory board. Architecture and Design Scotland provides a service similar to this and should consider including active travel in its remit.

Quality

Contributors said that the likelihood of people using built infrastructure to cycle or walk on, is highly dependent upon its perceived quality. First and foremost, the paths must be fit for purpose (intended use), but they must also be well maintained and safe to use. The Task Force believes that the evidence is implying that there is not enough pressure or prioritisation from all quarters for remedial works to either build more on road or introduce segregated paths. This is because our towns and cities are built already and remedial works or retro-fitting is usually more expensive than building a new path.

One of the main areas of contention was shared use paths and the challenges that these present in meeting the needs of both walkers and cyclists. Improvements could be made by providing enough space, for both and providing well defined marking for each area of use – but even then, without hard boundaries these are a difficult space to manage and can be dangerous to navigate as users.

Many highlighted that the on-going maintenance of paths, in both summer (with high user numbers) and winter (extreme weather), represents a considerable issue in terms of safety and appeal to users. There were many evidence contributions that spoke of issues regarding poor lighting, litter, leaves, potholes, and sizeable cracks. The uncertainty about whose responsibility it is to provide and fund the on-going maintenance was also noted.

Courtesy of Cycling Scotland

To address some of the main quality issues, it was suggested that the Place Standard Tool, Cycling by Design and Designing Streets should be used by all Local Authorities (LAs) /RTPs, as a minimum requirement.

In order to best encourage and enable people to bring walking and cycling into their everyday journeys, there are a number of additional infrastructure requirements that must be put in place, to support people as they travel. The most significant of these is a reliable, comfortable, efficient and affordable public transport system. People may not feasibly be able to walk or cycle the entire length of their journey, but may at least manage some of it with the support of various modes of public transport. People living in rural areas and/or travelling long distances would benefit immensely from cycle friendly public transport while pedestrians would very much favour bus shelters that are welcoming and provide adequate coverage against the elements.

It was also suggested that utility companies should be compelled, under the Scottish Road Works legislation, to coordinate works better with each other and the LAs, in order to avoid unnecessary and costly disruption.

The perceived safety of pedestrians and cyclists was considered by many contributors to be at risk due to the presence of speeding motorised vehicles in the proximity of both purpose built active travel infrastructure and ordinary paths and roads. There was a popular suggestion to make 20 mph the statutory maximum speed limit in all residential and town areas, as well as main routes to schools. The Scottish Green Party has consulted on proposals to introduce a national default 20 mph speed limit on restricted roads (the current default limit is 30 mph). Mark Ruskell MSP has the right to introduce a Private Member's Bill. He is establishing a 20 mph

national implementation group with the aim of bringing together relevant stakeholders to assist in the planning and preparation of his proposed Members Bill on this topic.

Courtesy of HITRANS

Key points:

1. Public consultation must be carried out as early as possible and use co-production methodology. A good practice document should be produced focussing on active travel and behaviour change projects.

2. Minimum standards for infrastructure must be adhered to (Designing Streets, Place Standard Tool, Cycling by Design and the Trunk Road Cycling Initiative)

3. Maintenance costs should be factored into grants for upkeep of active travel infrastructure

2.   Policies, processes and resources

Evidence provided under this theme was concentrated upon the matters that are essentially determined by factors within the political sphere, i.e. (i) the policies that direct the business of active travel, (ii) the processes that govern the implementation of the policies and (iii) the resources that are made available to drive delivery. The evidence highlighted that, at times, governance issues, such as a lack of political consensus amongst decision makers, has added difficulty and inconvenience to an already challenging landscape.

Policies

The Task Force believe that the policy environment for active travel is cluttered, uncoordinated and in some instances, needing to be updated. One of the recurring sentiments in the written evidence was that much better connectivity was required between the ambitions and targets set at national level and the delivery capacity available at local level. In order to create a sustainable active travel environment in Scotland it was felt that there is an absolute necessity to improve the coordination of national, regional and local strategies and related policies so that they are in alignment, and maximise resources available. In addition, it was suggested that national, regional and local active travel policies should be linked to the ambitions set out in documents such as the Cycling Action Plan (CAPS), the National Walking Strategy and the Active Scotland Outcomes Framework (and vice versa).

Better coordination between relevant policy areas is also required to realise the potential of active travel. The shared outcomes (in health, transport, economics, climate, education, etc.) should be identified, highlighted and used to garner support for cross portfolio delivery and funding. They can also provide the means to better and more positive promotion of active travel projects to engage the general public and media, as well as forming the basis of joined up communication strategies to help drive population level behaviour change.

Specific documents were identified as having the potential to drive forward and support better delivery of active travel projects. These included: making the Place Standard Tool compulsory for upgrades, maintenance and new builds; naming active travel as a key infrastructure within the National Performance Framework (NPF); and making it a statutory obligation for all LAs and RTPs to have an Active Travel Strategy with targets and visions aligned with the national Active Travel Vision, possibly as a subset of a Local/Regional Transport Strategy, or Local Outcome Improvement Plans.

Contributors suggested the inclusion of the LA Active Travel Strategies within Community Plans would help create momentum with active travel projects locally. These Community Plans are intended to take a more holistic approach to local delivery and, with the Community Engagement Act (2005), can harness community engagement.

Processes

The evidence presented to the Task Force suggested that the processes and procedures in place for delivering walking and cycling projects could be improved.

Contributors suggested that the process of implementing policy and delivering on active travel commitments needs strong leadership at both national and local level. Factors that influence success include whether there is political consensus, accountability, someone taking charge, a good depth of understanding of the political and 'on the ground' issues and determination to see things through, despite possible political consequences.

Better evidence is required to provide reliable and relevant data to:

- politicians and decision makers (to help them make decisions and argue in favour of the project)

- delivery partners to guide design, planning and implementation of the project

- the general public and media, as part of a positive education and information strategy to promote active travel

The type of evidence (data) that needs to be monitored relates to the cross-portfolio outcomes that are associated with the delivery of active travel projects, e.g. air quality improvements, road safety, health benefits, local economics and tourism potential.

A frequently referred to example of where the decision making process was believed to be unduly onerous and bureaucratic was in relation to the handling of public challenge to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs).

Detail of the TRO process is attached at annex five. In summary a public notice is required for the LAs to inform interested parties of the intention to change the use of a carriage way. If there are objections, they will have to be submitted to the LA within the statutory period as detailed in the notice.

The LA will work with the objectors to resolve their points. However where there are any sustained objections to roads infrastructure changes, these must be submitted to Transport Scotland, and require a decision by the Minister for Transport and the Islands.

From the evidence submitted, each case was unique and the time taken to progress varied, but was generally felt to be too long. There is currently no statutory time limit for this process.

The use and weight of evidence was also highlighted as a concern in the process, for example, there had been cases where the objections from a small proportion of

residents had been anecdotal and not factual and had resulted in the cancellation or removal of projects. Contributors suggested that any evidence given should always be factual and have a greater influence on the outcome.

