
Cycling Action Plan for Scotland Review of Next Steps 2019

Report

Prof Tom Rye

Project No: 67751
February 20

Table of Contents

1. PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT.....	2
1.1 PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT	2
1.2 DOCUMENTS REVIEWED FOR THIS REPORT.....	2
2. INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE.....	4
2.1 WHAT ACTIONS ARE NEEDED TO BOOST CYCLING RATES RAPIDLY?.....	4
3. REVIEW OF CURRENT ACTIONS.....	6
3.1 CYCLING ACTION PLAN FOR SCOTLAND 2017-2020.....	6
3.2 KEY DOCUMENTS AS SPECIFIED IN THE BRIEF	7
3.3 MORE DETAILED FOCUS ON CAPS AND ACTIVE TRAVEL TASK FORCE DELIVERY PLAN ACTIONS8	
3.3.1 Conclusions from analysis in tables above.....	13
3.4 REVIEW OF ACTIONS IN OTHER NATIONAL DOCUMENTS	14
3.4.1 <i>Infrastructure Investment Plan.....</i>	<i>14</i>
3.4.2 <i>National Transport Strategy Consultation Draft.....</i>	<i>14</i>
3.4.3 <i>National Planning Framework</i>	<i>15</i>
3.4.4 <i>National Walking Strategy</i>	<i>16</i>
3.4.5 <i>Preventing Overweight and Obesity In Scotland – a Route Map Towards Healthy Weight (2010).....</i>	<i>16</i>
3.4.6 <i>Scotland’s Accessible Travel Framework 2016.....</i>	<i>16</i>
3.4.7 <i>ScotRail Cycling Innovation Plan.....</i>	<i>17</i>
3.4.8 <i>Scottish Planning Policy</i>	<i>17</i>
3.4.9 <i>Conclusion to this section.....</i>	<i>18</i>
3.5 REVIEW OF ACTIONS IN LOCAL AND REGIONAL STRATEGIES.....	18
4. PROGRESS AND GAPS	19
4.1 PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING HIGHER LEVELS OF CYCLING.....	19
4.2 PROGRESS IN DELIVERING CAPS AND OTHER RELATED ACTIONS	19
4.3 AREAS IN WHICH CAPS AND RELATED DOCUMENTS COULD BE STRENGTHENED	20
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22
5.1 KEY FINDINGS	22
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22
5.3 FUTURE VERSION OF CAPS.....	24
REFERENCES.....	25
APPENDIX ONE – REVIEW OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL ACTIVE TRAVEL STRATEGIES....	26

This is an independent report, produced for Cycling Scotland and commissioned by Transport Scotland. The views expressed in this report reflect the opinions of the author and not necessarily the official views of Cycling Scotland or Scottish Government.

1. PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 Purpose and structure of this report

This report is produced in response to a brief from Cycling Scotland, commissioned by Transport Scotland, to carry out a review of the Cycling Action Plan for Scotland (CAPS) and future priorities for cycling in Scotland in relation to CAPS. The report does not present any new evidence but is instead based on a review of, in particular, the actions set out in a number of national, regional and local level policy documents that have relevance to active travel. It provides a structured critique of these actions and makes some recommendations as to how these actions could be strengthened, speeded up and/or supplemented by further actions in order, ultimately, to increase the take up of cycling and active travel in Scotland.

The other chapters of this report are structured as follows. Firstly, there is a brief recap of the international evidence on what is needed to increase levels of cycling quickly over a small number of years. Secondly, and in relation to the international evidence, the report then reviews the quality of the actions in four key documents (as defined in the brief). It then more briefly reviews the actions in a larger number of national documents, and those in local and regional Active Travel Strategies. The report then considers the evidence of progress in Scotland in terms of delivering the actions reviewed previously, and in terms of the country hitting its targets for levels of cycling. It discusses what more might need to be done both in implementing existing actions and in further developing actions or adding completely new ones, and summarises this as a set of recommendations.

1.2 Documents reviewed for this report

The following key documents (as defined by the brief) were reviewed:

- A Long-Term Vision for Active Travel in Scotland 2030
- Active Travel Framework 2019 latest draft
- Active Travel Taskforce Report 2018
- Active Travel Taskforce Delivery Plan 2019
- Cycling Action Plan for Scotland 2017-2020

In addition, the actions in the following other documents were reviewed:

- 'A More Active Scotland - Scotland's Physical Activity Delivery Plan 2018'
- A Healthier Future - Action and Ambitions on Diet Activity and Healthy Weight Consultation Document 2017
- Abellio ScotRail Cycle Innovation Plan (CIP)
- Active Scotland Delivery Plan
- Cleaner Air for Scotland Air Quality Strategy 2017
- Climate Change Plan: third report on proposals and policies 2018-2032 (RPP3)
- Cycling Action Plan Progress Report 2016
- Going Further Scotland's Accessible Travel Framework 2016
- Infrastructure Investment Plan 2015
- National Planning Framework 2014
- National Transport Strategy (consultation) 2019
- Prevention of Obesity Route Map 2010

- Scotland Walking: National Walking Strategy Delivery Plan – Action Plan 2016-2026
- Scotland's Railways Strategy document 2006
- Scottish Planning Policy 2014
- Transport (Scotland) Bill 2019

A Strategic Transport Projects Review 2 document was not available at the time this work was carried out. Finally, Local Authority Active Travel Strategies and Regional Transport Strategies were reviewed by Matt Davis at Sustrans Scotland, whose assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

2. INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE

2.1 What actions are needed to boost cycling rates rapidly?

Cycling under human power is, for day to day utility trips, a short to medium distance mode of transport, and this is acknowledged in CAPS insofar as it recognises that the biggest potential for growth in cycling is in Scotland's urban areas, where average trip lengths are shorter. This is also recognised in Cycling Scotland's 2015 International Comparator Study of what has brought about change in cycling in other European cities and countries, in the following quote (page 5):

"Most policies that increase cycling and make it safe are implemented at the local level. National governments, however, influence cycling through national cycling policies, dedicated funding, traffic regulations, roadway and bikeway design standards, and dissemination of expertise."

The policies found by this report to have increased cycling rates are as follows:

- **Pro-cycling policies backed up by funding at the national level but also for key cities and regions**
- **Provision of continuous, direct, well-designed, safe infrastructure, segregated from motor vehicles on roads where their speeds are higher.**
- Cycle training.
- Events to support cycling to schools and workplaces and promote cycling more generally.

Of these, the most essential were found to be the second and then the first; without them, the effectiveness of the others was much reduced (page 74):

"The evidence strongly indicates that, to grow cycling appreciably, the primary investment focus should be on enabling cycling through changing the physical environment (e.g. providing protected cycle tracks and/or managing motor traffic)"...[but] "cycle training – while an important tool in growing cycling - is not a substitute for physical measures to make cycling both be and seem safer."

It should be noted that the advent of the electric bike has increased the range of cycling trips and thus its suitability for interurban and longer rural trips. However, countries such as the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and Germany where electric bikes are increasingly used for such trips are places that have well developed cycling infrastructure, so the conclusion of the International Comparator Study about the importance of infrastructure remains valid even in the light of the electric bike. These conclusions are backed up in a paper dealing with the experience of German cities in increasing cycling in the short period from 2002 to 2008 (Lanzendorf and Busch-Geertsma, 2014). These authors were clear that a significant increase in funding spent on improving the physical infrastructure and on *accompanying* campaigns and public awareness measures were the key actions in raising cycle mode share in Munich, Frankfurt am Main and Berlin in this period. (The greatest growth was in Munich with 11% of all trips by bike in 2002, rising to 15% in 2008.)

As a final note to this chapter, is important not to neglect the role of land use in facilitating active travel. If urban areas are dense then, all other things (for example, quality of active travel infrastructure, or car ownership) being equal, average trip

distances will be lower than in less dense areas, and short average trip distances lend themselves to being walked and cycled. For example, the proportion of trips made on foot by residents of the central City of London averaged over the years 2014 to 2017 was 57%; for the inner London Borough of Wandsworth, 35%; and for the outer London Borough of Bromley, 23% (Transport for London 2018). Whilst not entirely a product of urban form, land use density and trip lengths play an important role in producing these travel patterns. Melia et al (2012) cite data from England, a number of Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands that highlight the same issue: both higher density and shorter distance of a location from the town or city centre are associated with higher rates of active travel. Thus the role of land use in facilitating active travel should not be underestimated and declining population densities and suburban development are likely to undermine other efforts to increase rates of active travel.

