

Edinburgh City Council election, 5 May 2022
Manifesto analysis re cycling-related issues
Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign

Overall Outcomes

- *Tops - Green*
- **Good – Labour & SNP**
- **Medium- LibDem**
- *Disappointing - Conservative*

Key to table: each entry begins with one of the following codes...

- N not in manifesto; e.g. the party may be keeping options open, or continue existing policy, or uninterested
- ++ excellent
- + good e.g. topic mentioned positively but not much detail
- = mixed/unclear
- disappointing

Obviously some of the individual codings are arguable, but we think the overall position above is pretty clear

Issue	Conservative	Green	Labour	LibDem	SNP
Cycling % of transport budget [<i>this is complex - see note 1 below</i>]	--- scrap the 10% cycling allocation	++ at least 10% for cycling [1]	++ 15% for active travel [1]	N	+ Capital sum instead of % [1]
Onroad safe/protected routes & network	= [4]	++	++	N [5]	++
Increased cash for road/path/ footway repair	+ amounts not specified	+	++ 20% more for footway maintenance	+ “millions of £ extra” but how much not stated	+
Cash for ped crossing & footway enhancements	N	+	++ 20% more for ped crossings	+	+
Cycle hire scheme	++	++	+ [2]	+ [2]	++
Onstreet secure storage	N	++	N [3]	N [3]	+
Traffic reduction - charging	- oppose Workplace Parking Levy	++ Congestion charge <i>and</i> Workplace Parking Levy	N	+ Consult on Workplace Parking Levy	++ Commuter charge <i>and</i> Workplace Parking Levy
Traffic reduction – parking restrictions	- oppose more parking restrictions	++ The most comprehensive manifesto on this	+ Reduced commuter parking opportunities	=	+
Speed limit reductions	N	N [3]	N [3]	N[3]	N [3]
School safer routes/ streets	+	++	N [3]	++	++
2030 Net Zero [not just transport]	Postpone 2030 to unspecified date	++ The most comprehensive manifesto on this	++	++	++
Air pollution	Scrap LEZ or just Princes St	++	+	++ widen the LEZ	+
LTNs, 20-min nbds, etc	N	++	+	++	++
Other relevant major promises	-- Remove most Spaces for People schemes	+ Lobby ScotGov for full non-residential parking levy powers	+ Seek through-ticketing for bus, tram, rail & bike-hire		+ Improve last-mile delivery, incl cargobikes

[1] Current Council policy is to allocate 10% of the transport budget (capital and revenue) to cycling, a policy unique in the UK as far as we know. This can then be used to attract substantial match-funding, notably government cash via Sustrans. Whilst much of this benefits walking too, separate cash is generally used to enhance the existing extensive pedestrian footway network, e.g. new pedestrian crossings.

This year's manifestos are very varied on cycle and AT cash. **Greens** continue the above policy; **Labour** has upped the 10% to 15% but made it officially 'active travel (AT)', i.e. cycling, wheeling, walking; **LibDems** do not mention cycling cash amounts at all and **Conservatives** promise to abolish the 10% cycling percentage. The **SNP** is no longer committing to a % but promises £118m AT capital investment over the next 5 years – this presumably is the Council's already agreed £118m [active travel investment programme \(ATINP\)](#), of which just £20m is the Council's own transport capital funding - probably somewhat less than the Greens' 10% cycling commitment or Labour's 15% Active Travel, and is a commitment on transport *capital* only, not also transport *revenue* (e.g. gritting, maintenance, etc).

[2] Restore bike hire scheme if sponsorship found / if financially viable

[3] Not mentioned in manifesto so we expect existing policies will continue where they chime with the spirit of the manifesto, e.g. continuing rollout of more onstreet storage; continuing existing Council speed limit reduction plans

[4] Conservatives argue for high quality cycle schemes, but there is no commitment to funding levels. They promise to work on the backlog of non Spaces for People schemes, but avoiding schemes which “clog up roads, reduce access or pander to minority lobby groups.” Most Spaces for People schemes will be removed.

[5] LibDems do not specifically mention main road cycle infrastructure, but want “high quality” projects “sensitive to local concerns”. However, no funding level is given. They will set up “full consultation” on the “most controversial” Spaces for People schemes – presumably with a view to amendment or removal.