Another highlighted concern of the TRO process is the type of evidence that is presented to support the objection. For example, contributors suggested that many objections have previously been supported with anecdotal evidence and opinion and that some were based on one off unusual events rather than an on-going situation. The Task Force concluded that a fairer, more appropriate approach would be for robust evidence based objections to be a requirement through effective community consultation.

Evidence also highlighted that where land owned by another organisation or individual needs to be accessed or purchased during a project, a lack of co-operation by the landowner was noted as an obstacle. There was the wish to have a process in place to ensure a greater level of co-operation in these circumstances.

Finally, it is understood that whilst developing an active travel route can cause disruption in an area; this could be reduced through close working with utility companies to complete upgrading of utility works at the same time.

Resources

There was a general consensus within the evidence submitted that LAs were losing staff resource numbers as well as vital skill sets specific to active travel projects. It was felt that more resources were needed locally to ensure that the right people with the right skills were involved right from the start. The reason for the loss in staff and skills was not explicit, however there were suggestions that active travel, as part of the transport budget, is not viewed as a priority area within all LAs, and that when difficult budget decisions have to be made, education and social care are prioritised.

It was recognised that 'co-production' and community engagement takes time and resources, in both staffing and funding. Funding processes for active travel projects have also been identified as contributing to staff resource issues in LAs/RTPs, in that the one-year funding cycles tend to add to job insecurity for staff, contributing to high turnover. The one-year funding cycles also reduce the opportunities for LAs/RTPs to commit to large and longer-term infrastructure projects.

This approach to funding requires LAs to deliver projects in phases, which can be an expensive administrative burden and add to delays. It has also been reported that the timing of bidding processes and funding allocation are at odds with LAs/RTPs own capabilities, creating additional barriers and challenges to getting projects agreed and underway. Multi-year funding is a consensus request from evidence presented to the Task Force, with the success of Community Links PLUS three-year funding approach offered as a welcome example.

The Task Force believes that multi-year funding would allow stakeholders to plan for more ambitious projects and deliver whole networks across towns and cities rather than having to phase developments due to annual funding bids.

There were also requests for an increase in funding generally for active travel. For some time, lobbyists have been asking for 10% of the transport budget to be allocated to active travel. In 2017/18 the budget for walking and cycling activities was £40m (or 1.9% of the transport budget). However, on 5 September 2017, it was announced in the Programme for Government that £80m would be allocated to walking and cycling from the 18/19 financial year.

This represents a doubling of the budget and has been cautiously welcomed by all stakeholders, with a caveat that more is required and requested. In particular, it was suggested that Scotland should increase its per capita spend on active travel to comparative levels found elsewhere in Europe (e.g. The Netherlands, Denmark – average £20-£30). Scottish Government investment of £80m per year in walking and cycling will give an average spend of £14 per capita in Scotland. This figure does not include European Regional Development funding, funding from Transport Scotland such as trunk roads and matched funding from partners or what local LAs and RTPs are already spending, and therefore the figure is higher.

Suggestions were also made that a percentage of the Cycling, Walking, and Safer Streets (CWSS) grant should be allocated to walking and cycling (suggested at 90%). This budget is currently part of the Local Government Settlement and LAs can spend it on local priorities providing that these are connected to cycling walking and safer streets. An alternative suggestion was that the ring-fencing of this grant be removed.

It was also suggested that a separate ring-fenced fund should be set up to fund active travel projects which include things such as bridges or other large cost-prohibitive and LA cross-border projects. It was advocated that funding should be allocated to Regional Transport Partnerships and LAs directly for cross-border projects.

Key points:

1. Better enforcement of local and national policy alignment to address targets across all policy areas, e.g. health, education and active travel, by using tools already available such as Place Standard Tool, Heat Tool. This will enable better gathering of evidence for delivering ambitious interventions.

2. Update the *Trunk Road Cycling Initiative* and *Cycling by Design* documents.

3. In consultation with relevant stakeholders, review and revise the TRO process.

4. Incorporate time and costs of co-production processes into grants for infrastructure delivery.

5. Re-consider how funding is allocated for larger scale projects such as junctions and bridges, to whom and if match funding is required at the 50% level; longer term maintenance should be included in the cost of the project.

3.   Community engagement

Courtesy of Sustrans Scotland

Almost all of the evidence received mentioned that public consultation could be much improved. It was suggested that a cross section of the community was needed at consultation events in order to get a balanced dialogue started and not just those who oppose the project and are the vocal minority.

Some LAs admitted they could have done better in publicising events and making the invite as open and inclusive as possible. The Task Force was heartened to hear that valuable lessons have already been learnt. For example, it wasn't always convenient for everyone to attend public consultation events in the evening – this was considered not to be 'family friendly' so alternatives are being considered. It was also reported that starting the consultation process, at the design stage, could gain more support for what the community wanted, and not just what the designers have put forward.

It was also suggested that there needed to be more emphasis on the promotion and evidence of the benefits of active travel for mental and physical wellbeing, air quality

and the local economy. Businesses were also vital to get on-side and should be made aware of the benefits to their staff and customers. One suggestion was to update the Living Streets' publication 'The Pedestrian Pound' and circulate to all businesses in the area of the project.

Community empowerment opportunities should be available to everyone, especially younger people and people with disabilities; 'Co-Production' and 'Co-Design' approaches should be used to develop equal and reciprocal relationships and partnerships. The use of plain English terms should always be used and instead of 'Active Travel' which some people do not understand, we should be using use every day descriptions – walking, cycling and improving the local community facilities such as greener space, more trees and less traffic and therefore, cleaner air.

It was made clear that elected members and senior officials should be available at these events to answer local and political questions and it should not be left up to consultants and the project officer (normally not a senior role) to answer these questions. Independent facilitators would also aid the process as some contributors felt that LAs were 'just going through the motions' of consulting. Political vision and strong leadership was needed at both national and local level. Some commented that Ministers had been noticeably absent where some controversial projects were being proposed, however, it was recognised that Minsters could not interfere in local decision making. Supportive Ministerial statements for what the LA in principle wanted to do would have been welcomed.

The use of virtual reality at consultation events would allow local residents to see for themselves what the project would look like when in place. This has been used to great effect on a forthcoming canal project on the Dundas Basin in Glasgow.

Key points:

1. Provide best practice community engagement guidance.

2. Involve communities and businesses at the very start of a project.

3. Include Police Scotland at the start of the project to ensure enforcement is high on the agenda.

4. Provide **factual** information to everyone in the area and accept only factual information from objectors.

5. Use innovative techniques to demonstrate how the project will look once delivered.

4.   Behaviour change and culture

A step change is required at population level in attitudes and behaviour related to active travel. It is also required in very influential sub-groups such as the media (who can sway perceptions with influential articles) and politicians who control budgets and influence key decision making. All of the benefits of this cross-portfolio focussed topic need to be identified, articulated and included in an effective comprehensive education and behaviour change programme.

