

This response to the Annual Monitoring report (AMR) is submitted on behalf of Southwark Cyclists, a group of over 700 cyclists living and working in Southwark.

The contribution that cycling can make to the achievement of Southwark's vision is not recognised in this report

Southwark Cyclists are concerned about the lack of indicators and data within the AMR which relate to cycling and the provision of cycling infrastructure. This absence is regrettable given the number of headline objectives for Southwark where an increase in cycling could contribute to achieving the Community Plan objectives and UDP Policy Targets eg:

- ❑ Tackling Poverty and Creating Wealth: As the Draft Cycle Plan notes: "Cycling is a leveller, promoting inclusion because of the parity it gives to all whatever their financial status". Cycling can make a contribution to policy SP8 about increasing life chances.
- ❑ Clean and green: the benefits of a no-emissions transport mode to SP 11 to increase improve environmental quality are obvious
- ❑ Sustainable transport: Again cycling is a key issue and can make a direct contribution to the UDP policy to increase the use of sustainable modes (SP18 &19) and the associated indicators 50 (to reduce CO²) and 51 (reduce particular matter emissions)

Indicators on cycling are inadequate

There is a lamentable lack of indicators about cycling. The most relevant indicator in the report is indicator 82 in the sustainable transport section which reviews adherence to parking standards. This is a catch-all indicator reviewing both cycle and car parking provision by use class and accessibility levels. An aggregate indicator is not satisfactory given the importance of promoting cycling and the need to understand progress against this target. Different motivations and policy initiatives affect modal choice for different use classes (eg business cycling, recreational cycling etc) so reporting needs to reflect this. Irrespective of the composite nature of the indicator, the AMR gives a verdict on this indicator despite the admission that there is no cycle data available. This is misleading.

Irrespective of the nature of the indicator is not clear why it has not been possible to collect data. Cycle parking provision will have been an element in all planning applications and provision of places should be collected as part of data provided on unit completions. Enforcement of cycle provision is one of the easiest and best policy levers available to make cycling an easy and practical transport choice.

Recommendation 1: Split indicator 82 into as a minimum two in order to differentiate between cycle parking provision and car- parking. Ideally separate out into cycle parking in commercial uses and cycle parking in residential units. Report progress separately

Recommendation 2: Begin immediate collation of data on cycle parking provision so that progress can be evidenced in the 2006-7 report

The Cycle Plan produced as part of the LTP has some excellent targets to increase ASLs and cycle contraflows. All of these items can contribute to the LDF's sustainable transport objective but are not in the AMR. There are no indicators either on km of cycle paths and no qualitative measures to show how good these paths are eg are they continuous or do they stop and start. Given that the LDF provides the overarching policy framework to implement and monitor the achievement of the Community Strategy, the AMR must be a more comprehensive report drawing in work of other departments where it has a direct impact on the goals of the Community Strategy

Recommendation 3: Liaise with the Transport Team to ensure that the work they are doing which contributes to the realisation of Southwark Objectives is reflected in the AMR in particular ASLs, introduction of cycle contraflows

Recommendation 4: Establish an indicator that can measure the quality and quantity of cycle paths

Data on cycle trips is poor

Southwark Cyclists acknowledge that there is a general lack of data about cycle trips in London. Official figures tend to draw on the census or on the LATS which works at an aggregate level. However Southwark must not be complacent and simply accept data gaps as per the comments in indicators 88 (personal trips by mode) & 89 (trips by non car mode by people from equalities groups) – “data not available”, “data infrequently updated”. The Cycle Plan made some impressive commitments to start innovative monitoring. EG:

Target 5.4 Develop a database of cycle users including the use of manual and automatic cycle counts by September 2006

Target 5.4 Carry out annual questionnaire survey of cyclists at key points throughout First survey September 2006

We note that the report states that “A more refined analysis which looks at walking or cycling time would be more useful and this will be developed over the coming years”. We support this objective but believe that this work should be expedited through links with the transport team. The Planning Team could also collate data provided as part of the Travel Plan monitoring which should link into indicator 85. Southwark has made a strong claim to being a borough that is serious about cycling and data collection processes need to demonstrate that this commitment is not just rhetoric.

Recommendation 5: Invest resources in cross-departmental cycle monitoring so that future AMRs and other Southwark policy documents report progress against a robust baseline

Recommendation 6: Ensure that indicator 85 looks not just at the % of development subject to travel plans but ensures that as part of the travel plan, the organisation subject to the travel plan provides the council with data on modal choice