3. REVIEW OF CURRENT ACTIONS

This chapter considers the actions set out in a range of documents, beginning with the current Cycling Action Plan for Scotland (CAPS).

3.1 Cycling Action Plan for Scotland 2017-2020

There has been no review of progress in implementing CAPS 2017- 2020 to date, other than this report, which of course does not have the benefit of having spoken first hand to stakeholders nor of having reviewed any non-published material of relevance (unlike the Progress Report on the previous CAPS). Therefore the comments in this section are based only on a reading of the available documents.

In general CAPS covers the areas that international experience, and experience of cities in Britain with high levels of cycling, should cover if levels of cycling are to be increased. However, it does not have a clear set of objectives (rather it accepts the recommendations of a previous separate report as its implicit objectives). Without clear and prioritised objectives, it is sometimes difficult to see how and why the package of measures (the actions in the plan) has been developed. In addition, its actions often lack detail, timescales and responsibilities, and it is not clear how some of the most important elements are to be delivered. For example:

- There is no clear timescale for a new version of Cycling by Design (although this is partly addressed in the Active Travel Task Force Delivery Plan (ATTFDP)).
- It is not clear what form of support and encouragement local authorities will receive from Transport Scotland and others to develop and implement their Active Travel Strategies, nor what these Strategies should, as a minimum, contain.
- Leadership is mentioned a number of times and the international experience shows that this is very important, but few specific actions are listed to develop either national or local leadership.
- It is not clear what types of measures will be implemented, and by whom, to achieve the ultimate road safety goal of no deaths or serious injuries on Scotland's roads, as set in the Road Safety Framework.
- Other than reiterating the government's commitment to maintain the current active travel budget, the document is quite silent on how to increase other sources of funding, particularly at the local authority level.
- There is a need for a better analysis of the current barriers to delivery of, in particular, local infrastructure; and then a clear set of steps to reduce or eliminate these barriers, such as, for example: lack of staff capacity; lack of political or senior management leadership at the local level; land acquisition for schemes; TRO processes; or funding of the maintenance of new schemes. These points are to some extent dealt with in the ATTFDP but not in a systematic way.
- Many activities listed to exemplify actions, whilst extremely valuable in themselves, appear piecemeal and/or small scale – for example, the possibility for disabled young people to try bikes is valuable but only if rolled out beyond one small pilot, and the document does not explain how this will happen.
- A commitment to “Work collaboratively across all policy areas” would be more helpful if it is clear which policy areas and who has committed to lead that work in each policy area.

3.2 Key documents as specified in the brief

The actions in the key documents were assessed on a qualitative scale of 5 “very good” to 1 “lacking”. This judges the action rather than their implementation. Rather than assess each individual action, the actions were categorised using the four categories from CAPS and one further category, related to training and capacity building, which is significant in ensuring that there are sufficient staff available to deliver the new infrastructure and services required to raise cycling levels. The assessment rated the respective document’s actions in each category against a maximum score which, if achieved, would be likely to deliver the growth in cycling that is aspired to in CAPS, on a short to medium term timescale. Comments are provided to put these scores in context.

Table 3.1 : Assessment of categories of action in each key document

	Leadership	Infrastructure and safety	Behaviour change and attitudes	Funding	Training and capacity building	
A Long-Term Vision for Active Travel in Scotland	5	5	5	5	5	An excellent vision for active travel in Scotland but lacking details on how the vision will be achieved.
Active Travel Taskforce Delivery Plan 2019	4	3	4	3	3	Many of the actions to implement recommendations lack clarity on responsibilities and timescale. Says little on funding beyond reiterating existing Transport Scotland funding. Weak on safety other than further roll out of 20mph zones. Only one action on training. Dominance of activity by TS, Sustrans and CS, whilst unclear as to how other actors will be encouraged/incentivised to join in – in particular, how will local authorities be incentivised to implement the AT strategies that they have been encouraged to develop.
Active Travel Taskforce Report, 2018	4	3	4	3	3	Recommendations are the same as above. Does not include actions to achieve recommendations – these are in the delivery plan. Some recommendations are vague or difficult to appreciate what they really mean (especially the final recommendation). Requires more actions on infrastructure and road safety if it is to be aligned with what the international evidence shows is important in increasing modal share for cycling.
Active Travel Framework draft 2019	2	5	4	3	3	The framework does not include actions but the indicators selected suggest that appropriate actions would be likely to flow from its adoption. Little on leadership or training and capacity building is only implied. Strong on infrastructure and safety and of course monitoring. Need to distinguish in spend indicator between national and local level spend.
Cycling Action Plan for Scotland 2017-2020	3	3	4	4	4	See more detailed analysis in following section of report, although many of the comments on the Active Travel Taskforce reports also apply to CAPS. In general, it is stronger on behaviour change and training, and on national level funding, than on leadership, local infrastructure and safety.

3.3 More detailed focus on CAPS and Active Travel Task Force Delivery Plan actions

A number of criteria were drawn up to help assess the actions in CAPS and the Active Travel Task Force Delivery Plan, as these are considered to be the documents that have most bearing on the delivery of cycling actions in the country (as will be seen from the review of other documents below, with the exception of the national planning documents, few contain actions that are critical individually for the achievement of cycling policy objectives, although all support what CAPS is trying to do). The criteria are as follows:

- Summarise status of the actions – whether delivered, in delivery, not delivered or delivered more slowly than anticipated.
- To what extent do the actions in the documents/plans relate to what the evidence shows is needed to boost cycling and walking.
- Clarity of timescales for implementation/achievement of actions and commitments.
- Funding for each action – is it identified, is it secured, or is there little detail on funding?
- Is a clear path to implementation identified, with clear responsibilities for the delivery partners involved?

In Tables 3.2 and 3.3, below, the actions are assessed on a 5 (“*strong*”) to 1 (“*weak*”) scale for each of the five criteria. This scale is qualitative and ordinal, that is, a score of 5 does not indicate a performance that is 5 times better than a score of 1. It is used to give an assessment of the actions in relation to each other and in relation to the criteria. This facilitates a clear overview of the relative positions of the actions but should not be regarded as being completely precise – rather it is indicative.

Table 3.3 – assessment of recommendations and actions in Cycling Action Plan for Scotland 2017-2020

CAPS 2017-2020 Actions	Status	Relationship to evidence	Timescale	Funding	Path to implementation	Comments
Leadership						
1. Transport Scotland will hold an Annual Active Travel Summit hosted by the Minister for Transport.	5	3	5	5	5	It is unclear that this form of leadership is most critical in boosting cycling levels
2. Transport Scotland will review and update the Trunk Roads Cycling Initiative and consult on an update of Cycling by Design.	3	4	2	3	3	Appropriate guidance is very important but there is a lack of clear timescales on this action
3. Transport Scotland’s Chief Executive will chair an Active Travel Task Force to tackle the practical barriers to the delivery of ambitious walking and cycling projects in Scotland.	5	3	5	5	5	It is unclear that this form of leadership is most critical in boosting cycling levels unless it results in major changes to national frameworks, traffic laws and standards that then reduce barriers to delivery of infrastructure and improvements in safety
4. Provide continued support to each local authority and Regional Transport	1	4	1	1	1	This is extremely important but it is very unclear from CAPS as to how it will be achieved