This should be viewed as a long-term project, which is planned, monitored and working in sync with other components of active travel projects (i.e. policy and project implementation, community engagement and budget availability).

Many projects are currently planned, budgeted for and communicated as 'walking' or 'cycling' projects. Some contributors provided evidence to the Task Force that this approach can create animosity, objections and sometimes anger directed at LAs/RTPs, particularly junior officials. Some people saw the proposed projects as negatively interfering with their quality of life through narrowing of roads and streets, reduced parking, and increased pollution. Often the perception and reality do not match.

There is also a pervading culture that the car (or motorised transport) has priority on the roads, a perception that some thought was supported in policies, both national and local. Other local level policies may also support the perception that the 'car is king' in terms of road space, with incentives to use the car (e.g. free car parking spaces and business travel schemes), sometimes comparing unfavourably with the disincentives for cycling (e.g. lack of safe bike parks, poor facilities at work to change, little or no bike space on trains/trams to support cycling on long journeys).

Transport poverty and access to active travel is an issue for those in deprived communities and those not in employment, as well as those who live in rural areas where bus services were not that frequent. It was suggested that more people needed access to bikes in these areas and therefore cycle training and led rides are required. The Fairer Scotland Duty will tackle these issues and will include socio-economic issues and proximity to active travel facilities such as access to bikes and cycle training.

The Taskforce noted that in the Programme for Government 2017-18 there are commitments to:

'Stepping up promotion of the use of electric bicycles to ensure as many people as possible can benefit from active travel. We will also deliver projects which help older people benefit from our network of walking and cycling routes.'

Courtesy of Glasgow City Council

The Taskforce noted that as well as electric bikes and other bikes to widen access to cycling, Scottish Government will continue to offer the Big Bike Revival and Dr Bike schemes which visit communities to offer free repairs and training to those who may have a bike but is not road worthy. The Taskforce also noted that the Government has committed funding to the 'Cycling Without Age' project nationwide which will enable older and disabled people to enjoy the outdoors and enjoy cycling once again.

To change behaviour it is necessary to use evidence and facts and present them in a way that is informative, relevant, personal and positive. It must tie in with timely planning and delivery of supportive infrastructure and it must have longevity to it, in terms of investment and political commitment. Those that contributed evidence noted that behaviours do not change overnight, it needs a longer-term vision, and in addition, it is a vital component to the success of long-term and ambitious active travel projects in Scotland as, one contributor noted, 'An infrastructure only approach is ineffective'.

Courtesy of Cycling UK

Key points:

1. Provide longer term funding for behaviour change projects.

2. Ensure behaviour change interventions are part of walking and cycling infrastructure projects.

3. Make accessibility a greater issue in planning/grant application considerations.

4. Provide greater access to bikes across the country as a whole, including in schools.

5. Provide accurate information/data/research on the benefits of proposed walking, cycling and place-making projects and target this to specific groups such as councillors, businesses, and local community groups.

Conclusions, recommendations and next steps

Conclusions from Task Force Members

The first and most important conclusion from the Task Force members was that the process itself was very worthwhile and we hope that all those involved have already learned lessons that they can apply now.

While some contributors did not always agree with each other, it did provide an open and secure platform for all of those who have an interest in active travel i.e. walking, cycling and place-making to make their voices heard.

There is still a lot to do to make walking and cycling an attractive form of getting around in Scotland and we will endeavour to do all we can to make this a reality. Inclusion and equality are vital if we are to build an Active Nation and deliver the Scottish Government's Programme for Government.

It has been a pleasure to be part of this process and we look forward to working together in the future to support the implementation of the recommendations in this document.

Daisy Narayanan, George Eckton, Derick Murray, James Fowlie

Recommendations

The Task Force, taking into account the evidence submitted and following long discussion of a range of options, make the following 18 recommendations:

1.   Infrastructure

1.1   Criteria for funding for walking, cycling and place-making projects must include the delivery of infrastructure combined with appropriate behaviour change programmes, in a way that is enforced and timely, sequential and coordinated, using planning policy and international best practice.

1.2   As a preventative spend measure, cross-portfolio policy investment (e.g. from Health, Transport, Environment and Education Directorates) should prioritise the delivery of a network of continuous and safe walking and cycling infrastructure routes, working in partnership with local authorities and other relevant stakeholders.

1.3   Formally approved, overarching design guidance for Scotland should be produced for local and trunk roads, and places, enabling people of all ages and abilities to access schools, workplaces and community destinations by foot, bike, public transport, ensuring accessibility for all users. National policy requirements should be reinforced for infrastructure, referencing Designing Streets, Cycling by Design and the Place Standard Tool.

1.4   Funding for long term maintenance for active travel projects, identified as a local or national priority, should be included as part of Community Links/PLUS projects.

2.   Policies, Processes and Resources

2.1   Increased, continuous, multi-year funding and resources, is required, along with simplifying the current bidding processes and conditions.

2.2   The match funding criteria should be reconsidered and the range of those organisations able to bid for active travel funding should be widened to ensure an open, fair and transparent process.

2.3   The collective impact of active travel strategies/plans, and related policies across national, regional and local levels, should be measured, and monitored longitudinally.

2.4   National, regional and local ownership and planning and delivery of active travel projects between policy departments must be more coordinated, and include as a minimum, planning, environment, health and education departments within central and local governments. Regional Transport Partnerships need to be better resourced to address cross-boundary issues, in partnership with other stakeholders.

2.5   There must be prominent and consistent national government and stakeholder support to enhance strong leadership at the local level to help make the often unpopular, but right decisions.

2.6   Professional training in community engagement and consultation and planning, delivering and maintaining active travel projects should be made available as CPD accredited courses to all public and private sector professionals, including elected members.

2.7   A policy of reducing urban traffic and transferring carriageway space to active travel should be considered, including workplace parking levy, road user charging and encouraging more car-sharing.

2.8   The National Transport Strategy Review must deliver the sustainable travel hierarchy, prioritising walking and cycling. Active travel should be mainstreamed into Regional and Local Transport Strategies.

2.9   The Strategic Transport Project Review should include Active Travel as a theme for nationwide projects, for example the National Walking and Cycling Network.

3.   Community Engagement

3.1   The active travel message should be promoted clearly to the general public and politicians, as being primarily about 'place', and having pride in their communities and local environment. Infrastructure projects are not just about walking or cycling. Community Planning Partnerships and local communities need to be included from the outset and consider wider public transport requirements, such as walking routes to bus stops.

3.2   Delivery partners must ensure they conduct strong public consultation exercises and community engagement from the very start of design and planning. This must be inclusive and representative, using appropriate and innovative techniques that enable the target population to understand the project and processes and be properly involved. This will include community groups, businesses and Police Scotland and must follow the legislation in the The Fairer Scotland Duty.

