

# SPOKES FUNDING SURVEY 11/12

## COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL OFFICERS

**Q2 Does your local authority have targets for cycle use? YES/NO**  
**If YES, Please specify the target(s)...**

Comment
It is hoped by this year that the percentage of adults cycling (for transport) at least one day in the previous week is increased by at least 20% compared to the average between 1999 and 2006.
general policy/aim to increase the number of people cycling set out in the Local Transport Strategy
to achieve 10% of journeys on bike by 2020
%age of pupils whose main method of travel to school is walking or cycling
15% of JTW trips by bike by 2020, 10% of all trips.
1% growth every year / 10% of journeys to be by bike by 2020
LTS commitment to support Scot Govt in achieving 10% by 2020
No LA specific target, utilise targets set out in CAPS
Short term: to halt decline in trips by foot & bike. Long term: 10% rise in work & study trips between 2001 & 2011
To achieve a 5% increase in cycling.
As detailed in Local Transport Strategy
to increase the mode share of cycling and walking. No figure has been stated – statistics will be obtained from the Scottish Household Survey
2% increase on levels of walking & cycling year on year

**Responses to Q15: "If you anticipate significant changes in your cycling investment sources/levels in 2012/13 please describe briefly."**

Comment
Reduction in the Scottish Government's Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets Grant to £286,000 reduced from £350,000
We are planning future cycle projects in 2012/13 and have a small amount of funding from Sustrans. Large project planned for 2013/14.
It is planned that this year some of the CWSS grant allocation will be utilised for cycling and walking projects. It is also the intention to bid for a specific Council capital allocation. The RTP has £80k allocated against development of the X Cycleway.
CWSS funding being reduced from 3173K to 3140k
5% commitment and underspend from 2011/12 will lead to Council capital cycle project budget of £1,051,000 for 2012/13. Sustrans to be at similar level. CWSS for cycling reduced to £280K.
CWSS funding cut from 2011/12 levels to £179,000 2012/13.
Implementation will take place on [3 projects mentioned]
ERDF funding package complete for X town Sustrans street design project not likely to be repeated.
The CWSS budget has been reduced to £157,000 which will impact on the ability to secure external funding. As it is anticipated that the CWSS will reduce on an annual basis this will continue to impact on the investment in relation to cycling.
The CWSS budget has been reduced for 2012/13, which will have a direct impact on potential walking and cycling schemes. In addition, the overall roads budget has been reduced, with an emphasis on maintenance works, limiting options to fund cycling and walking schemes from the roads management budget.
In 2011/2012 we expected to deliver the final and largest part of the Connect 2 NCN X cycle route – the section between A and B. However, despite a considerable effort by the Council, the outstanding land issues could not be resolved. The project could therefore not be taken forward and the funding from the Big Lottery was slipped to 2012 / 2013. The proposed works involve narrowing the road carriageway to allow the construction of a wider footway / cycleway and will

require full road closures and significant temporary / diversionary signing etc. The works will be expensive because narrowing the road on the one side means that the crown / central line of the road is now in the wrong place. The road therefore needs to be resurfaced so that the crown / central line is repositioned into the middle of the 'new' road. The Roads Area Manager, who's DLO will be carrying out the works, has allocated £275,000 of his roads budget for this purpose. The RTP has awarded the Council £125,000 for cycling projects this year, £75,000 of which will be going to this project. Finally, SUSTRANS has also awarded us a further £100,000 for this project. Taking into account the Big Lottery funding, this gives us a pot of funding of £906,000 in 2012 / 2013 for this project alone. The good news is that work on this project has already begun. It is anticipated that it will be complete by the end of September – weather permitting.
European Funding for A-B Shared Access Route – Approximately 500k
In 2011/12 we were unsuccessful with all our SUSTRANS bids. In 2012/13 we have been successful and consequently will be implementing significantly more this year than last.
Due to the reduction in our CWSS allocation, any reduction in spend is potentially doubled, due to any match funding source reducing its contribution by the same amount

## SUMMARY OF Q15 REPLIES

**Brief summary of topics mentioned in at least 2 responses** – in order of number of mentions [first 2 are the most frequent]

- (7) Big cut in government CWSS funding expected in 12/13
- (5) Sustrans funding has been approved or bid for
- (3) Bidding for council non-CWSS capital funding
- (3) Some big cycling projects anticipated
- (3) Money expected from RTP
- (2) Match-funding will be harder to achieve since CWSS cut
- (2) Bidding for funding from other sources, lottery and ERDF

***Responses to Q16: "Give any comments on funding methods for cycle project capital expenditure. Consider small/medium/large cycle projects and integrated cycle/public transport projects. What changes would overcome the problems?"***