CAPS 2017-2020 Actions	Status	Relationship to evidence	Timescale	Funding	Path to implementation	Comments
Partnerships to develop/update their active travel plans/strategies.						
Infrastructure, Integration and Road Safety						
5. Continue to deliver and maintain high quality, local infrastructure to encourage people to choose active travel for short journeys [with focus on] improvements in urban areas.	3	5	1	2	2	This is extremely important in raising levels of active travel but it is unclear as to the quality of the infrastructure delivered and the proportion of new infrastructure that is in rural compared to urban areas, given that the biggest potential for increased cycling is likely to be in urban areas. National funding is available but there is no clear path to making more local funding available. It is known from Sustrans data that around two thirds of the NCN is <i>not</i> traffic-free, so in this sense does not meet the standard set in the Chapter 1 for high quality infrastructure.
6. Continue to grow and maintain the National Cycle Network (NCN) to provide a strategic network of longer distance cycling routes for leisure, recreation, tourism and functional trips.	4	4	3	4	3	Progress is better than for point 5 but the balance between rural and urban and segregated and not segregated is again important.
7. Continue to support the 3 levels of the UK national standard Bikeability Scotland cycle training programme.	4	4	4	4	4	It appears that this is being implemented comprehensively and is important for raising levels of cycling where there is also quality infrastructure available
8. Improve integration with public transport.	2	3	1	2	1	Appears piecemeal apart from the provision of bike parking at stations.
9. Encourage and support the implementation of 20 mph streets/zones in communities across Scotland to improve road safety and encourage walking and cycling for everyday journeys.	3	5	1	1	1	Extremely important but the path to comprehensive implementation, and funding of that implementation, is unclear.
Promotion and Behaviour Change						
10. Continue to promote a national training programme on cycling design and best practice to planners, designers and engineers.	4	4	5	4	3	The programme is in place but it is less clear how those engineers who are less interested in active travel are exposed to this training.
11. Develop Active Travel Hubs across Scotland.	3	3	4	4	4	Funding is in place together with an implementation strategy but actual implementation appears somewhat slow and piecemeal.
12. Continue to support educational campaigns such as the 'Give Everyone Cycle Space' campaign aimed at all road users.	3	4	4	4	4	It is unclear as to which other campaigns will be supported and within what kind of strategic framework of key messages and key target groups for those messages.
13. Increase levels of access to bikes through projects that support inclusive cycling initiatives, such as community bike library schemes.	2	4	2	3	2	Given the low levels of access to bikes in Scotland this is important and the intention is correct but again this appears to be a rather piecemeal set of initiatives lacking a strategic framework.
14. Work collaboratively across all policy areas to promote cycling and increase participation for young people of all abilities.	1	3	1	1	1	This action is very vague.

CAPS 2017-2020 Actions	Status	Relationship to evidence	Timescale	Funding	Path to implementation	Comments
15. Invest in and deliver a "Cycle Friendly" package of support for workplaces, campuses, communities and schools.	3	4	2	4	3	The evidence shows that this is important in raising levels of cycling where good infrastructure exists. This activity appears quite institutionalised, widespread and set in a strategic framework.
16. Continue to support the Smarter Choices, Smarter Places Programme.	4	2	4	5	4	Because of the nature of the programme where organisations bid in with ideas on how to spend the money, it is unclear how this programme contributes in a consistent way to raising levels of active travel across Scotland. It is unclear whether it focuses on those factors which are known to be most important if active travel levels are to increase.
Resourcing						
17. Maintain record levels of funding for active travel for the term of this Parliament. Cycling Action Plan for Scotland.	5	5	5	3	3	National level funding increases are impressive although the totals are still a small proportion of the rail and trunk road budgets. The funding issue may be more problematic at the regional and local level, yet the review of international evidence suggests that it is at these levels that most changes to infrastructure need to be brought about.
Monitoring and Reporting						
18. Agree with the CAPS Delivery Forum members a suite of national indicators to inform the national picture of cycling participation, and report annually.	2	3	2	2	2	It is not clear what progress has been made on this action, nor who is responsible for its implementation.
19. Encourage and support all 7 Scottish cities to develop and publish a Bike Life report by the end of 2018.	2	1	5	4	2	This action is relatively marginal in relation to the factors known to be important in raising levels of cycling.
Average scores	3.1	3.58	3.00	3.21	2.79	

Table 3.3 – assessment of recommendations and actions in Active Travel Task Force Delivery Plan (ATTFDP)

ATTF Delivery Plan recommendations/actions	Status	Relationship to evidence	Timescale	Funding	Path to implementation	Comments
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	4	4	3	4	3	Agreed. Unclear however how the long term actions relate to the recommendation. Also unclear as to whether this means that projects that do not include either infrastructure or behaviour change will automatically not be funded.

ATTF Delivery Plan recommendations/actions	Status	Relationship to evidence	Timescale	Funding	Path to implementation	Comments
1.2 Cross-portfolio policy investment should prioritise the delivery of a network of continuous and safe walking and cycling infrastructure	2	3	2	2	2	It should, but the action gives few clear mechanisms for the delivery of this action; most are to be driven by Transport Scotland and few other actors are named. Rather than a Transport Scotland lead, this may better be driven by a Cabinet Secretary with cross-portfolio responsibilities. It is critical that "Local authorities will develop long term costed transport strategies/plans identifying "pipeline projects" but the mechanism to deliver this is very unclear.
1.3 Formally approved, overarching [walking and cycling] design guidance for Scotland should be produced.	3	5	5	5	3	It is concerning that Roads for All is not mentioned. In addition, it is not clear whether the new design guidance would supersede other guidance that is more relied upon by traffic engineers such as the DfT's Traffic Advisory Leaflets, Local Transport Notes and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, or will conflict with it. A process needs to be included in the action to deal with such conflicts otherwise implementation will continue to be slow. Separate guidance for trunk roads and local urban roads must be produced. The guidance should reflect the requirement of the Equality Act to build reasonable adjustments into new schemes and maintenance schemes. The action should include a programme of training for traffic engineers in the use of the new guidance and its relationship to existing guidance that they use (LTNs, TALs, DMRB more than Designing Streets).
1.4 Funding for long term maintenance for active travel projects should be included as part of Community Links/PLUS projects.	3	4	4	5	3	Agreed. Action is unclear as to when this option will be introduced since there is only a commitment to develop options for including maintenance costs as match funding, not to implement one or more of these options. Purpose and nature of long term post 2020 action is unclear.
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	5	4	3	3	Funding at the national level has increased and Sustrans have simplified funding streams. There is no commitment in this action to increase funding further, however. The action undertakes to keep current funding mechanisms under review, but the criteria for this review are unclear and therefore it is unclear as to under which circumstances a review would lead to change in levels of funding and/or funding mechanisms. It is critical that "Local authorities will develop long term costed transport strategies/plans identifying "pipeline projects" but the mechanism to deliver this is very unclear.
2.2 The match funding criteria should be reconsidered and more organisations able to bid.	3	5	3	2	2	As above
2.3 The collective impact of active travel strategies/ plans and related policies	4	3	5	5	5	Well-coordinated action that will support delivery of higher levels of cycling but that will not in itself deliver change.

ATTF Delivery Plan recommendations/actions	Status	Relationship to evidence	Timescale	Funding	Path to implementation	Comments
should be measured, and monitored longitudinally.						
2.4 National, regional and local ownership and planning and delivery of active travel projects... must be more coordinated.	3	5	2	2	2	Ownership and coordination across portfolios at national level might come better from a Cabinet Secretary than from Transport Scotland. It is not clear how ownership will really be delivered at local levels. No commitment to increase resourcing at regional level.
2.5 There must be prominent and consistent national government and stakeholder support to enhance strong leadership at the local level.	2	5	2	3	1	This action is heavily focused on the Active Nation Commissioner with some actions for Transport Scotland. There is little clear link between these activities and development of leadership at the local level.
2.6 Professional training in community engagement and consultation and planning, delivering and maintaining active travel projects should be made available.	2	5	2	3	1	Heavy focus on training for community engagement, with much less focus on planning, delivering and maintaining projects. No mechanism for ensuring that engineers involved in street design <i>must</i> undertake training.
2.7 A policy of reducing urban traffic and transferring carriageway space to active travel should be considered.	2	5	1	1	1	This action is absolutely critical if in urban areas space is to be found to provide high quality cycling facilities without encroaching on already often substandard walking facilities. The primary arena for this action is on local roads in urban areas but there are almost no actions here for local authorities, or to assist them in understanding how to bring about reallocation of roadspace and encouraging them to do this. Examples might include training on how well traffic models predict the impacts of roadspace reallocation; on economic impacts of roadspace reallocation away from moving and parked motor vehicles; and on the politics of roadspace reallocation. Whilst the medium term action undertakes to review the TRO and Redetermination Order processes, there is no action or timescale related to modifying them if they are found to be major barriers – although the ATTF Report already provided considerable evidence that they are indeed major barriers to delivery.
2.8 The National Transport Strategy Review must deliver the sustainable travel hierarchy (STH), prioritising walking and cycling. Active travel should be mainstreamed into Regional and Local Transport Strategies.	3	5	2	2	2	At national level, NTS 2019 Consultation Draft commits to use of STH in project appraisal. “Proof of pudding” will though be in how this is used in STPR. There is no mechanism in the action to mainstream active travel into RTS and LTS and no commitment to update the guidance on each which was produced in 2006 and 2005 respectively, well before active travel took on its current high profile.
2.9 The Strategic Transport Project Review should include Active Travel as a theme for nationwide projects.	2	4	3	2	2	See above. There is no commitment in the ATTFDP action to actually deliver any active travel projects within the STPR, but rather to include them in appraisals and to “look to include them” in future infrastructure reviews.
3. Community engagement						

ATTF Delivery Plan recommendations/actions	Status	Relationship to evidence	Timescale	Funding	Path to implementation	Comments
3.1 The active travel message should be promoted clearly to the general public and politicians.	3	3	3	4	3	Primarily mechanisms for national level promotion. Could be more consideration of how local authorities can be incentivised to promote the same message at a local level.
3.2 Delivery partners must ensure they conduct strong public consultation exercises and community engagement from the start.	3	3	4	3	3	The actions are laudable but the key issue is how to ensure that they are adopted at local level. This is not well defined in the series of actions.
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.	3	4	3	3	3	Many previous comments related to campaigns and promotion apply here. Again local level adoption/implementation is missing.
4.2 All spheres of governance, led by the Scottish Government, must ensure the benefits of active travel are widely promoted.	3	4	3	3	3	As above.
4.3 Fairer Scotland Duty – transport poverty, access to bikes.	-	-	-	-	-	It is not clear what this action means.
Average scores	2.82	4.12	2.88	3.00	2.49	

3.3.1 Conclusions from analysis in tables above

The analysis of the actions in CAPS and the ATTFDP points to some real achievements but also some areas in need of further work. Both documents' actions coincide with what the literature tells us is required to increase levels of cycling. In general, funding is available, certainly at the national level and for actions not requiring match funding. However, the status of the actions in terms of whether they have been or are being implemented is less clear. Related to this there are also relatively fewer actions with a clear timescale or clear path to implementation – in several actions, it is not clear which organisations will implement the action, or the way in which various partners will be coordinated to deliver the action is not clear.

CAPS actions 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18 and 19 score 15 or below out of a possible 25. These actions are related to the following areas:

- Local infrastructure provision, including 20mph zones.
- Development and implementation of active travel strategies.
- Initiatives to increase access to bikes.
- Integration with public transport.

The corresponding lower scoring ATTFDP actions relate to:

- Delivery of high quality infrastructure.
- Match funding.
- Active travel strategies.
- Leadership.

- Training.
- Roadspace reallocation and traffic reduction.
- The National Transport Strategy and Strategic Transport Projects Review 2.

It is clear that there are some similarities in the criteria that are lower scoring, and in those actions that are lower scoring. These will be discussed in the concluding chapter.

3.4 Review of actions in other national documents

In this section, other national level documents are discussed. All the documents listed in Chapter 1 were reviewed but they are discussed here only if their actions were particularly relevant to the brief, so not all documents will be found in this section.

3.4.1 Infrastructure Investment Plan

The transport investments listed in this plan are major road and rail schemes that cut journey times and increase travel speeds. By so doing, they increase travel distances and contribute therefore to less dense development and more car dependent lifestyles (even those people who move out from cities but commute into work by train are more car dependent in the rest of their life). The schemes are predominantly interurban and rural, thus doing little directly for travel within urban areas unless accompanied by capacity reductions within those urban areas at the same time as capacity increases are provided in suburban and rural areas (for example if the Aberdeen Western Peripheral Route were accompanied by the closure of Union St in Aberdeen this could enhance the environment for active travel within the city considerably; but if not, the addition of road capacity overall will work against active travel goals by making car travel faster and more convenient). The financial resources of these investments dwarf the national active travel budget.

The Town Centre Action Plan element of the infrastructure investment plan is something that could indirectly aid active travel by attracting more people to live and visit town centres, but in comparison to the major transport schemes it is rather under-resourced (for example, in 2015, £4m for Town Centre Empty Homes fund). Investment in digital infrastructure as something that could support less travel intensive lifestyles is welcome. Overall, though, the investments in this plan will encourage people to travel by modes other than active travel – by making those modes relatively more attractive – and will support dispersed land use which is not supportive of active travel.

3.4.2 National Transport Strategy Consultation Draft

As noted earlier, the emphasis on the Sustainable Travel Hierarchy in this document is welcome as a means of increasing the priority placed on active travel schemes and activities in national transport policy and projects. Statements in the draft NTS such as “Scotland’s transport system will be designed with sufficient walking and cycling options to help us become a healthier nation and tackle medical problems caused by poor levels of activity” are also helpful. However, the NTS Consultation Draft lacks any proposed infrastructure actions at all and therefore it is difficult to assess its potential impact any further. At a national level the STPR is critical as a

statement of the actual projects that Transport Scotland plans to implement, but it is not yet available. The NTS does make some statements on governance and depending on the changes that ultimately come about in transport governance in Scotland, it may be that new larger organisations will have greater capacity for delivery of cycling and walking schemes and programmes than current local authorities. However, at present this remains an unknown and it cannot be automatically assumed that changed governance arrangements will simplify delivery – whether they do is critically dependent on the allocation of responsibilities, competencies and funding, and lines of accountability, within any new structure.

3.4.3 National Planning Framework

This document is very important for setting the land use development framework for Scotland; as explained in Chapter 2, denser settlements of short distances will have higher levels of active travel than low density settlements with longer distances between activities. Therefore it has the potential to be very supportive of CAPS and other active travel policies. There are positive statements regarding placemaking and role of active travel particularly in town and city centres. In relation to new development and keeping distances short (as evidence shows is key to high active travel mode share), document is, however, somewhat inconsistent in its message – for example here in Para 2.20:

Further increasing the density of development, particularly in the centre of towns and cities and in key locations which are well-served by public transport, could accommodate much of this growth. However, more ambitious and imaginative planning will be needed to meet requirements for a generous and effective supply of land for housing in a sustainable way. Planning can ensure it enhances quality of life through good placemaking, and lead a move towards new, lower carbon models of urban living.

In general this inconsistency is seen in the discussion of development in the different regions. Regeneration of existing brownfield land (Edinburgh Waterfront, Ravenscraig) is a priority, but so are major road projects to facilitate development of greenfield suburban land which will increase travel distances and make active travel less attractive. The document is good about planning new developments to make them active travel friendly, but this is in conflict with the equal emphasis given to greenfield development and major transport infrastructure which risks locating such developments in places where because of the distance from the nearest centre, the only viable travel option will be the car.

Given a choice between developing greenfield and brownfield land, many developers will prefer the former given that it is more likely to be closer to a high speed road and development costs are lower because there is no need to decontaminate land before building. There is nothing in the NPF to say how the public sector might influence or regulate this choice – for example nothing to say that there will be a presumption in favour of brownfield development for housing over greenfield.

On the other hand, there are other supportive statements in the document:

Para 4.15: “We need to plan now for the kind of change to urban environments which is needed to support the vision in the Cycling Action Plan for Scotland

(CAPS), and the National Walking Strategy, for example by rolling out 20mph zones to more residential and shopping streets and further application of the principles set out in Designing Streets.”

Para 5.14: “As a key part of the low carbon agenda, we will encourage local authorities to develop at least one exemplar walking-and cycling-friendly settlement to demonstrate how active travel networks can be significantly improved in line with meeting our vision for increased cycling. These settlements, as well as wider core path networks, will act as key nodes on the national walking and cycling network.”

Overall there is something of a disconnect in the document: it is strong on trying to use the planning system to create active travel friendly environments in new developments, but much less strong on locating those developments in places where active travel will be the natural choice for most journeys.

3.4.4 National Walking Strategy

Much of this strategy is about core paths, placemaking policy and the promotion of walking, not about improving the existing street environment for walking, installing more crossings to make it easier to get across roads (over 70% of urban pedestrian KSI occur away from a formal crossing), and improving road safety. It does not include the phrases “crossing” or “road safety” anywhere, whilst the word “pavement” is mentioned only three times, and as delivery organisations local roads authorities are rarely mentioned in spite of their statutory responsibility for the local road network and as statutory planning authorities. Instead in many cases the “Delivery Lead” for most actions is a non-statutory organisation, often an NGO. It is hard to see therefore how this Strategy will result in a significantly enhanced environment for walking on the local road network which is where the vast majority of walking trips take place.

3.4.5 Preventing Overweight and Obesity In Scotland – a Route Map Towards Healthy Weight (2010)

This document is strong on the need for active travel and for the creation of environments (including retrofitting of existing environments) that support active travel. However, implementation paths, responsibilities and timescales are very unclear and the role of local authorities is understated, with much responsibility - where it is highlighted - given to national government to change local environments through guidance and funding incentives. Thus, whilst the document is supportive in policy terms of active travel, it is not clear how it can deliver the changes that it says are necessary in our travel environments. However, it does not conflict with CAPS or related transport documents.