4.   Behaviour Change and Culture

4.1   There must be investment in behaviour change programmes for the longer term, in order to normalise walking and cycling for everyday journeys, including walking to public transport venues as part of a multi-modal journey. These should be balanced and coordinated with infrastructure/place making, media campaigns and must include enforcement of road safety and parking legislation in favour of pedestrians and cyclists.

4.2   All spheres of governance, led by the Scottish Government, must ensure the benefits of active travel are widely promoted across all portfolios and integral to all relevant Scottish Government policy.

4.3   The Fairer Scotland Duty, which is a key component in changing behaviour in relation to active travel, will challenge all public sector bodies, including the Scottish Government, NHS and local authorities, to tackle social and economic disadvantage in local areas. This will include tackling transport poverty and increasing access to bikes.

Next steps

A copy of this report will be sent to every local authority elected member and chief executive, as well as Chairs of Regional Transport Partnerships, CEO of Health Boards and Chairs of Community Planning Partnerships and other relevant bodies. There will also be an invitation to Councillors to a round table discussion with Humza Yousaf MSP, Minister for Transport and The Islands, to discuss the recommendations. The publication will be available on the Transport Scotland website.

Following publication, there will be further conversations with Transport Scotland, Scottish Government officials, especially Health and Planning, and other partners such as local authorities to seek their views on the report and discuss and agree

implementation and delivery of recommendations as appropriate. This will lead to the production of a delivery plan with realistic timescales and accountability for delivery.

A communications plan will be produced and shared with partners to ensure consistency of message across the country. Transport Scotland will ensure this year's Active Travel Summit builds on the work of the Task Force and also takes into account the timescales for implementation of accepted recommendations in this report. Ministers will also ask the Active Nation Commissioner to champion this report, once appointed.

Annexes

1.   Summary of written evidence and key themes

Following the first meeting of the Task Force on 8 February 2017, an invitation was issued via the Transport Scotland's website inviting written evidence on *'the barriers to the delivery of ambitious, inclusive walking and cycling projects in Scotland'*. The deadline for written submissions was 10 March 2017; however a small number of requests for a short extension to this date were received and granted by the Task Force Secretariat. A final total of 55 responses were received.

Breakdown of written evidence contributors by sector

Written evidence received	LA	RTP	Individual	3rd Sector	Lobbyist	Stake holder	Copies	Total
No. received	10	4	16	7	8	7	3	55
% of received	18.2	7.3	29.2	12.7	14.5	12.7	5.4	100

Analysis of written evidence

All written evidence submitted to the Task Force Secretariat was collated to determine what the key barriers and issues to the 'successful delivery of ambitious walking and cycling projects in Scotland' are. Each of the written contributions was examined and all key and recurring themes were then grouped under appropriate headings which are briefly described in this chapter. Further detailed description and discussion of the key themes is provided in chapter three. Four themes emerged from the written evidence: Infrastructure; Policies, processes, and resources; Behaviour change and culture; and Community engagement and leadership. These are explained in more detail below and in further chapters.

Key themes from written evidence

Theme 1.   Infrastructure

The key issues for this theme can be divided into comments relating to; (i) the Design and (ii) the Quality, of purpose-built active travel infrastructure, as well as other supportive, auxiliary infrastructure.

Design

1. For active travel infrastructure to realise its intended purpose and potential, it must be considered at the design stages of a new housing estate, industrial estate, school, etc. Land use decisions need to take into account the need to travel in the first place. Retro-fitting active travel infrastructure is ineffective and costly for towns and cities, but is inevitable given how much of towns and cities already exist.

2. Active travel infrastructure should be designed to integrate and connect communities with each other and those passing through. It should also be designed to connect communities with basic and vital amenities, such as shops, schools and services such as GP and health centres, libraries and sports/activity centres.

3. Public transport improvements alongside walking and cycling infrastructure should be considered as a holistic project, to encourage people out of cars and onto more sustainable, accessible and affordable forms of transport for short local journeys.

4. Cycle and pedestrian pathways should be designed to appeal to the intended target audience. For example, some but not all, cyclists commuting to work would prefer a safe, direct route whilst some school children may primarily prefer a safe, quiet route where there is less traffic.

5. The design (and building) of active travel infrastructure should be done by professionals with the appropriate understanding, experience and qualifications. This is currently not the norm, and is instead often undertaken by road engineers who are trained to build roads.

Quality

1. The safety of pedestrians and cyclists is too often compromised by the quality of cycle and pedestrian pathways. Access is an issue for people with mobility and visual restrictions. Key issues for paths and cycle lanes include being:

    a. too narrow

    b. unlit

    c. exposed to the elements

    d. intrusion of physical barriers such as bins, railings, lamps, and business sign posts on the pavement

2. The maintenance of existing cycle lanes and pathways is inconsistent and often absent. Routes are often hindered by litter, leaves, pot holes and grit from

passing traffic, leading to the potential for accidents. It also reduces the appeal of the route and the likelihood of it being used for active travel purposes.

3. Guidance documents such as Cycling by Design, the Place Standard Tool and Designing Streets should be used to inform minimum quality standards.

4. Cycle lanes and pedestrian paths are often placed too close to the road without adequate protection from motorised vehicles – segregation projects such as Community Links PLUS are a positive, progressive move.

5. Some narrower shared use paths (for cyclists and pedestrians) are problematic without the appropriate markings and space for both. Each group has separate needs and where there is the necessary space; coherent integration of both groups requires appropriate planning for new paths or widening of older paths.

Supportive infrastructure

1. Public transport – trains, trams and coaches - should be cycle friendly, especially in rural areas and for long distance journeys.

2. Utility companies and local authorities need to work better to coordinate installation work with delivery of active travel routes.

3. Secure numbers of safe cycle parking spaces should be available in public spaces, train stations, schools, workplaces, shops and outside flats and tenements.

4. Public transport shelters should be welcoming and provide adequate coverage against rain and wind.

5. Public transport should meet the needs of the public, i.e. reliable, comfortable, efficient and affordable.

6. 20 mph limit should be mandatory in residential and school areas.

Theme 2.   Policies, processes and resources

The key issues for this theme centre on the political backdrop to implementing a long-term and ambitious active travel environment across Scotland. The comments relate to; (i) specific influential policies, (ii) particular decision-making processes and (iii) the allocation of funding and resources.

Policies

('Policies' used here as an inclusive term for other key documents. e.g. Strategies, Plans, etc.)

1. All local authorities and RTPs should have an Active Travel Strategy with targets and visions aligned with the National Active Travel Strategy. This should be a statutory obligation, similar to Regional Transport Strategies to encourage a more 'network' approach, building cross- border projects.

2. Local Authority Active Travel Strategies should be included in the Local Community Plans and these should be approved and adopted by the respective Councils.

3. The use of the Place Standard Tool should be compulsory in developing proposals for upgrading, maintenance and new place developments.

4. Active travel should be a key infrastructure type within the National Planning Framework.

5. Active travel should be linked to the Active Scotland Outcomes Framework.

6. Planning policy and guidance should explicitly support active travel, to ensure that it is not marginalised. Planning Advice Note 75 needs to be updated to reflect Scottish Government (SG)/ Transport Scotland (TS) higher priority for walking and cycling projects.

7. Planning policy should include statutory obligations for developers to include walking and cycling infrastructure in new developments.

8. Mixed messages are often sent out when local politicians, particularly those of the national ruling group, go against national policy established by their own party.

9. Strategic Transport Projects Review (STPR) needs to include walking and cycling routes and not just bridges and roads.

10. Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) needs to take account of the health and economic benefits of active travel projects.

11. Active travel has the potential to deliver on objectives beyond the sphere of transport. Active travel delivers physical and mental health improvements, air quality improvements, carbon reductions and better workplace productivity, as well as contributing to local economies and promoting community cohesion. Active travel needs to be Scottish Government cross-portfolio policy. Currently, there is little buy-in or responsibility taken by policy areas other than transport, at both local and national government levels.

12. Policy areas concerned with air and noise pollution, traffic speed and parking should bring about legislation to create better, healthier and safer places based on the current evidence base.

13. Many travel related policies create incentives for the use of cars through actions such as; low cost or free parking, subsidised travel and business mileage. The introduction of road pricing and workplace parking levies should be considered to emphasise the cost of car use as opposed to the use of public or active travel, to act as a disincentive for car users.

14. Incentives to walking or cycling are either removed or not created through strategies which have poor provision of supportive walking and cycling infrastructure. These include secure cycle parking, lockers, clothes drying facilities and showers.

Processes

1. More joined up thinking is needed between the local and national government decision making processes.

2. Strong leadership is required at national and local level, to take charge and to take the difficult, contentious decisions.

3. Comments received specific to the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) include:

    a. Powers should be given to Local Authorities to decide TRO outcomes rather than the decision being made by the Minister on the basis of a minority objection.

    b. Decisions should be made in favour of the majority view rather than prolonging decision making and progress because of objections by the mobilised minority.

    c. Objections must be evidence based rather than anecdotal to avoid fact versus fiction discussions and then decisions made on rumours and not fact

    d. Objectors need to confirm that their original objection is sustained (following acknowledgement of their objection by the Local Authority).

4. Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs) should be considered for shared use paths, in much the same way that CPOs are considered for, and used in, road building projects.

5. Implementation of active travel strategies and policies is often deferred and delayed for numerous reasons. This negatively affects momentum, budgets, staff capacity and ultimately outcomes.

6. The process of maintaining active travel infrastructure is unclear, in terms of who has responsibility for it and what the process is for keeping it fit for purpose. There should be a publicly available list of shared paths and who is responsible for maintenance, similar to the Core Paths legislation and, where applicable, the National Cycle Network.

Resources

1. Year-to-year funding is problematic for local authorities (LAs)/RTPs in that it acts as a barrier to planning for more ambitious projects. It also forces them to phase developments, which causes additional and costly time delays, insecure employment and burdensome administration.

2. The challenge of annual funding cycles is compounded by difficulties associated with the requirement of LAs/RTPs to provide matched funding of 50% of project costs. Given the increase in the Active Travel budget through the Programme for Government, matched funding of 50% will be impossible for some. Ministers should reconsider the match required.

3. The timing of the bidding process is at odds with financial management systems at LAs/RTPs, thus adding to already overly burdensome administration duties.

4. Scotland needs to increase its per capita spend on active travel to comparative levels found elsewhere in Europe (e.g. Netherlands, Denmark).

5. There is a need to provide ring-fenced funding to LAs/RTPs, particularly for large cost-prohibitive and cross-border active travel projects, such as bridges and improving dangerous junctions.

6. A percentage of the Cycling, Walking and, Safer Streets (CWSS) grant should be allocated to cycling (suggested at 90%, currently requested at least 50%). Some contributors disagreed and suggested that the ring-fencing be removed altogether.

7. A lack of resource, expertise and skillsets specific to bidding, developing and delivering on ambitious active travel projects exists within LAs/RTPs. Co-design and co-production for projects takes time and costs money and both are in short supply. Training for engineers, different types of people – takes time, money and needs to be longer term.

8. Central funding should be provided for appropriate and relevant training courses and CPD for all staff and elected members, in addition to road engineers. This CPD and training should be mandatory for all professionals and politicians working or making decisions in active travel policy or project areas.

9. The Sustainable and Active Transport Team at Transport Scotland requires more resourcing with additional staff, as do LAs and RTPs, for example, through more professionally qualified transport planners.

Theme 3.   Behaviour change and culture

The key issues for this theme can be divided into comments concerning; (i) attitudes towards, and (ii) knowledge about active travel. It also highlights some of the pervading cultural norms that exist in terms of the perceived hierarchy of transport use.

Attitudes

1. It can be difficult to 'sell' cycling as a means of transport to novice or inexperienced cyclists because of perceived fears associated with travelling by bike. These fears are mostly concerned with safety of the cyclist and the physical demands of cycling.

2. There is a majority perception in Scotland (and elsewhere) that people 'need' to drive the car to shops, work, school, etc., for a variety of personally held reasons to do with comfort, convenience, habit and a perceived lack of alternative option.

3. Walking and cycling as a commuting option is seen as impractical and unrealistic for certain populations, e.g. some working parents with drop-off responsibilities at schools/nurseries and children who must travel on a busy route to school. The route driven to school is not always the route you would take if you were cycling.

4. Police don't appear to take complaints by cyclists seriously unless an actual injury or hospitalisation has occurred.

5. There are also enforcement issues with illegal parking on pavements and in cycle lanes.

6. Active travel is seen as a low priority or is absent from key strategic transport documents such as Strategic Transport Projects Review and Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance.

7. Active travel has low priority in some LAs/RTPs in terms of decisions made about staff allocation, particularly when there are budget constraints.

Knowledge

1. Inappropriate campaign/media messages have been used to promote walking and cycling to different target populations. The messages are not always clear or address the particular barriers or issues relevant to different groups. Communication campaigns should better understand and meet the individual needs of different target groups. One campaign will not meet the needs of all road users.

2. Drivers should be better educated about the conditions that cyclists are often required to cycle in, in order to reduce driver bias and improve understanding of cyclists' needs.

3. Information and education campaigns about active travel are often disjointed and un-coordinated with delivery of active travel projects, interventions and infrastructure. These need to be much better coordinated.

4. Decision makers with responsibility for developing policy and allocating budgets need to be educated about the cross-portfolio benefits that active travel can help deliver, including; educate the people who are responsible for:

    a. Increased economic activity

    b. Culture change

    c. Decreased car use and associated air pollution

    d. Improved health

    e. Improved road safety

    f. Improved planning and accessibility

    g. Reduce traffic congestion through reduced traffic volume

    h. Tourism benefits

    i. Increased levels of walking and cycling

5. Local authority councillors also need to be better informed about the benefits associated with long term and consistent investment in active travel, to help avoid further detrimental decisions against active travel investment and project delivery.

6. Active travel should be better promoted and integrated into the Curriculum for Excellence to help normalise active travel from a young age.

7. National and local government priorities need to lift active travel to a priority.

8. Rather than the current emphasis on vehicular movement, people and places should come first in order to promote better air quality, health and economic benefits.

9. It needs to be understood by all professionals, councillors and budget holders involved in active travel that behaviour change, on a large-scale population level, takes many years to deliver. Therefore, investment in behaviour change interventions, such as walking and cycling programmes and media campaigns need to be patiently and consistently invested in over the longer term.

Theme 4.   Community engagement

A number of responses raised concerns about techniques currently used to engage communities, prior to and during consultation phases of planning active travel projects. The main comments were concerned with:

1. Appropriate engagement techniques need to be used, depending on the demographic profile of the community.

2. The timing of public consultations should be reconsidered so that it is more 'family friendly'. Early evening was not deemed to be so.

3. Plain English should be used when engaging with communities, rather than technical and professional language. E.g. some research has shown that many people don't understand what is meant by 'active travel', but use everyday words like 'walking' and 'cycling'.

4. The point of entry of community involvement into the project is important and should be from the very start of the design/planning stage.

5. The opportunity to be involved should be open to everyone and not just 'the vocal minority'. This especially includes younger people, people with disabilities, older adults and parents with young children.

6. It is important to especially hear the voices of people from areas of disadvantage, as they are most likely to be affected by the impacts of increased traffic and/or have less opportunity for safe walking/cycling. To not do so means risking increasing health inequalities.

7. Planners and developers do not fully utilise existing, relevant and modern tools for engaging with communities. Virtual reality tools are useful at public consultations as they give local residents the opportunity to see the final project from multiple angles and times of day. This allows for a more informed discussion about potential challenges and barriers.

Overview of written evidence

The successful, long-term delivery of ambitious, inclusive walking and cycling projects in Scotland requires:

1. Better coordination of active travel (AT) strategies and related policies across national, regional and local levels.

2. Better coordination of planning and delivery between policy areas relevant to AT.

3. Moving away from an 'infrastructure only' approach to delivery is required. The delivery of infrastructure should be combined with appropriate behaviour change programmes and supportive policy and enforceable legislation, in a way that is timely, sequential and coordinated.

4. Better implementation of design guidance principles and use of best examples from the UK and Europe.

5. Increased, continuous, long-term funding and resources, as well as reconsideration of current bidding processes and conditions, especially match funding.

6. A change in culture to normalise walking and cycling for everyday journeys.

7. Better community engagement techniques and understanding of the needs of target populations.

Courtesy of Sustrans Scotland

2. Summary of oral evidence and key themes

Following the analysis of the written evidence submitted, the Task Force identified gaps in the evidence base and sought to fill the gaps through a set of oral evidence sessions. Invitations were sent out to a variety of organisations involved in the delivery of active travel projects as well as community groups and professional bodies that were both for and against walking and cycling projects.

In total there were 3 days of oral evidence sessions held during 2017. In order to have full and frank discussions the sessions were conducted under the Chatham House Rule and therefore the following comments are un-attributable.

Oral evidence received	LA	Community Councils	3rd Sector	Lobbyist/ consultant	Professional bodies	Total
No. received	6	4	4	4	6	24
% of sectors	25	16.6	16.6	16.6	25	100

Analysis of oral evidence

The oral evidence was recorded by the Task Force Secretariat during each of the three sessions. These notes were then collated to assess what key issues were raised by the contributors to identify what they believed is preventing the 'successful delivery of ambitious walking and cycling projects in Scotland'. Any emerging themes were grouped together and are briefly described in this chapter. Further detailed description and discussion of the key themes, as identified by the Task Force, is provided in chapter three.

Key themes from oral evidence

Theme 1.   Community engagement

This theme was very dominant in the oral evidence sessions, with many contributions detailing real examples of poor practice and ineffective engagement techniques, resulting in misinformation, extensive community conflict as well as lengthy and costly project delays. Contributions highlighted cases where:

a. A series of public consultations created the need for additional design and traffic remodelling. This in turn meant multiple submissions to council committees and, ultimately, long delays to the project initiation.

b. Tensions between local business objections and council decisions, resulting in delays caused by the initiation of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO). (Refer Annex C).

c. Initiation of public consultation after plans/designs had been commenced. This meant that public consultations were therefore used to present the designs to the public rather than using the more inclusive engagement techniques of co-production/co-design.

d. Inappropriate techniques used to attract the public to consultations – resulting in questionnaires with poor levels of return, workshops with low turnout. Engagement techniques need to be more user-friendly.

e. A proposed town centre 'shared space' area drew concerns from some within the wider community of disability and equality groups. Place planning had included an Equality Design Group and undertaking of an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA). While some opposition remained within the community, it was well received by the majority of residents and businesses.

f. Threatening behaviour by opposition groups towards council officials at public consultation meetings. This should not be tolerated.

g. Learning that it is worthwhile spending effort to identify and engage those who support the project to come to public consultations, to provide informed debate and to help balance objections from those opposed.

h. Useful to invite councillors to public engagement meetings, to help them to understand the details of the project and the local issues first hand.

i. Everyone needs to understand the difference between 'consulting with' and 'informing' communities about proposed place-making projects.

j. Good examples are needed of where and how public consultation has worked.

Theme 2.   Behaviour change and culture

The oral evidence sessions affirmed an urgent need to invest in soft measures for active travel, identifying in particular, the need to 'crack the behaviour change nut'. A number of specific experiences were relayed that touched on issues relating to: (i) attitudes to, and (ii) knowledge about active travel, as well as actions that might help bring about a positive change in behaviour.

a. Media campaigns and government policies/documents that seek to promote active travel need to champion the message that active travel initiatives are focussed on 'place' and making the environments in which we live, work, travel through and play, better for everyone. Public messaging needs to move away from referring to projects as 'walking or cycling projects'.

b. Objections lodged by businesses and residents can tend to be based upon anecdotal information without any supportive evidence, e.g. saying that the introduction of a segregated cycle path will 'increase congestion, reduce loading bays', 'increase pollution' and encourage 'illegal parking'.

c. With the right messaging and supportive environment, we can create an attitude to active travel where it becomes the natural choice for people.

d. Local media can be unsupportive of active travel initiatives, often using misinformation and anecdotal stories in their articles.

e. Local councillors do not always have the appropriate information or depth of understanding about active travel, i.e. its cross-portfolio appeal and multiple benefits. They also rarely have sufficient knowledge about active travel projects, which can lead to unfavourable decisions being made against proposed projects.

f. Successful active travel projects will have good communication and marketing strategies, both internal and external, built in to them from the very beginning of planning and design.

g. Wording used in campaigns and communications for active travel can be confusing and too technical. Plain English approach is required to communicate benefits and positive outcomes associated with investment in active travel projects.

