

# SPOKES FUNDING SURVEY 09/10

## COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL OFFICERS

**Responses to Q15: "Give any comments on funding methods for cycle project capital expenditure. Consider small/medium/large cycle projects and integrated cycle/public transport projects. What are the problems and what improvements do you suggest?"**

[responses are anonymised][not all councils answered this question – all answers are printed below]

Comment	Need longterm funding, not yearly	Need dedicated funding	Sustrans funding	CWSS funding	Targets/objectives need funds	Other
The same comment as last year applies, 'The Single Outcome Agreement sets out aims with regard to encouraging a modal shift to sustainable methods of transport, whilst of course highlighting the health benefits of active travel. In order to facilitate such, any success in securing a greater allocation of resources through the Scottish Government would be of great benefit. Essentially whilst such ambitions can be stated on paper, they can only be realised by obtaining sufficient funding to implement dedicated facilities.' Thus, additional funds are always welcome, provided there is sufficient time to design, consult on proposals, and thereafter implement facilities.	X	X			X	
Our Council has identified two extremely valuable cycling schemes in X and at Y. The X Cycle Route between the small town of A and the village of B, forms a link between two cycle routes and carries forward the expansion of the strategic cycle network from the north of the council area into the south. It is essential that continued CWSS funding is made available to allow the Council to implement these high priority projects. Funding from Sustrans is also extremely valuable and it would be beneficial if Sustrans could distribute larger sums of money and allocate funding earlier in the year to allow works to be planned and implemented during the summer months when weather conditions are more favourable.	X	X	X	X		
The Scottish Government's Cycle Action Plan sets ambitious targets for future cycle use but says very little about funding. Without substantial, ring-fenced funds it is unlikely that these targets will be met. There needs to be sustained, long-term investment in the provision of cycle facilities in order to encourage modal shift.	X	X			X	
It will be helpful this year to comply with the government's instruction to spend a minimum proportion of CWSS funds on cycling. Suspect many authorities are still struggling with a lack of staff resource and political will for cycle schemes.				X		X
Access to large/medium-scale funding now very limited due to reduction in resources available to Sustrans and our RTP. Reinstating ring-fenced funds would provide the opportunity for the Council to construct key missing links. Schemes involving significant works and/or legal procedures (such as TROs) require 1-2 years to design, consult, tender and build. A lack of commitment to significant funding in 2-3 years time means that it is difficult to know whether it is worth investing now in designing larger schemes.	X	X	X			
1. The restrictions of the financial years are always problematic. For larger schemes phased funding would be beneficial; 2. Land purchase for schemes can take many years, which means projects can take some time; 3. Match funding will become more problematic over the coming years due to tighter budgets;	X	X				
There is less money available so inevitably there is greater pressure to deliver more for the funding you are given, a standardized cost/benefit analysis may help justify cycling projects in this climate. It is still as difficult to conceive, design, consult on and construct anything more than a small scheme within the financial year, however funding is generally allocated on a yearly basis. The Smarter Choices and Connect2 projects have allowed an escape from this for some councils, and hopefully, when complete, will prove successful enough to help move funding models towards longer term planning.	X	X				X
As per previous survey, while improvements to NCN are welcomed for there to be significant increase in cycling there needs to be commitment within wider Planning system and also targeting of funding towards improving cycling facilities in urban areas where implantation is often problematic but where						X

majority of trips are made.						
<p>Comments as per last year:  Good to see CWSS continuing into 10/11 – would be great to see similar revenue budget earmarked for cycle infrastructure maintenance as this is becoming an increasing issue for local authorities.  However, money isn't everything and we need a more consistent approach across LAs, lead by central govt. in how we approach our ambitious national targets for 2020. A dedicated cycling officer in each LA would be a good starting point from which to move forwards.</p>				X		X
<p>Funding for cycling needs to be ring fenced or it will be frittered away on other “priorities”.  As the cycling infrastructure through external capital funding increases authorities must recognize this in their revenue budgets or the routes will deteriorate quite rapidly.  By limiting funding to the financial year it prohibits the development and implementation of larger schemes.</p>	X	X				X
<p>As mentioned previously the allocation of funding for one year at a time can hinder the delivery of larger projects due to uncertainty on the availability of funding to complete and difficulties and delays associated with land acquisition. Delays in acquiring land this year resulted in the loss of significant funding from Sustrans as project could not be completed within the financial year.  It can be increasingly difficult to obtain match funding, though the availability of funding from external sources can assist in leveraging this.  Removal of ringfenced budgets including CWSS will have an impact on the level of funding likely to be made available for cycling and walking scheme</p>	X	X	X	X		
<p>The previous loss of the Schools, Home Zones &amp; 20's Plenty ring fenced monies was to the detriment of cycling/walking schemes, as it removed a reasonable amount of money which would otherwise have been directed specifically at such schemes.  The potential cessation of the ring-fenced Cycling Walking and Safer Streets (CWSS) allocation is of great concern, as in previous years it proven to be very helpful in providing certainty for medium-term planning of cycle schemes and to enable the programming of potential schemes for the year ahead at an early date. However, the loss of CWSS funding in the future would remove that certainty, and to revert back to year-by-year budgets would be a retrograde step as we would lose the ability for forward planning. In addition, if we entered into a new financial year before we had our funding confirmed it would potentially delay further the tendering/award of new works.  Coupled with the significant spending cuts that are anticipated across local authorities, that problem will only be severely exacerbated, as any centralised funding would likely be prioritised to other Council services, and Roads budgets would likely be primarily targeted towards network maintenance.  The arrangement for seeking grant funding from Sustrans is very welcome, as it helps to offset these potential funding shortfalls, particularly for larger schemes. However, if Sustrans funding was to be reduced it would be to the detriment of all local authorities. However, any funding bids to Sustrans will likely be subject to a bidding process, so there would still be no guarantees as to how much any LA would get from that source.  The reduction in funding to Sustrans, if that is indeed the case, appears contrary to many of the Government's own initiatives, including the climate change initiative, tackling obesity and inactivity indicatives, and the National Transport Strategy, which highlights the need to support and improve sustainable travel choices, with a consequential reduction in car-borne travel. Any reduction in the level of funding to Sustrans, and such other streams, will be to the detriment of promoting and facilitating more sustainable travel choices.</p>	X	X	X	X		X