3.4.6 Scotland’s Accessible Travel Framework 2016

This document is about making the transport system more accessible to people with disabilities. Its main focus is however the public transport system. It makes no mention of the duty under the Equality Act 2010 for roads authorities to make reasonable adjustments to the road (and therefore footway) network to make it accessible, nor on a need for more guidance and training for roads authorities and especially their maintenance engineers on improving the accessibility of the footway and crossing network. It has very little focus on the road network and on roads authorities at all, in spite of the key importance of this network in providing mobility

for disabled people making walking journeys in their entirety, or walking trips as part of longer trips by car or public transport. It therefore does little for active travel but is mentioned here because it is a missed opportunity.

3.4.7 ScotRail Cycle Innovation Plan

The actions set out in this document are concrete and specific, with timescales and funding, and they do promise a very significant increase in the supply of bike parking at stations, together with some additional cycle hire at stations. Cycle security at stations and cycle carriage on trains are also tackled. In this sense the document does add some very specific actions to help achieve CAPS' aspiration for better cycling-public transport integration. The significant gap in the document is dealing with the quality of links to stations; there is an ambition to "work with partners" to secure funding from CLP to improve these, but no specific plans or stations that this work should be targeted at. Both for pedestrians and cyclists the quality of the walking and cycling infrastructure to and around stations must be enhanced if more people are to be attracted to the train/bike combination.

3.4.8 Scottish Planning Policy

This document makes some potentially powerful policy statements that if interpreted in a very direct way could be extremely supportive of CAPS' goals. It seeks to create higher density urbanised built environments of shorter distances with a street pattern and facilities that together should all support and increase the use of active travel. There are however some challenges in achieving this through the planning system.

The first is that there is no quantification or very specific definition of many of the terms in the document so that it is difficult for both local authorities and developers to know whether or not their proposed plans and developments satisfy the conditions set out in Scottish Planning Policy. For example, the following is a potentially powerful paragraph:

Para 287. Planning permission should not be granted for significant travel-generating uses at locations which would increase reliance on the car and where:

- direct links to local facilities via walking and cycling networks are not available or cannot be made available;*
- access to local facilities via public transport networks would involve walking more than 400m;*

or

- the transport assessment does not identify satisfactory ways of meeting sustainable transport requirements.*

However, in order to effectively operationalise this then both local authority and developer need to know how to measure reliance on the car; the specific meaning of "direct link"; and the specific meaning of "satisfactory ways", otherwise these will be interpreted in different ways by different authorities and developers producing in practice environments that are not conducive to active travel. An example of how such an element could be quantified is using a travel time ratio, where a location becomes unacceptable for development where the travel time by cycling and public transport exceeds the travel time by car by a particular ratio, for example 2 to 1.

Without such quantification, policies such as that in Para 287 of Scottish Planning Policy risk losing their effectiveness.

A second challenge is that for the SPP's policies on development that is supportive of active travel to be effective, then both developers and planning authorities need to know that proposed developments that conflict with these policies will indeed be called in and that the risk of not getting planning permission is significant for a proposal that is in conflict; and that the same is true of local plans that propose locations for and densities of development that are not consistent with this policy.

3.4.9 Conclusion to this section

This section has reviewed certain national documents that were found to be of particular relevance to the brief (although all documents listed in Chapter 1 were reviewed). The key findings from these documents were:

- Almost all were supportive in principle at least of active travel. However, some such as the Routemap Towards Healthy Weight (2010), lack clear paths to implementation.
- The Infrastructure Investment Plan emphasises major road and rail schemes that will lead to lower density more dispersed land use and make car travel more attractive, risking undermining the aims of active travel policies.
- The Consultation Draft National Transport Strategy is supportive of active travel but contains no hint of actual projects that will be implemented so it is difficult to assess its potential impact.
- The land use planning documents are very supportive of active travel and could contribute significantly to creating environments that facilitate more active travel, but this depends crucially on how (well) their policies are implemented. The National Planning Framework may permit development in locations that will encourage more car-based lifestyles in dispersed settlements far from urban centres.

3.5 Review of actions in local and regional strategies

For this report, Sustrans Scotland reviewed all current local authority active travel strategies, and all current regional active travel strategies, to obtain their objectives, targets and actions on active travel. The full results are presented in Appendix 1, but a summary is provided here.

Some 18 local authorities have current active travel strategies whilst the three HiTRANS local authorities refer to that organisation's active travel strategy, so in total 21 out of 32 Scottish local authorities have a current strategy. Three RTPs, HiTRANS, NESTRANS and TACTRAN have a strategy also.

All except Stirling and East Renfrewshire's documents include a clear objective, which is generally to increase rates of active travel by creating supportive environments. In the majority of cases this is backed up by targets, in some cases measurable, for increases in modal share for cycling and sometimes walking. It is less typical for these documents to include any objectives, targets or actions relating directly to road safety for vulnerable road users, however – only 9 local and one regional strategy do so. Most however express intentions to roll out further 20 mph zones.

Almost all local active travel strategies set out aspirations for a network of safe, often segregated cycle routes either within and/or between their major settlements. This is in some cases to be based on audits of routes and existing facilities, and around half of the strategies include a network map. However, work on developing the network was not very advanced at the time of writing for the majority of strategies. This can be inferred from the fact that few of the active travel strategies contain costs for their planned networks. It may of course be that since the publication of the strategy further work has been undertaken to develop these networks but at the time of writing only four local and no regional strategies contained capital cost estimates for their planned networks, totalling about £217 million in cash terms over a number of years. These four councils cover about 25% of the Scottish population so a simple extrapolation suggests that delivering the networks aspired to by all Scottish local authorities could cost close to £1 billion, although this is likely to be influenced by the nature of the networks and balance between rural and urban routes. However, without doubt this is an issue worthy of much more investigation – there is a need to have a more accurate understanding of what total level of investment is required, over what period (given the staff resources available to design new schemes), to bring about an order of magnitude change in the availability of high quality safe cycling infrastructure in Scotland.

4. PROGRESS AND GAPS

4.1 Progress in achieving higher levels of cycling

The majority of documents reviewed do not include assessment of progress up to the point at which they were written, and obviously no assessment of progress after they were adopted. The main exceptions to this are the ATTFDP and the NTS Consultation Draft. In addition, a separate CAPS progress report on CAPS 2013-2017 was published in 2016; and in 2019 the first edition of the to be annual Scottish Cycling Monitor was published. This latter document showed that 4.9% of people were cycling to work at least regularly and in raw terms cycling in Scotland as a mode of transport has increased from 0.9% of trips averaged across the early 2000s to 1.3% averaged across the mid-2010s, a very significant proportionate increase but far from the target of 10% of all trips by 2020. Kilometres cycled have increased significantly but the number of cyclists and pedestrians killed and seriously injured remains around the same.

4.2 Progress in delivering CAPS and other related actions

In terms of implementation of the actions in CAPS 2017-20, the most comprehensive view is provided in the ATTFDP (since many of the actions in CAPS are cross-referred to in the second document). Actions for which implementation is generally progressing better are those in the areas of leadership, monitoring and behaviour change, and the implementation of the NCN (with the caveat that it is unclear how much of the additional NCN is provided on traffic free/segregated routes). In general there is more evidence also of delivery of measures for which the primary responsibility for delivery is with Transport Scotland or NGOs, rather than with local authorities.

There is less evidence of significant progress in the development and implementation of local active travel strategies and, in relation to this, local level

infrastructure. This does not necessarily mean that high quality segregated local cycling infrastructure has not been delivered but more that the evidence of its delivery is lacking. In addition, it is difficult to assess the degree of implementation of 20mph zones, both with and without physical traffic calming measures. At the national level there are challenges in delivering effective leadership to local authorities, wider access to bikes and those actions that seek to achieve greater coordination between delivery bodies, insofar as the specific activities required to bring about such better coordination are not well specified. Beyond this it is difficult to assess how well the various actions are coordinated between delivery bodies without carrying out primary research.

4.3 Areas in which CAPS and related documents could be strengthened

As noted earlier, the evidence of the progress or otherwise of the implementation of CAPS actions is based on limited research because this report is based only on a review of documents, without any primary research. Nonetheless there are sufficient indicators to point to some important areas of activity where active consideration should be given to strengthening the action and/or improving delivery. These are discussed below.

- The delivery of high quality infrastructure at a local level – meaning segregated infrastructure on arterial roads/streets and on any street with a speed limit of more than 20mph – needs to be speeded up and strengthened. This is primarily a local authority responsibility and various supporting actions are required to realise it, as follows:
 - Actions to develop leadership and ownership of cycling policies and cycling measures in local authorities. There is some evidence of national level leadership but this needs to be reflected more at the local level.
 - Active travel strategies must be monitored for quality and improved to include much more detailed specification/design of local cycling networks.
 - Local authorities require support and best practice examples of roadspace reallocation and traffic reduction in order to understand how it can be brought about.
 - There is considerable evidence in the ATTF report that the current TRO and Redetermination Order processes present a significant barrier to the delivery of active travel schemes involving the reallocation of roadspace. It is unclear why further review of these processes is required before any decision is made to change them. In countries such as Sweden and France which have higher levels of citizen satisfaction with their transport systems than does the UK, the equivalent of TRO processes give far less weight to objectors than the UK and especially the Scottish TRO process, and more measures can be implemented without any equivalent of the TRO process than they can in Scotland.
 - The cost estimates for cycle networks contained in those few active travel strategies that have them indicate that the current level of funding for active travel infrastructure investment is, in spite of recent increases, inadequate (although this depends in part on how quickly these cycle networks should be delivered). Even with current levels of funding, match funding is increasingly challenging for local authorities and a case needs to be made for why active travel infrastructure needs to be match funded at all when rail and trunk road infrastructure does not.
 - Increased investment in active travel infrastructure requires additional, trained, staff than local authorities currently have access to.

- National guidance such as LTNs, DMRB, and TALs do not appear consistent with the new infrastructure designs required to deliver high quality attractive cycling and walking infrastructure. As long as inconsistencies remain this will slow delivery as engineers will be reluctant to forsake older guidance for new guidance unless and until the old guidance has been officially superseded. New planning guidance such as Designing Streets will not resolve this problem.
- More steps to increase access to bikes require to be taken.
- The National Transport Strategy is supportive in policy terms of active travel but contains no references to actual projects; and the Strategic Transport Projects Review 2 is not yet released. Both documents are an opportunity to provide national leadership.
- The relative stability in the numbers of cyclist and pedestrian KSIs indicates a need for further road safety initiatives targeted at improving safety for these users.
- The National Planning Framework is as not as unequivocal as it could be about the need to create new development at higher density and as close as possible to existing urban centres.
- Integration of cycling with public transport, with the exception of bike parking at stations, is not proceeding as quickly as it might. However, this is not considered to be a very high priority for action since the international evidence does not highlight it as a deciding factor in whether people choose to combine cycling, or walking, with a public transport trips. The literature shows that the key deciding factor in this choice is the quality of the infrastructure available for the trip to the public transport station or stop, and of course the overall journey time and cost in comparison to the same trip made entirely by car.
- Transport appraisal remains quite dominated by cost-benefit analysis which itself is dominated by journey time savings. Clearly, moves to walking and cycling will rarely show journey time savings, at least in the short term. Thus some review of how walking and cycling schemes are appraised in relation to road and public transport schemes is required.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Key findings

In brief, the report has found that there has been progress on implementing CAPS but that progress remains somewhat patchy and there are key areas that remain somewhat problematic, and in need of strengthening. Areas such as behaviour change and monitoring, and the implementation of the NCN, have been progressing reasonably well. Related to this is that those actions for which responsibility lies primarily with Transport Scotland and/or NGOs have also been progressing reasonably well.

The main problematic area is the relatively slow progress in implementing high quality safe cycling infrastructure at the local level, and in improving road safety for vulnerable users. These are local authority responsibilities primarily, and the slower progress is due to lower levels of funding and staffing than TS and national level NGOs together with the political challenges of implementing new cycling infrastructure where this involves allocating road space away from parked or moving private motor vehicles. The relatively slow progress may also be because CAPS is not completely clear that high quality safe segregated cycling infrastructure is the key measure that must be implemented if Scotland's cycling mode share is to increase.

The report has also found that most other policy documents reviewed are aligned with the objectives of CAPS but do not offer it significant additional support, with the exception of national land use planning policy, which is favourable to CAPS at least in relation to the design of new settlements. The National Infrastructure Investment Strategy, in contrast, could be argued to work against achieving a higher mode share for active travel as its transport investments are focused on "strategic" networks which will have the effective of lengthening travel distances and increasing travel speeds, which in the medium to long term will lead to more dispersed land use, which is not conducive to active travel.

5.2 Recommendations

The recommendations of this report take the areas in which CAPS and related actions could be strengthened, as detailed in the previous chapter, and put forward in brief some possible ways to achieve these. These are listed in Table 5.1, below.

Table 5.1 Areas of CAPS to strengthen and possible means to deliver this

Areas of CAPS to strengthen	Ways to do this
Improved active travel strategies	<p>Condition receipt of funding on local authority having adopted a high-quality active travel strategy that includes a well-specified and outline costed plan of new active travel infrastructure, prioritised, and with a timescale for delivery. These active travel strategies should of course take cognisance of infrastructure plans already contained in existing local and regional active travel strategies.</p> <p>Provide direct support to local authorities to produce high quality active travel strategies with new support staff, most likely in government itself rather than in Sustrans or other third party organisation. Given that these posts would be linked to the delivery of infrastructure, it is likely that their funding could be capitalised.</p>

Areas of CAPS to strengthen	Ways to do this
Support to local authorities on road space reallocation and traffic reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance on modelling of road capacity reduction and roadspace reallocation. • Provide case studies of road capacity reduction and roadspace reallocation, including evidence regarding local economic impact and of actual traffic impacts compared to previously modelled impacts. • Changes to TRO process (see below). • Transport Scotland to pilot at least two schemes of roadspace reallocation to create high quality segregated cycle facilities and pedestrian facilities at Roads for All standard on trunk roads in small unbypassed towns, and to organise for local authority traffic engineers (not just active travel staff) site visits and training based on the experience. These projects must be included in STPR2. • For any authority that does implement a Workplace Parking Levy, condition its Ministerial approval on a certain proportion of the net proceeds being spent on active travel infrastructure.
TRO and Redetermination Order processes	<p>Accept evidence of ATTF consultation that current processes are barrier to timely scheme delivery. Review experience in terms of public perceptions, awareness and feedback on implementation of works on Edinburgh's Picardy Place which were carried out on the street prior to the approval/adoption of TROs and Redetermination Orders.</p> <p>Consult on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving equal legal weight in process to supporters as well as objectors of proposed TRO. • Reducing number/scale of measures requiring any TRO process (for example, a stipulated minimum length of double yellow line that can be implemented without a TRO, in the same way that bus stop clearways currently do not require a TRO). • Removing need for hearings for all measures on local roads. • Removing need for referral to Scottish Ministers of unresolved TROs and objections to Redetermination Orders. • Adopting English process for Experimental TROs (in England, Experimental TROs can be made permanent directly. In Scotland, the identical permanent order must be advertised and adopted before the Experimental Order expires).
Funding for local infrastructure	<p>Increase national capital funding to a level and duration to provide sufficient funding for high quality local cycle networks to be introduced as specified in the improved Active Travel Strategies.</p> <p>Reduce/eliminate need for match funding for segregated cycleways on arterial streets which involve significant reallocation of roadspace from private motor vehicles, parked or moving. Consult on modification of road maintenance block grant to be calculated including off-road cycling and core path infrastructure; and consult on whether to remove all or part of the competitive award element of Community Links and Community Links Plus.</p>
Staff capacity	<p>Offer national funding to local authorities for employment of additional <i>traffic engineering</i> staff to work on design and implementation of active travel infrastructure. Since such posts would be infrastructure related, there is a strong possibility that they could be capitalised.</p>
National guidance such as LTNs, DMRB, and TALs do not appear consistent with the new infrastructure designs but will continue to be used in conflict with new guidance	<p>Ensure that process for new design guidance clarifies where and when it supersedes other guidance that is currently more relied upon by traffic engineers such as the DfT's TALs, LTNs and DMRB.</p> <p>Ensure that new guidance resolves conflicts between new road design for cycling and walking and older guidance such as DfT TALs. An example for pedestrians is the placing of signalled crossing on desire lines at or very close to junctions.</p> <p>Separate guidance for trunk roads and local urban roads must be produced.</p> <p>The guidance should reflect the requirement of the Equality Act to build reasonable adjustments into new schemes and maintenance schemes.</p> <p>Ensure that any new guidance is consistent with TS' own Roads for All document and any update of DfT's Inclusive Mobility.</p> <p>Guidance should be supplemented with a training course for traffic engineers in the use of the new guidance and its relationship to existing guidance that they use (LTNs, TALs, DMRB more than Designing Streets). Receipt of cycling and walking funds should be conditioned on all traffic engineering staff in a local authority completing the training course.</p>
Increase access to bikes.	<p>Consider directly funding the purchase of new or second-hand bikes for all or a means tested proportion of the Scottish population. Using bulk purchase discounts, a basic new adult bike could be obtained for around £100. These could either be given to people or rented on a long-term basis to include maintenance (similar to a scheme operated in By way of</p>

Areas of CAPS to strengthen	Ways to do this
	comparison, the Air Discount Scheme for Scottish Island and Caithness residents costs around £113 per member per year (and is not means tested).
National leadership	See above, pilot small town trunk road schemes by Transport Scotland. Higher national funding levels for active travel. Organise smaller more focused meetings with senior local authority staff and transport convenors to explain the benefits of investment in active travel, and to explain the funding linked to it. Bring local politicians who are already committed to active travel to lead these meetings with their political counterparts in other authorities.
Road safety to reduce ped and cyclist KSIs	Study road safety infrastructure and legislation adopted by countries with lower KSI rates per trip or km travelled for cyclists and pedestrians. Implement similar infrastructure on national roads, and legislation. Introduce dedicated fund for local authorities to bid to expand 20mph zones that include speed reducing measures and to implement safety infrastructure found to be effective in other countries with lower KSI rates per trip or km travelled.
National Planning Framework and high density development.	Assess likely economic impact of including in NPF4 presumption against greenfield development, at least in Scotland's former City Regions. Assess likely economic impact of stipulating minimum in NPF4 average densities for new residential development. Seek to influence NPF4 on these issues. Increase level of call in on planning applications that do not support walking and cycling in their proposed location and/or detailed design of internal street network and permeability.

5.3 Future version of CAPS

On the basis of this review of key documents, and the actions in CAPS and the ATTFDP, it is recommended that the next version of CAPS is much more of a strategically based plan that places more emphasis on the delivery of key actions to achieve the actions that the international evidence shows is required to increase levels of cycling. This means that it should have:

- A vision
- A set of clear objectives
- A number of outputs and outcomes that will measure the achievement of these objectives.
- A set of actions, prioritised, and each with a clear timescale, cost estimate, funding source and a lead delivery organisation, that need to be delivered in order to achieve the plan's objectives.
- A monitoring and review process to ensure that the outputs and outcomes are being achieved (or not) and to understand why.

Fortunately the first three and the last one of the above bullet points already exist in the form of the adopted Active Travel Vision and the Active Travel Framework. Thus the additional work in producing the new CAPS must be focused on the development and specification of actions. Table 5.1 above sets out the highest priority actions, although does not specify costs, timescale or lead delivery organisation. It is recommended that the most important action is the first, on local Active Travel Strategies, which should each contain a local delivery plan for cycling and walking infrastructure. On the basis of this, many of the other actions can then be programmed. Work on leadership; on changing the TRO and RO processes; on new design guidance; and on roadspace reallocation can be run concurrently once work on local Active Travel Strategies commences.

REFERENCES

Lanzendorf, M., & Busch-Geertsema, A. (2014). The cycling boom in large German cities—empirical evidence for successful cycling campaigns. *Transport policy*, 36, 26-33.

Melia, S., Parkhurst, G. and Barton, H. (2012). The paradox of intensification. *Journal of Transport Policy*, 18(1)

Transport for London (2018) *Travel in London – report of the London Area Travel Survey*. TfL, London.

APPENDIX ONE – REVIEW OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL ACTIVE TRAVEL STRATEGIES

Grateful thanks to Matt Davis at Sustrans Scotland for preparing this.

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
Aberdeen City Council	Aberdeen Active Travel Action Plan 2017-2021	To foster a cycling culture in Aberdeen by improving conditions for cycling in Aberdeen so that cycling becomes an everyday, safe mode of transport for all	An increase in the proportion of adults cycling as their main mode of travel to work and children as their main mode of cycling to school	A decline in the number of accidents and casualties involving people walking and cycling	Make improvements to the cycle network, in line with the priorities for the next 5 years as set out in the proposals map
Aberdeenshire Council	Walking & Cycling Action Plan 2009	Objective 1: more walking and cycling to and from school Objective 3: To promote walking and cycling as alternative transport modes Objective 4: To encourage and facilitate walking and cycling as leisure and tourist activities	% of pupils travelling to school in Aberdeenshire by active travel modes. Number of pedestrians /cyclists killed, seriously injured and/or slightly injured. Mode share of walking and cycling for trips to work by Aberdeenshire residents. Frequency of walking and cycling in the previous seven days just for pleasure or to keep fit.	Objective 2: To improve the safety of walking and cycling in Aberdeenshire – but no quantified target	Through the Core Paths Plan, seek to develop new walking and cycling routes, both on and off-road (1) within Aberdeenshire towns; (2) connecting Aberdeenshire towns; and (3) linking into Aberdeen City. Establish Peterhead as a Cycle Demonstration Town (CDT) Ensure pedestrian and cyclist needs are taken into account in all new development and transport schemes from the outset by undertaking pedestrian and cycle audits.

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
Angus Council	Angus Active Travel Strategy	Encourage and enable more people to walk and cycle more often	No quantified targets in the plan	No quantified targets in the plan	<p>Create good off-road networks, and improve attractiveness of streets as places to walk and cycle</p> <p>Prioritise auditing and enhancing active travel networks in Angus' main settlements (7 Burghs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seek to develop inter-burgh cycle routes (based on priority routes identified on the network map) - Ensure active travel networks are signed
City of Edinburgh Council	Active Travel Action Plan 2016 refresh	increase number of people walking and cycling both as means of transport and for pleasure	<p>10% of all journeys by bicycle by 2020</p> <p>15% of journeys to work by bicycle by 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase cycling to primary school 	Reduction in casualty rate for walking and cycling (per km travelled) by 50% from 2010 to 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • citywide signed 'QuietRoutes' cycle network - suitable for unaccompanied 12 year old - traffic-free paths, quiet roads or segregated cycle paths • Complete updating of Edinburgh Street Design Guidance, including training, during 2016
Dumfries & Galloway Council	Active Travel Strategy	to see active travel being the normal choice for short, everyday journeys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6% of people cycle to work • 12% of people regularly cycle (daily) as a means of transport by 2017 	improve the safety of walking and cycling in Dumfries and Galloway, and contribute to national road safety targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • audit 16 main towns (population > 1500) and improve active travel links within them • develop active travel infrastructure / links between communities • Audit existing walking and cycling links to public transport interchanges within the 16 towns and key rural points

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
Dundee Council	Dundee Cycling Strategy	enable and encourage more people to cycle more often	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase the number of journeys made by bike annually in Dundee by 200% by 2026 • To increase the number of Dundee residents cycling monthly or more often by 100% by 2026 • To increase the number of children who cycle to school by 100% by 2021 	For the number of cyclist casualties in road crashes in Dundee, as reported by Police Scotland data, to be no higher in any year than the 2010-14 average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a signed network of strategic high-quality continuous cycle paths and lanes - segregated from general motor traffic where possible - include links across or around key barriers to cycling
East Dunbartonshire Council	Active Travel Strategy 2015-2020	Facilitate an increase in everyday and leisure journeys made by walking and cycling in East Dunbartonshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual increase in the percentage of people cycling to as a main mode of travel and children cycling to primary school • Increase travel to work/study percentage rates for cycling (in next Census) 	No quantified targets in the plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver new active travel routes identified in audits of the main settlements of Milngavie, Bearsden, Kirkintilloch and Bishopbriggs • Deliver proposed inter-settlement active travel routes • Create an East Dunbartonshire circular active travel route, connecting the majority of settlements
East Lothian Council	Active Travel Improvement Plan 2018-24	To make active travel the first choice for all users who must undertake a journey	LTS: Increase households owning a bicycle to 55% by 2024. Reduce levels of car use and increase use of sustainable modes including walking, cycling and public transport by 2024.	In comparison to the 2012-2016 average, achieve a: 40% reduction in people killed by 2024; and 55% reduction in people seriously injured by 2024.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segregated Active Travel Corridor (east/west connecting settlements between Musselburgh & Dunbar) • Work with Area Partnerships to develop local active travel action plans in main towns • complete NCN route 76 around the coast • other key routes as per the proposals map

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
East Renfrewshire Council	Active Travel Action Plan	Increase active travel to schools Improve connections to public transport Increase Active Travel to Work and key destinations and for recreation	No quantified targets in the plan	No quantified targets in the plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deliver the 5 identified strategic cycle corridors (primarily segregated or off-road) • create signed local cycle networks in the key urban areas of Barrhead, Clarkston, Giffnock, Newton Mearns and Thornliebank (on quiet roads/off road paths) • develop a National Cycle Network route through East Renfrewshire
Fife Council	Local Transport Strategy Walking and Cycling Chapter	To encourage walking and cycling for short trips and as part of an integrated journey to promote a healthier lifestyle.	WCT1 - Halt the decline in walking WCT 2 - Maintain walk trips to work at 15%. WCT3 - Increase cycling to key Public Transport Interchanges by 10% by 2011 WCT4 - Increase cycle usage on key monitored routes	No specific targets in plan	Detailed implementation plan for all modes

<p>Glasgow City Council</p>	<p>Strategic Plan for Cycling, refreshed 2016</p>	<p>Create a vibrant Cycling City where cycling is accessible, safe and attractive to all</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase cycling to/from the City Centre (roughly double number of daily journeys by 2025) • Increase number of children cycling to primary school from 3.5% to 7% by 2025 	<p>No specific safety related target</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the overall length of the Glasgow cycle network from 310km (2015) to 400km (2025) and to 590km thereafter • Develop a signed integrated network of cycle routes including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - City Ways high quality, direct radial cycle corridors to/from city centre - Quietways ensure quieter, local roads are suitable for cyclists and well linked together - Avenues integrated network of pedestrian and cycle priority routes in the City Centre
-----------------------------	---	--	---	--	--

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
Inverclyde Council	Inverclyde Active Travel Strategy	Make active travel a realistic, convenient and attractive choice for everyone to make everyday journeys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in % of adults (aged 16-74) travelling to work/study by bicycle • Year on year increase in cycling trips across monitoring cordon sites in Inverclyde 	A reduction in the number of cyclists killed or seriously injured (per million km cycled)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complete a signed network of strategic, high-quality, continuous cycle routes, which are segregated from general motor traffic where possible • improve trunk roads (A8/A78 corridor) and crossing points for active travel
Midlothian Council	Midlothian Active Travel Strategy 2018-2021	to aid the increase of walking and cycling journeys, especially for commuting and short trips to local facilities	By 2021: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5% people cycle to work regularly • 33% of Midlothian rail station users walk or cycle to the station • 15% of pupils cycle to primary school and 2% of pupils cycle to secondary school 	reduce walking and cycling KSIs to 5 by 2021 (2018 - 2021 average)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase length of active travel network by 10 miles • create/improve the active travel routes identified in the strategy proposals maps in main settlements (Penicuik, Loanhead, Roslin & Rosewell, Bonnyrigg, Danderhall & Shawfair, Dalkeith, Newtongrange and Gorebridge) • construct Roslin to Peebles cycleway (up to Scottish Borders Boundary)
Moray Council	The Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016-21	Increase the number of active travel journeys made within Moray	Increase the modal share of both walking and cycling journeys to work and school	No specific targets in plan	Continue to develop active travel infrastructure to provide a cohesive and continuous network across Moray including urban and rural areas.
Orkney Islands Council	Orkney's Green Travel Plan	To increase the modal share in active and sustainable travel i.e. walking, cycling and use of public transport for everyday journeys	No specific targets in plan	No specific targets in plan	Improve the current walking and cycling infrastructure by joining up 'missing links' to create a safe, effective and efficient active travel network

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
Perth & Kinross Council	Active Travel Strategy	encourage more people in Perth and Kinross to walk and cycle more often	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of journeys made by bike • Increase the proportion of residents cycling monthly or more often in Perth and Kinross by 50% by 2028 	No specific targets in plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deliver links between selected settlements as shown in the network map • develop a Perth City cycling masterplan to identify key routes into the city centre
Renfrewshire Council	Renfrewshire Cycling Strategy, 2016-2025	to get more people in Renfrewshire cycling more often	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7% of journeys to work by bike by 2025 • 10% of children travelling to school by bike by 2025 	A reduction in the number of cyclists killed or seriously injured (per million km cycled)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upgrade deficient cycle routes to Cycling by Design standards or better • large expansion in the cycle network through the creation of new cycle routes (identified in proposals maps in the strategy)
South Lanarkshire Council	Cycling Strategy 2015-20	We will enable cycling to become a viable transport option for more of our residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase the proportion of commuters cycling to work, year on year • To increase levels of cycling to school, year on year • To increase the frequency of cycling for recreational purposes, year on year 	To reduce the number of cyclists killed, seriously injured and slightly injured, year on year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle networks proposed for main settlements of East Kilbride (£3million), Hamilton (£5 million) and Rutherglen/Cambuslang (£3 million) • other proposed cycle routes as listed in appendix 1 of the strategy

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
Stirling	Walking and Cycling to a Healthier Stirling: Active Travel Action Plan	No specific objective found in Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in percentage of pupils cycling to school • Increase % journeys by bicycle 	Reduction in percentage of children killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete a suitable network of cycle routes to serve the key destinations through the Stirling area • Complete and improve the National Cycle Network (NCN) routes through Stirling, as well as core leisure and tourist routes • long list of costed route improvements in the 'Cycle Network Schedule (Appendix E) - phased delivery planned through to 2037
West Lothian Council	Active Travel Plan for West Lothian 2016-2021: Making Active Connections	to increase the number of people travelling actively in West Lothian.	No specific quantified target	No specific quantified target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • create a comprehensive active travel network including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deliver a network of strategic active travel connections between settlements (quiet roads, off-road paths & cycle lanes) - Develop Active Travel Network Plans for main towns (Livingston, Linlithgow, Broxburn/ Uphall, Bathgate/ Blackburn, Whitburn and Armadale)

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
Hitrans	Regional Active Travel Strategy 2016-21	to deliver increased levels of cycling and walking across the HITRANS area	Increase mode share of cycling to work and school, in each HITRANS local authority area, between 2016 and 2021	No specific quantified target	Published Active Travel Audits/Masterplans for Inverness and 16 main towns set out prioritised infrastructure and behaviour change proposals for each settlement
Nestrans	Active Travel Action Plan 2014-2035 AcTrAP	To increase active travel mode share and work towards achieving the National vision for cycling by 2020.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To increase active travel mode share on journeys to work to 25% by 2021 • To increase the proportion of children travelling actively to school in the north east to 60% by 2021 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reduce the number of cyclist and pedestrian casualties in the north east and ensure that the proportion of all casualties does not exceed 20% • To reduce the number of cyclist and pedestrian casualties in the north east and ensure that the rate per thousand population does exceed 0.4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop a strategic network of active travel routes linking Aberdeen City and the main towns in Aberdeenshire (9 strategic routes identified in the plan forming a regional network) • In partnership with the Local Authorities, develop local active travel networks focusing on: - Aberdeenshire Integrated Travel Towns (Peterhead, Fraserburgh, Ellon, Inverurie, Huntly & Portlethen); - Aberdeen City Centre; - Transport interchange hubs - School catchment areas. • Work with Sustrans to ensure the National Cycle Network is developed and improved throughout the region

Local Authority/RTP	Strategy Document	Key objectives	Targets	Road safety targets related to cycling and walking	Planned key improvements to infrastructure to achieve objectives
Tactran	from active travel section of RTS				<p>AT2: Improved Walking and Cycling Links within the Region Develop walking and cycling links to and within town and city centres and to employment, health facilities, services, leisure and tourism activities. AT3: Regional Walking and Cycling Routes</p> <p>Establish routes of regional priorities and close gaps in the regional network for walking and cycling in line with expansion of the NCN, national long distance paths, tourism strategies and local active travel strategies.</p> <p>AT4: Improved Walking and Cycling Links to Education Facilities. Promote walking and cycling links to schools as well as further and higher education facilities. Promote continuation and expansion of school travel plans, Cycling Friendly Schools and Campuses.</p>

Argyll & Bute Council, Highland and Comhairle nan Eilean Siar using HiTRANS Strategy