Theme 3.   Policies, processes and resources

The political environment in which active travel projects are decided upon is, by suggestion from oral evidence contributors, complex, confusing and cluttered with policies and processes. There are also competing priorities from local and national governments adding to the challenge of delivering successful and appropriate projects within budget.

a. Political consensus in councils can be difficult, and can frustrate and impede progress on projects which can sometimes have one to two years of resource and investment in them up to that point.

b. The TRO and RDO processes are viewed as lengthy, onerous and costly for local authorities.

c. It would be helpful to have access to more comprehensive data that shows the value of active travel across economic, environment and health perspectives, at both national and local levels.

d. Strong leadership both locally and nationally is vital, as is political consensus on the importance of active travel across political parties.

e. Active travel should be mainstreamed into policies and documents in other areas including climate change, health, education, tourism, economy.

f. Some design and technical documents in circulation need to be updated; otherwise there is inconsistency in delivery, e.g. Living Streets' document 'The Pedestrian Pound' and Road Humps Act 1984 as well as Cycling by Design and the Trunk Road Cycling Initiative.

g. One-year funding is problematic as it means that larger projects must be phased, introducing time delays and uncertainty as political approval and funding must be secured for each subsequent phase. Also means LAs are doing the minimum that secured funding will allow.

h. The requirement for matched funding also contributes to challenges in project initiation and delivery as it is difficult to secure this from LAs, particularly in austere conditions.

i. LAs/RTPs are experiencing a loss of staff resource and expertise in areas related to active travel, partly because of the funding issues and partly because of the low priority assigned to active travel.

j. Procurement policies are different in each LA, making it difficult to work across LAs and also resulting in large variation in quality standards.

k. Pursuing Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs) in situations where small pieces of land (owned by a third party) are holding up an otherwise consensually agreed and beneficial project should be purposefully pursued by LAs and/or Transport Scotland.

Theme 4.   Infrastructure

Contributors to the oral evidence sessions were invited to provide insight into their own infrastructure delivery projects and experiences. Comments therefore reflect on some of the specific challenges and achievements.

a. A section of a route identified for improvement (in order to complete a network), was proposed with a combination of segregated and non-segregated sections. Challenges in completing have previously been identified in other themes above (e.g. objections from businesses, political indecision, TRO processes, funding), leaving the project still incomplete after three years.

b. An infrastructure project with active travel at its centre is pitched as a 'project aimed to make cars feel like guests and put people and place first' and has been well received by most residents and businesses.

c. Aspects of infrastructure design in a street design project include; local firms doing the work, 20 mph speed limit, access for buses but not cars, and a possible dedicated cycle path incorporated into 6 m carriageway (under consideration).

d. A project (removing junction lights, crossing etc.) has 'designed disabled people out of their town centre'. Disabled groups were not consulted and feel that concessions made do not meet the minimum standards of the Equality Act, e.g. in shared areas the kerbs were not as visible for visually impaired people and a controlled crossing (over a canal) is 800m from the town centre.

Overview of oral evidence

The successful, long-term delivery of ambitious, inclusive walking and cycling projects in Scotland requires:

1. The active travel 'message' to be clearly articulated and promoted to the general public and politicians, as being primarily about 'place', and not just about walking or cycling.

2. A cultural shift in normalising walking and cycling, and thinking about benefits of active travel as extending across portfolios such as; economy, tourism, road safety, pollution emissions, health.

3. Public consultation and community engagement should be initiated at the very start of design/planning. It needs to be inclusive and representative, using appropriate techniques that enable the target population to understand and participate properly.

4. Better connectivity between local and national priorities on delivering active travel projects.

5. Deliver an 'active travel' network similar to the Central Scotland Green Network. This should be a key recommendation for the National Transport Strategy update (NTS2).

6. Strong leadership and vision within LAs to make the often unpopular but right decisions.

7. Changes to how funding is allocated – increase length of funding cycle and reconsideration of the requirement for matched funding.

8. Investing in behaviour change programmes for the longer term. These should be balanced and coordinated with infrastructure development and media campaigns.

9. Drawing from best examples within Scotland and across Europe for; (i) implementation of design guidance principles and (ii) implementation of behaviour change programmes.

3.   List of organisations/individuals submitting written evidence

Written Evidence Contributor	Written Evidence Contributor
The Bike Station Edinburgh	Peter Brett Associates
Fife Council	North Lanarkshire Council
NESTRANS	West Dunbartonshire Council
Paths for All	Sustrans Scotland
Midlothian council	Transform Scotland
SPOKES	Pedal on Parliament
SYSTRA Consultants	Cycle Stirling
Aberdeen Cycle Forum	Go Bike Strathclyde Cycle Campaign
Living Streets Scotland	Scottish Natural Heritage
Orkney Islands Council	East Dunbartonshire Council
NHS GGCV	East Ayrshire Council
Cycling Group	Ayrshire Roads Alliance
Glasgow City Council	Forth Environment Link
HITRANS	Individual
North Lanarkshire Council	Individual
Roseburn Cycle Group	Individual
West Dunbartonshire Council	Individual
ByCycle Perth and Kinross Cycle Campaign	Individual
Urbantu Ltd	Individual
NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Valley Health Board	Individual
Cycling UK	Individual
Living Streets Scotland	Individual
SESTRAN	Individual
Howgate Village Hall and Community Council	Individual
Highland Cycle Campaign	Individual
NESTRAN	Individual
Joint RTP chairs response	Individual
SCOTS	Individual
Aberdeenshire Council	Individual
Jog Scotland	Individual
Cycling Scotland	
The City of Edinburgh Council x2	Individual
Comhairle Nan Eilean Siar	Individual

4.   List of organisations/individuals invited to give oral evidence

Oral Evidence Contributor session 1
City of Edinburgh (x2)
East Dunbartonshire Council
Ayrshire Roads Alliance
Aberdeen City Council
Murrayfield Community Council
Roseburn Community Council
Independent Consultant - Plan for Bikes Ltd
Oral Evidence Contributor session 2
Spokes Lothian Cycle Campaign
East Dunbartonshire Visually Impaired Group
East Dunbartonshire Community Councils (x2)
Council of Ethnic Minority Voluntary Sector
NHS Scotland – Health Equality
Oral Evidence Contributor session 3
Mobility and Access Committee Scotland
Neilston Community Trust
Scottish Community Planning Network
Institute of Civil Engineers Scotland
Royal Town Planning Institute
Head of Roads Policy, Transport Scotland
Teacher, Falkirk Council
University Cycling Officer
Venture Trust
Young Scot

5.   Traffic Regulation Order process outline

In order to deliver the routes it may be necessary for the use of a section of carriage way to be redetermined. To do this a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is needed.

