RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Cabinet is recommended to:

1. note and welcome the report of the scrutiny committee, and:

2. advise the County Council that, in considering the report of the Scrutiny Committee, the Council be recommended to welcome the report of the Scrutiny Committee and to agree the response of the Director of Transport and Environment to the recommendations and their implementation as set out in the action plan attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

1. Financial Appraisal

1.1 The effect of the recommendations set out in this report is to rebalance the priority given to cycling schemes in the balanced scorecard assessment process which informs scheme selection. This would not require an increase in investment rather a redistribution of funding in the integrated transport capital programme.

2. Background Information

2.1 The balanced scorecard rates the performance of schemes against LTP objectives. Cycling is not currently identified as a priority within the Transport & Environment section of the Council Plan. This relative priority is reflected by applying a negative weighting to all cycling schemes assessed through the balanced scorecard. Where investments in cycling are proposed these are prioritised to secure implementation of the strategic National Cycle Network (NCN) routes 2 and 21.

2.2 This reduced priority towards cycling has arisen for a number of reasons, most notably a public consultation carried out in 2004 as part of the second Local Transport Plan (LTP2) development process which suggested there was a public view that cycling should be afforded a lower priority than other kinds of Integrated Transport schemes.

2.3 The Scrutiny review of cycling has coincided with a recent redistribution of responsibilities in the department meaning that the cycling strategy function is now integrated into the role of a principal transport planner. This helps to ensure that cycling is considered as part of an integrated transport approach from a conceptual stage to ensure maximum contribution to LTP2 objectives.

2.4 The Scrutiny review has determined a number of recommendations which I have responded to in detail in the appendix to this report. I highlight the key issues below. It is sensible to determine the relative priority of cycling investment on the basis of the
contribution of specific schemes to achieving LTP objectives in an integrated approach rather than reflect a reduced priority by applying a negative weighting in the assessment process (Recommendation 2). However the proposal to establish a cycling development fund seems to run contrary to that principle (Recommendation 3).

2.5 There is benefit in taking a broader perspective of wider objectives such as health (Recommendation 5) and this should be integrated in the assessment framework for integrated transport schemes together with other strategic objectives such as economic prosperity, social inclusion, and climate change.

2.6 Revision of the County Council’s cycling strategy to make the specific objectives more realistic will be an important first step towards managing expectations (Recommendation 1).

3. Conclusion and Reason for Recommendation

3.1 I welcome this timely Scrutiny Review of cycling. The conclusion of the review that utility cycling can effectively contribute towards achieving LTP2 as part of an integrated approach objectives is welcomed.

3.2 The recommendations arising from the scrutiny review raise some interesting opportunities and issues. My detailed responses to each recommendation are set out in the appendix.

RUPERT CLUBB
Director of Transport and Environment
21 January 2008
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BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS
A revised Cycling Strategy for East Sussex should be developed to:

**a)** Send a clear, unambiguous message that sets out the Council’s direction and commitment to promoting cycling in all its forms, and the factors limiting what can be achieved.

**b)** Explain the priorities that will be used to allocate funding to cycling through LTP capital funds which should support suitable and effective utility cycling schemes.

**c)** Set out its aspirations for recreational cycling which will be dependent upon sourcing external funding and partner cooperation.

**d)** Explain its policy regarding the priority schemes such as L’Avenue Verte or completion of sections of the National Cycling Network (NCN) through East Sussex and clarify the basis of future progress and funding for these schemes.

**e)** Contain targets that are: clear; achievable yet challenging; carefully phrased to ensure public acceptability; and are within the power of the relevant organisation to achieve.

**f)** Take into account and be compatible with other relevant policies, such as the East Sussex Active Living Strategy 2007-12.

Agreed. It is acknowledged that the 2003 strategy was over ambitious and was not consistent with profiled investment levels. Therefore a new cycling strategy should be developed with an emphasis on completing the strategic NCN2 and 21 routes where supported by external funding. Utility cycling scheme should be brought forward as part of local packages of integrated transport improvements. It is envisaged that a new strategy will be in place by Summer 2008. The process will be informed by reviewing the cycle targets and the baseline monitoring system to better reflect a value for money approach that is more focused to delivering LTP2 targets and objectives.

