

Developing the third cycling and walking investment strategy (CWIS3)

Your information

Q1. What is your name?

MR ALAN MORRIS

Q2. What is your email address?

alan@morrieses.fastmail.fm

Q3. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

Yes

Organisation details

Q4. What is your organisation's name?

Bristol Walking Alliance

Q5. What best describes your organisation?

Third sector organisation

Proposal

Q8. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed national vision for active travel?

Disagree

Disagree with national ambition

Q9. Why do you disagree with the proposed national vision for active travel and what potential alternatives do you suggest?

The vision needs to:

- set out long-term transformational ambition
- set out how streets and places will be transformed in order that safe, easy and accessible options will be available, and do so separately for walking, wheeling and cycling

Ensuring people are safe to travel objective

Q10. Do you agree or disagree with the objective: 'Ensure people are safe to travel actively'?

Disagree

Disagree with ensure people are safe to travel actively

Q11. Why do you disagree with the objective: 'Ensure people are safe to travel actively' and what potential alternatives do you suggest?

- this objective is not SMART. It is vague, and not measurable.
- the objective should be to eliminate walking, wheeling and cycling deaths and serious injuries entirely by 2050. Only an ambitious target will drive action to identify and implement the measures needed so that people perceive they are safe, eg 20mph speed limits in all towns and cities, safe crossings at least every 400m along main roads in all towns and cities

Ensuring people feel it is an easy choice objective

Q12. Do you agree or disagree with the objective: 'Ensure people feel it is an easy choice'?

Disagree

Disagree with ensuring people feel it is an easy choice objective

Q13. Why do you disagree with the objective: 'Ensure people are safe to travel actively' and what potential alternatives do you suggest?

[There is a typo in the question: it should refer to The objective: 'Ensure people feel it [active travel] is an easy choice']

- is not SMART. It is vague, and not measurable.
- should encompass making active travel 'attractive' as well as 'easy'
- should give some indication of the measures required and the level of ambition, and do so separately for walking, wheeling and cycling

Performance monitoring

Q14. Do you agree or disagree with the following proposed key performance indicators?

	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Don't know
Increase the percentage of people that achieve 150 mins a week activity through active travel by 2030			X	
Increase the percentage of walking and cycling stages per person by 2030			X	
Increase the percentage of walking and cycling trips per person to and from school			X	
Decrease the rate of cyclists and pedestrians killed on England's roads, measured as the number of fatalities per billion miles walked and cycled			X	
Decrease the rate of cyclists and pedestrians seriously injured on England's roads, measured as the number of serious injuries per billion miles walked and cycled			X	
Decrease the percentage of people walking and cycling concerned about safety				

If disagreeing explain why.

- the metrics need to be alongside targets. Targets exist across multiple other transport modes; active travel should be treated in the same way.
- walking/wheeling metrics need to be kept separate from cycling. They are different.
- there should also be metrics to cover progress in some of the measures required to achieve the objectives, eg numbers of School Streets, 20mph zone coverage.

ATE monitoring

Q15. Do you agree or disagree with the following indicators relating to the work of Active Travel England?

	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Don't know
Improved local authority active travel capability ratings	X			
Percentage of average increase in scheme quality	X			
Percentage of planning applications within our thresholds responded to within the statutory timescale (%)	X			
Increased number of people actively engaged via activation programmes (including Bikeability)	X			
Increased percentage of ATE capital projects completed on schedule (%)	X			
Increasing the number of trained active travel professionals including local authority officers	X			

If disagreeing explain why.

ATE can also provide support on strategies and plans, not just capital projects and planning applications.

Final comments

Q16. Any other comments?

Bristol Walking Alliance is a consortium of organisations and individuals campaigning to improve Bristol's walking environment. We want to create an environment for pedestrians that is welcoming, safe, convenient and inclusive.

Delegating the ambition: the rationale for CWIS 3 is devolution to LTAs "where local leaders and communities define the plans and targets that make up CWIS3" on the basis that "Achieving our objectives for CWIS3 at national level is only possible through the cumulative impact of locally delivered active travel schemes". Devolution is welcome but it should be within the context of a visionary national framework. Local authorities need the impetus that comes from a national vision with ambition. The proposed Strategy's vision and objectives are not a recipe for transformational change. National government should not delegate this to LTAs.

Too vague: CWIS3 is too vague. If it is going to achieve anything, it needs to include measurable targets, and reference the sort of measures that are required.

Short-term targets needed: five-year output targets are needed. Other parts of the transport system operate on predictable five-year cycles with transparent reporting. Active travel deserves the same specificity and maturity.

Making active travel attractive: The proposed objectives are simply to make active travel safe and easy: that doesn't include making it attractive. Active travel needs to be an attractive alternative to other transport modes, especially the car.

Keeping walking/wheeling separate from cycling: the needs for walking/wheeling are different from cycling. The infrastructure needed for walking can be measures like crossings, wide pavements and continuous footways across side junctions. (Such infrastructure measures can sometimes be simple and small and therefore cost much less than other transport expenditure.)