Comment
As stated in the past, with Council resources being targeted at maintaining the existing road network, it is direct funding from the Scottish Government for Cycle or Cycle/Walk projects that is of utmost importance as it allows the development and implementation of such infrastructure.
There are many areas within the local authority where cycling can be enjoyed by the enthusiast on scenic country roads. There is not always the need for specific capital project expenditure within towns although it can be seen that CWSS encourages cycle use , as well as facilities provided on coastal routes/ cycle links.
Cycling and sustainable travel are now becoming integrated into our policy and strategy documents e.g. The Local Development Plan and the revision of the Economic Development Action Plan. Continued reference to cycling and walking at this level will hopefully encourage more funding from within the Council and higher priority given to cyclist and pedestrian provision as part of other capital works or developments.
More funding!
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 as has been the case in Denmark over recent decades.
CWSS ring fencing is vital; it provides core funds to lever external monies and increasing this fund would provide the greatest benefit. (NB We are grateful to Spokes for campaigning vigorously to protect these funds). Sustrans are effective fund managers and their 3 year deal is most welcome – however, it is not ideal that their announcement on bid success is made after several months of the year have elapsed and physical works consequently are carried out when the weather isn't favorable. There may also be a tendency to attempt to spread funds on a geographical basis rather than purely on merit. Obviously it would help if the government were to commit to longer term security for CWSS and Sustrans budgets
Some good numbers on spend from non-transport this year, thanks to X project and a particularly good year for non-urban network development. Happy to discuss/provide further details as required
Programming long term projects given short term funding commitments (somewhat alleviated by Sustrans commitments to multi year bids for Community Links) – Also needs long term commitment for CWSS funding. A bigger problem is public buy-in into cycleway schemes – more buy-in = more demand = more political pressure = more funding.
There is less money available so inevitably there is greater pressure to deliver more for the funding you are given, a standardised 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 SCSP and Connect2 projects have allowed an escape from this and hopefully, when complete, will prove successful enough to help move funding models towards long term planning.

Funding for cycleway projects is not governed by the traditional financial year April to March. Planning process could be streamlined (fast tracked) for cycling (sustainable transport) projects. Applications for matched external funding could be easier especially WREN.
Funding methods for capital cycle projects are fine for improving networks and creating new facilities but do not make any allowance for maintenance which does become a problem a few years later.
The present arrangement whereby the CWSS grant allocation is ring fenced for cycling, walking and safer streets projects guarantees expenditure in relation to cycling however if this position was to alter this may impact on expenditure. Additional resources for funding organisations such as Sustrans Scotland would also be beneficial.
A ring-fenced CWSS budget is very beneficial, as it ensures at least a certain level of expenditure on cycling and walking schemes. The allocation of additional funding to Sustrans is very welcome, although it is still not clear how much will be available, and it is not clear how much will be available for Local Authorities to bid for. The funding of large scale cycling projects will be problematic in the current financial climate, (and may be for the next few years); this could be alleviated by the Scottish Government allocating sizeable, annual budgets for cycling, that local authorities could bid for. The earlier that the Scottish Government announces CWSS, and other budgets for the coming years, the earlier local authorities can start programming works for the following years.
The announcement that there will now be a 3 year funding source from Sustrans is welcomed. This will allow agreed projects (with Sustrans) that require land to be purchased to be progressed with some confidence in that funding will be available to construct the project in years 2 and 3.
To meet the cycling related targets set by Scottish Government, the direct allocation to Local Authorities needs to be significantly increased either through the CWSS programme or through a new dedicated ring fenced fund.
As above, match funding potentially prohibits larger projects being undertaken by smaller authorities so perhaps submitting bids to Scottish Government / RTP for 100% funding of projects would ensure they went ahead. The phasing of Sustrans bids over multiple years for design, construction and promotion is a welcome step forward.

## SUMMARY OF Q16 REPLIES

**Brief summary of topics mentioned in at least 2 responses** – in order of number of mentions [first 2 are the most frequent]

- (10) Importance of funding: CWSS critical, including for getting match funds; Sustrans very valuable; existing funding quite inadequate to achieve government cycle-use targets; CAPS targets not properly funded; Need a bidding fund for very large projects.
- (7) Need long-term funding; assurance of future funding; to allow planning & big projects; problem if funds arrive part-way through the year
- (2) Money can be raised from outside funds sometimes
- (2) Admin/ planning processes too slow and bureaucratic

## THIS IS 2011 SUMMARY

**Brief summary of topics mentioned in at least 2 responses** – in order of number of mentions [first 2 are the most frequent]

- (a) Top issue – need for continued ring-fenced/significant funding, CWSS and sustrans – without this many councils will invest little/nothing in cycle projects.
- (b) Assurance of long-term funding, not just year-by-year
- (c) Land ownership problems can be big setback/ delays/ costs – particularly difficult in relation to absence of assured long-term funding for cycle projects – relates to (b).
- (d) Council transport capital increasingly dedicated to road maintenance, leaving little/none for bike projects – relates to (a)
- (e) Councils increasingly investigating other funding sources to top-up or match other bike project funds – including ERDF, Paths for All, Woods in and around Towns (what's that!), Lottery, own road maintenance budget, Leader, lottery, etc.
- (f) Government announces aims/targets on such as cycle use, obesity, transport emissions, for councils to work on, but doesn't resource it.

## Uninvited relevant comments [esp re. match funding] in other qns

Comment
18,000 (LEADER SRDP) Creation of new multi-use path in country park, section of recreational cycle network
1 <sup>st</sup> year of Green and Active Travel ERDF project with total spend of c£130K in year one to complete cycle route between A and B. Also NCN 1 improvements in X and National bike week promotion. Overall project is 3 years with £560K budget. It includes following match funders – THC - £151K, Sustrans £50k, RTP £90K, Common Good Fund, £45k and ERDF grant =£224K “ Also £5k from National park towards Active Travel Audit
NB It is not possible to differentiate between the expenditure for walking and cycling in relation to path works as the paths provide for both walkers and cyclists.

## Comments On The Survey

The problem is that some projects fall under more than one category – e.g. Traffic Signal alterations can fall under all categories
---