Agreed. Cost effective utility cycling schemes contribute to achieving modal shift when implemented in appropriate locations and under the right circumstances, whilst also improving cyclist safety. Cycling can make a positive contribution towards achieving LTP2 targets and objectives and should be considered as part of a package of local Integrated Transport Capital Programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation from Scrutiny Review</th>
<th>Response of Director</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** A revised Cycling Strategy for East Sussex should be developed to:  
**a)** Send a clear, unambiguous message that sets out the Council’s direction and commitment to promoting cycling in all its forms, and the factors limiting what can be achieved.  
**b)** Explain the priorities that will be used to allocate funding to cycling through LTP capital funds which should support suitable and effective utility cycling schemes.  
**c)** Set out its aspirations for recreational cycling which will be dependent upon sourcing external funding and partner cooperation.  
**d)** Explain its policy regarding the priority schemes such as L’Avenue Verte or completion of sections of the National Cycling Network (NCN) through East Sussex and clarify the basis of future progress and funding for these schemes.  
**e)** Contain targets that are: clear; achievable yet challenging; carefully phrased to ensure public acceptability; and are within the power of the relevant organisation to achieve.  
**f)** Take into account and be compatible with other relevant policies, such as the East Sussex Active Living Strategy 2007-12. | Agreed. It is acknowledged that the 2003 strategy was over ambitious and was not consistent with profiled investment levels. Therefore a new cycling strategy should be developed with an emphasis on completing the strategic NCN2 and 21 routes where supported by external funding. Utility cycling scheme should be brought forward as part of local packages of integrated transport improvements. It is envisaged that a new strategy will be in place by Summer 2008. The process will be informed by reviewing the cycle targets and the baseline monitoring system to better reflect a value for money approach that is more focused to delivering LTP2 targets and objectives. | Complete in 2008/09 |
<p>| <strong>2</strong> When competing for LTP capital funds, cycling schemes should be judged fairly and robustly against the LTP objectives in the balanced scorecard but without being given a negative weighting. This would allow high quality utility cycling schemes to come forward and compete effectively against other traffic and public transport schemes. | Agreed. Cost effective utility cycling schemes contribute to achieving modal shift when implemented in appropriate locations and under the right circumstances, whilst also improving cyclist safety. Cycling can make a positive contribution towards achieving LTP2 targets and objectives and should be considered as part of a package of local Integrated Transport Capital Programme | 3 months to inform 09/10 Integrated Transport Capital Programme |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation from Scrutiny Review</th>
<th>Response of Director</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 A £50,000 ‘cycling opportunity fund’ should be put forward annually as a project within the balanced scorecard which, if successful, would enable a range of flexible, low cost responses to meet unanticipated but desirable utility cycling activities including: a) supplementing larger traffic and maintenance schemes to benefit cycling and walking b) joint funding of cycle parking for example with rail companies at key railway stations c) signing and reactive maintenance in conjunction with partners such as Sustrans</td>
<td>Disagreed. No opportunity fund exists for other transport modes such as walking or public transport. Investment in individual schemes should be determined on the basis of the contribution to the broader transport objectives. Creation of a cycling opportunity fund would increase the investment in cycling disproportionately.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The Council should implement the Audit Commission recommendation to agree and implement an audit regime for new highway and traffic schemes by taking a practical and tailored approach depending on the type and size of scheme, including: a) all transport scheme promoters and designers should be made aware of the need to cater for cyclists wherever possible; b) opportunities should be identified within repair and maintenance programmes to introduce cost effective cycling measures at marginal cost using the ‘cycling opportunity fund’ as required. The effectiveness of this approach would be measured by bringing a sample of successful scheme outcomes to Transport and Environment Scrutiny Committee during the monitoring period of this review.</td>
<td>Whilst the intention of the recommendation is agreed the mechanism would be a resource intensive activity for an individual to undertake and it is likely that a new post would need to be created to fulfill this role. It would be more efficient to ensure that all scheme promoters and designers are made aware of the need to cater for cyclists within integrated transport schemes. This would achieve the same outcome making use of existing staff resources. Officers are in discussions with Cycling England with a view to providing a one day workshop in February / March detailing how to undertake cycle audits.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from Scrutiny Review</td>
<td>Response of Director</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The scoring criteria used in the Balanced Scorecard assessment process should be refined to include explicit health benefits within the Local Transport Plan 2 objective ‘protect, promote and enhance the environment’.</td>
<td>Agreed. The balanced scorecard rates the performance of schemes against LTP objectives. There is a benefit in taking a broader perspective of wider objectives and this should be extended to include issues such as economic prosperity, social inclusion and climate change as well as health.</td>
<td>3 months to inform 2009/10 capital programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Where schools that would benefit from cycle training are failing to identify staff or time for training, the cycle training manager should take all possible action to try to encourage recalcitrant but otherwise ideally placed schools to take part by: a) emphasising the benefits of cycling both to individual children and the wider community b) engaging the help of local elected Members to use their influence c) consider using monetary incentives if it is cost effective and affordable.</td>
<td>Partly agreed. It would not be cost effective to divert money away from directly supporting the cycle training programme to provide financial incentives to recalcitrant schools to take part.</td>
<td>Immediate – (a) &amp; (b) to be included when schools are contacted for the next round of training in Summer 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Southern Rail should be requested to consider whether in the light of the impact of its policy of banning cycles on certain rush hour services: a) it would be prepared to adopt a more selective approach towards banning the carriage of cycles on its trains, for example by limiting the policy to certain stations rather than a blanket ban for entire routes b) when considering the future operation of the Gatwick Express a cycle ban policy is not introduced on this service c) it will negotiate with bicycle retailers to promote discounts on the purchase of new bicycles for its customers.</td>
<td>Agreed. Officers will prepare a letter to be sent by the Director of Transport &amp; Environment requesting that both Southern Rail and South Eastern consider their current policies regarding carriage of bicycles on trains. This will also be raised as an agenda item at the next meeting with Train Operating Companies scheduled for March 2008. We will also take the opportunity to address points b) and c) through these channels.</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Opportunities to provide high quality cycle parking at rail stations across East Sussex be explored fully in</td>
<td>Agreed. Officers have developed a good working relationship with staff at Southern</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from Scrutiny Review</td>
<td>Response of Director</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunction with Southern Rail with a view to implementation of facilities where possible.</td>
<td>and opportunities to provide additional cycle parking at stations across the County are currently being explored. Implementation of these facilities will require a 50% contribution by the County Council and therefore this will be dependant on the schemes justifying funding priority from the LTP Capital Programme through the balanced scorecard assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 That the Lead Member should consider carefully whether the Council should place a bid for resources to create a demonstration site in East Sussex under Cycling England’s second phase of cycling demonstration towns within Bike for the Future 2 (2008-12).</td>
<td>Agreed. Consideration will be given to submitting an expression of interest to Cycling England for the next round of cycling demonstration towns. A report will be brought to a future meeting of the Lead member for T&amp;E exploring the options.</td>
<td>To be determined when bid timescales are confirmed by Cycling England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>