

Name \* : Geoff Rone

Organisation (if applicable) : Cycling Embassy of Great Britain (<http://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk>)

What are your views on the proposals for Local Authorities to have a duty to:

- identify and map the routes within their areas that are safe and appropriate for walking and cycling

*The Cycling Embassy of Great Britain welcomes these proposals; we believe that this is an essential first step in designing and eventually implementing a fully integrated active travel solution. We would however recommend that this is nationally driven with dedicated funding in order to maintain consistency and high quality.*

- identify and map the enhancements that would be required to create a fully integrated network for walking and cycling and develop a prioritised list of schemes to deliver the network

*This naturally follows on from the above – mapping the already safe routes will highlight the dangerous and inappropriate options which will require work to improve and deliver.*

- deliver an enhanced network subject to budget availability and following due process

*The phrase “subject to budget availability” may be seen as a “get out of jail free” card. Sadly budgetary constraints are frequently used as the excuse to do nothing. We would prefer to see a proportion of the budget per head of population be set aside nationally to implement the delivery of an effective network.*

- consider the potential for enhancing walking and cycling provision in the development of new road schemes?

*This is essential. It is much cheaper to build the facilities at the same time as the new road than to squeeze them in afterwards. Similarly, when roads are “improved” we would expect infrastructure to increase active travel options be included as part of the improvement. This has been identified as offering both the best opportunity and value to establish proper cycling and walking infrastructure.*

2. How do you think the duty should be enforced? :

*There should be a legal duty on Local Authorities to deliver the plan within a specified time limit and to a specified standard audited at a national level to maintain consistency and best practice.*

3. Do you think the type of routes and facilities that Local Authorities be required to map should be specified in guidance or regulation? \*

*Regulation. Unfortunately, guidance can be ignore and is too open to interpretation.*

If you wish please add additional comments to support your response: :

4. What are your views about revising rights of way definitions, for example allowing cyclists to use footpaths, or equestrians to use cycle paths? :

*The Cycling Embassy of Great Britain is an organisation primarily concerned with utility cycling and would rather that safe and properly designed cycling infrastructure be built to enable people to go about their normal business by bicycle. It is important therefore to differentiate between the access requirements of a Mountain Biker crossing a piece of moorland and those of a commuter, schoolchild or shopper wishing to just "ride a bike".*

*In a built up environment, mixed facilities are often seen as a cheap option but they are disliked by all parties. There are inherent problems when pedestrians and cyclists are mixed particularly in busy or confined places. Pedestrians are worried that they will be hurt by speeding cyclists and responsible cyclists are also concerned that pedestrians and dogs will wander into their path.*

*In addition shared facilities send out a confused message particularly with regard to pavement cycling. Allowing cycling on some pavements blurs the boundary between acceptable pavement cycling and the illegal use of the pavement.*

*Horses are capable of damaging many of the unsealed surfaces that are used to construct cycle paths and again, the opportunities for conflict are increased. We would not wish to see horses on primary cycle routes.*

5. What are your views of the proposal for new design guidance? :

*We need a high quality network working to Dutch principles of separation their methodology has had proven success .The Dutch are the world experts in providing safe, efficient, well designed infrastructure for cycling and walking we would like to see use of their expertise in delivering this guidance. Existing design guidelines (hierarchy of provision etc.) aren't up to scratch.*

*We consider that it is particularly important to avoid the 'dual network' approach which is at the core of our current design guidelines. The results are usually slow circuitous and shared facilities for families and novices, while 'proper' cyclists on the road are expected to be grateful for signage, advance stop lanes and the odd slick of painted track that is usually used as a parking space. We must use this opportunity to build one network and build it properly for everyone.*

6. What would the costs and the benefits be to you or your organisation (or the people your organisation represents)? :

*We represent those people who want to cycle but are deterred by the current road infrastructure and traffic volumes and speeds. Cycling should be a safe and normal option*

7. We have asked a series of specific questions. Is there anything else that you would like us to consider as part of the development of the Active Travel Bill, or wider active travel activity? :

*We would like to see a review or implementation of better procurement strategies to give better cost effectiveness & accountability on how any money is spent as with procurement frameworks for other public infrastructure such as schools and hospitals. We also believe it is essential that any new legislation should help to ensure that any design brief for 'active travel' is robust from the start and not open to 'artistic interpretation'.*

Responses to consultations may be made public – on the internet or in a report. If you would prefer your response to be kept confidential, please tick here: