

2020 AGM Ruled Out of Order Motions

The motions below were received for consideration for the Cycling UK 2020 AGM. The reasons for ruling the motions out of order is recorded below.

Motion passed at the Cycling UK 2016 AGM:

This AGM proposes that any amended or rejected motions should be published (redacted if confidential personal information is involved) on the website with subsequent communications.

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconded	Board response
1.	That the CTC seeks a revision of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning law so that it gives equal rights of appeal for proposers and objectors in the planning process for major developments.	Currently, the planning procedures permit applicants the right to appeal against refusal, however objectors are permitted to object but no right of appeal. A major prison development at Full Sutton in East Yorkshire was granted outline planning permission without undertaking an environmental impact assessment. If built, it will result in deterioration in conditions for both walking and cycling in the surrounding area due to the extra 1000 plus motor vehicle trips per day.	Colin F Clarke	Ron Healey	The promoters are rightly aggrieved that the planning system is skewed in favor of granting planning permission for unsustainable developments (e.g. for those whose location is likely to result in high levels of car-dependence). However the solution is not to strengthen appeal rights but to strengthen the requirements for planning authorities to take account of the environmental impacts (and particularly climate impacts) of development proposals, They allude to this in mentioning the failure to conduct an environmental impact assessment in the case of the Full Sutton prison expansion, yet the motion does not address this point. Neither the Government nor Parliament is likely to support an increase in appeal rights, as this would simply slow down the planning process. Cycling UK's policy on planning and land use is downloadable from (and

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconded	Board response
					summarised at): www.cyclinguk.org/campaigning/views-and-briefings/national-planning-policies .
2.	<p>That the CTC seeks provision under the Freedom of Information Act 2006 to improve access to data on the maintenance standards and maintenance schedules for Highways/Local Authorities, by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtaining a licence to publish information released under Freedom of Information. • Making the information obtained via its website to members. • Making FOI courses available to members at minimum charge 	<p>The standard of roads, particularly minor ones vary and, in some cases, range from poor to potentially life-threatening because of potholes. Some local authorities are using poor procedures e.g. East Riding of Yorkshire sometimes use the spray-on process and patching, without compacting, which produces uneven surfaces and poor quality. Many minor roads are in a poorer condition that they were 50 years ago and improvements to methods, repairs and resurfacing procedures need to be made. From 1984 to 1990 approximately 8.5% of Local Authorities road repairs were to minor roads compared to 3.9% for 2014 to 2019. Lack of background knowledge of the Freedom of Information Act by local campaigners may hinder their ability to hold account Highways/Local Authorities as to the condition of roads.</p>	Colin F Clarke	Douglas Hope	<p>Cycling UK's policy and campaigns' teams prioritise the issues that they lobby and campaign on at any given time having regard to the importance of the issue, the prospects of success, the presence or absence of an opportunity to advance the case and secure change, and resources. Spending significant amounts of resource and time via FOI requests extracting information from local authorities and then publishing this ourselves, presumably on an annual or other recurring basis, is not an effective use of resources. Highway maintenance is an issue Cycling UK campaigns on already with a 'pothole week' campaign already planned for this year. Cycling UK does however the need for flexibility to prioritise different issues to campaign and lobby on, when the best time to do this is, and how to do it at any given time. The proposer's suggestion is not compatible with this and would require significant effort which could be better directed. However the point that it would be helpful if guidance was made available to campaigners about how to utilise freedom of information requests, the type of information that can be requested and how to draft requests, is well made. Accordingly Cycling UK will commit to make such information and guidance available to campaigners, as part of a wider toolkit to assist campaigners.</p> <p>Cycling UK's policy on highway maintenance is downloadable from (and</p>

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconded	Board response
					<p>summarised at): www.cyclinguk.org/campaigning/views-and-briefings/highway-maintenance</p> <p>Our evidence on highway maintenance to the Commons Transport Select Committees's 2019 inquiry on the subject is downloadable from (and summarised at: www.cyclinguk.org/press-release/potholes-minor-roads-cost-econom-ps2bn-says-cycling-uk</p>