The evidence submitted to Active Travel Task Force (ATTF) included two suggestions in relation to TROs:

a. A Local Authority (LA) should be able to make decisions on the TRO without intervention from Ministers.

b. A minority of objectors to the order should not have undue influence and be able to have the Minister intervene in the TRO. The majority view should be upheld.

The following explains the life cycle of a TRO.

Legislation

a. *The Roads (Scotland) Act 1984* designates routes for specific purposes and confers powers to the LAs. Within the Act a cycle track is defined as a mandatory cycle route on a road separated by a solid white line. A footway is a route for pedestrians only if it is linked to a road and a footpath is a footway without the road. This is provided by section 152 of this Act.

b. *Statutory Instrument 1986/252*. The Stopping up of Roads and Private Accesses and the Redetermination of Public Rights of Passage (Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 1986. This facilitates the serving of order to Transport Scotland (TS) and processing of any objections made.

Full definitions as set out in the *Roads (Scotland) Act 1984* are contained in Annex – Legislative definitions.

Process

This is the background to the handling of an order outside of the Scottish Government involvement.

The *Statutory Instrument 1986/252 S (16)* provides the mechanism for the LAs to inform interested parties of the intention to change the use of a carriage way.

The Order will be advertised by the LA in one local paper and the Edinburgh Gazette. If there are objections, they will have to be submitted to the LA within the statutory period as detailed in the advertisement.

The LA will work with the objectors to resolve their points. However, if this is not possible the LA will send the order to Transport Scotland, specifically the Trunk Road and Bus Operations (TRBO) Team.

In general there are two situations where Transport Scotland will only become involved with the TRO. Firstly if there have objections to the proposed action that the LA has tried to resolve but have not been able to. The other is if the TRO is a temporary order.

If Transport Scotland need to be involved a number of actions are taken; these are dependent on the specific details of the order.

1. Transport Scotland ensures all documents are present and correct before passing the case to the Scottish Government Legal Department (SGLD).

2. SGLD consider the technical and procedural aspects of the case. Ensure the LA is empowered to make this and have provided all the required detail.

3. SGLD provide a legal opinion on the case:

   a. If there are no legal concerns, any objections are considered. The Local Authority is informed that the order has been confirmed and that it will be considered further.

   b. If there are serious legal concerns the Local Authority will be refused an order confirmation and will have an opportunity to resubmit an order. Other concerns are dealt with through stating reasons and requesting further supporting reasons for the order.

4. Transport Scotland will decide on the necessity of involving the Department for Planning and Environmental Appeals (DPEA). Historic Environment may be consulted. DPEA are responsible for inspections and inquiries. The result of which will be a report. These will be the result of one of the following:

   a. A reporter's site inspection

   b. An engineer's site inspection

   c. A Public Lead Inquiry (PLI)

   The report has two parts and the content varies according to the action the DPEA has taken.

5. When Transport Scotland are content that investigations have been carried out, a final draft of the TRO is requested of the LA.

6. Transport Scotland will issue a decision letter, copying all objectors and DPEA if required. Accompanying the letter will be a copy of the report from the actions.

Timeline

When handling orders, the Transport Scotland branch will classify each case according to its sensitivity. Communications with other organisations and interested parties such as objectors will be made within specified time limits and these have been listed in Annex - Timescales.

Importantly there is no statutory limit on the time taken to reach a decision on an order.

Legislative definitions

Definitions used in the *Roads (Scotland) Act 1984.*

'pedal cycle' means a cycle whose motive power is provided solely by the legs of its rider or riders or which complies with the requirements specified in Regulation 4 of the *Electrically Assisted Pedal Cycles S.I. 1983/1168 Regulations 1983;*

'carriageway' shall be construed in accordance with sub section (2) below;

'cycle track' shall be construed in accordance with subsection (2) below;

'footpath' shall be construed in accordance with subsections (2) and (3) (a) and (b), and 'footway' in accordance with subsection (2), below;

(2) For the purpose of this Act, where over a road the public right of passage referred to in the definition of 'road 'in subsection

(1) above:

(a) is by foot only, the road is:

   (i) where it is associated with a carriageway, a 'footway'; and

   (ii) where it is not so associated, a 'footpath ';

(b) is by pedal cycle only, or by pedal cycle and foot only, the road is a 'cycle track'.

(3) This Act does not confer any power or impose any duty as regards a road or proposed road which-

(a) being a footpath only, is a public path created under 1967 c. 86. Section 30 of the *Countryside (Scotland) Act 1967 (*power of planning authority to create public paths by agreement);

(b) being a footpath only, forms part of a long-distance route the proposals for which have been approved by the Secretary of State under section 40(1) of that Act (approval of proposals relating to a long-distance route) ; or

(c) forms part of land owned or managed by an islands or district council and used by them for the provision of facilities for recreational, sporting, cultural or social activities in the discharge of their duties under section 1982 c. 43. 14 of the *Local Government and Planning (Scotland) Act 1982.*

Timescales

Within Transport Scotland the Team responsible for TROs will confirm communications with stake holders as detailed below.

Examples of response guidelines

Guidelines	Priority Cases	Non Priority Cases
Acknowledgement by branch of order	Day of receipt	1 week
Scrutiny and logging of the case	3 days	1 week
Engineers/Planning/Historic Environment	1 week	2 week
Follow up queries	1 week	2 weeks
SGLD for scrutiny	2 weeks	3 weeks
SGLD comments	1 week	2 weeks
Decision letter drafted	2 weeks	2 weeks
Issue of letter	1 week	1 week
Replies from LAs and objectors	2 weeks	1 month
Acknowledgement of correspondence	Same day	Same day
Reply to correspondence	1 week	3 weeks
DPEA	Each case on its own merit	approximately 7 months

Glossary

DPEA	Department for Planning and Environmental Appeals
LA	Local Authorities
PLI	Public Lead Inquiry
SGLD	Scottish Government Legal Department
TRBO	Transport Road and Bus Operations
TRO	Traffic Regulation Order
TS	Transport Scotland
Edinburgh Gazette	Local Authorities place notices in the Gazette to inform of the closing of roads and footpaths, acquisition of land for development etc. This will coincide with the similar notices in the local press.

Further copies of this document are available, on request, in audio and visual formats and in
community languages. Any enquiries regarding this document / publication should be
sent to us at **info@transport.gov.scot**

This document is also available on the Transport Scotland website: **www.transport.gov.scot**
Published by Transport Scotland, June 2018

Follow us:

 transcotland   @transcotland

transport.gov.scot

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba