

## 2021 AGM Ruled Out of Order Motions

The motions below were received for consideration for the Cycling UK 2021 AGM. Following a motion passed at the 2016 AGM it is our practice that any amended or rejected motions should be published (redacted if confidential personal information is involved) on the website.

The reasons for ruling the motions out of order is recorded below.

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconder	Board response
1.	Cycling UK seeks Her Majesty's Government to review its "Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy" and to evaluate if it stated aims needs to be updated due to current traffic conditions and the effects of the pandemic.	<p>Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy included;</p> <p>1.14 Our objectives are that by 2020, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increase cycling activity, where cycling activity is measured as the estimated total number of cycle stages made</li> <li>reduce the rate of cyclists killed or seriously injured on England's roads, measured as the number of fatalities and serious injuries per billion miles cycled</li> </ul> <p>1.15 Further to this, we have set the following aims and target, respectively, to 2025:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We aim to double cycling, where cycling activity is measured as the estimated total number of cycle stages made each year, from 0.8 billion stages in 2013 to 1.6 billion stages in 2025, and will work towards developing the evidence base over the next</li> </ul>	Colin Clarke	Phillip Benstead	<p>Whilst the board accepts the spirit of this motion, it rejects the motion's specific proposals. It does so on the grounds that:</p> <p>(a) it effectively mandates Cycling UK to do what we are currently doing and are committed to doing;</p> <p>(b) the motion does not acknowledge that HM Government is already committed to a new Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy – see <a href="http://www.theyworkforyou.com/wms/?id=2021-03-25.hcws891.h">www.theyworkforyou.com/wms/?id=2021-03-25.hcws891.h</a> – and that Cycling UK and our Walking and Cycling Alliance partners are already engaging with them on influencing it;</p> <p>(c) the motion is limited to England, whereas Cycling UK is pressing for increased cycling and walking investment in all 4 nations of the UK;</p> <p>(d) whilst current traffic conditions and the effects of the pandemic are relevant, they are not the only or the most powerful reason to seek increased investment in cycling and walking. For instance, the UK Government's desire to show international leadership on tackling the climate crisis, through its hosting of the international climate summit in November 2021, will carry far greater weight. The motion would therefore bind us to draw on arguments that are not the most effective ones we could deploy in seeking to further our lobbying of HMG.</p>

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Secunder	Board response
		<p>year.  <a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/918442/cycling-walking-investment-strategy.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/918442/cycling-walking-investment-strategy.pdf</a></p> <p>The Department of Transport reported that from 2003 to 2016 cycle traffic increased by 25% and the number of serious injuries rose by 48 per cent and a review could be helpful to show if the aim to 'reduce the rate of cyclists killed or seriously injured on England's roads' is being met and the reasons why. Details of the Coronavirus aspects could be included.</p>			
2.	<p>Cycling UK shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review its policy to Parliamentary Petitions relating to cycling and the environment.</li> <li>- Review its policy to crowdfunding for improving conditions for cycling.</li> <li>- Seek the Department of Transport to match fund crowdfund cycling schemes.</li> </ul>	<p>Currently, little support from Cycling UK is provided for Parliamentary Petitions or for crowdfunding of cycling facilities. As examples</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Presumed liability petition <a href="https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/580595">https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/580595</a></li> <li>2) Review plans for a category C prison at Full Sutton <a href="https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/564623">https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/564623</a>?</li> <li>3) Kirkbymoorside Path for Everone, Crowdfunder for a section of A170 verge path, segregated for cyclists and pedestrians <a href="https://www.crowdfunder.co.uk/kirkbymoorside-path-for-everyone">https://www.crowdfunder.co.uk/kirkbymoorside-path-for-everyone</a></li> </ol> <p>Such petitions and</p>	Colin Clarke	Phillip Benstead	<p>Cycling UK has a long-standing policy of only supporting petitions on the Parliament website in very exceptional circumstances. (We have only done so once, in 2012, when the Times newspaper initiated a Parliament website petition in support of its Cities Fit for Cycling campaign, that Cycling UK was also supporting).</p> <p>The Parliament petitions website requires petitions to attract 100,000 signatures before they are even considered for a parliamentary debate – and even then there is no guarantee of a successful outcome. The largest campaign response that Cycling UK has mobilised (on the Highway Code last year) attracted 16,000 responses.</p> <p>Therefore, even for a cause which was very popular with our members and supporters, Cycling UK (and/or any allies we were working with) would need a membership or supporter base about 6 times larger than it has at present, just to have a reasonable chance of securing a parliamentary debate, let alone a successful outcome.</p>

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Seconder	Board response
		<p>crowdfunding efforts could be listed in Cycle, if they met a suitable criteria. Cycling UK could seek extra funding from the DfT for cycle paths to match fund proposals or contribute if funds were available.</p>			<p>Cycling UK's campaigns team is skilled and highly effective at identifying what campaigning strategies are likely to be effective in different situations and overall our organisational view is that mobilising members and supporters to support parliamentary petitions would be a poor value for money and inefficient use of our campaigning resources. (Local petitions, by contrast, can be highly effective).</p> <p>Cycling UK is often asked by individuals to support parliamentary petitions they have tabled and whilst well-intentioned, may not align with our wider strategy or available resources, and even those which are in line with Cycling UK's policies are often not drafted in ways that might ensure maximum political impact. Supporting petitions that our campaigns team had not researched and drafted ourselves could therefore create reputational risks.</p> <p>Finally, if Cycling UK was to support the occasional parliamentary petition, this could lead to further requests to support yet more petitions. This would lead to a significant increase in triaging these requests, engaging with members on the rationale as to why we were supporting petition A but not petition B and overall a significant volume of work which the campaigns team is not currently resourced to undertake. The AGM selection committee's view was therefore that the current organisational approach and policy of not supporting parliamentary petitions other than in very exceptional circumstances should be maintained. The selection committee therefore cannot support a motion that mandates Cycling UK to prioritise parliamentary petitions when this would carry significant resource burdens and when our campaigns team is of the view that the petition process is not the most effective means of campaigning.</p> <p>In relation to the crowdfunding elements of the motion, since 2019, we have had a director of income generation responsible for fundraising from non-statutory sources. There is a detailed fundraising plan in place focused on providing funding from a diverse range of sources for the wider charitable objectives and the overall strategic aims of the organisation. Whilst the benefits of crowdfunding can in some</p>

No.	Motion	Reason	Proposer	Secunder	Board response
					instances be limited we do already and will continue to consider crowdfunding opportunities as part of the ongoing fundraising mix when we determine the cause and the moment are right. This element of the motion would therefore be duplicative of our existing activities.
3.	<p>That Cycling UK shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seek funding for an officer to engage exclusively with Highway England and similar bodies.</li> <li>- Review its policy on existing major road infrastructure etc. and barriers it creates for cycling.</li> </ul> <p>Seek to reduce the effects of existing barriers and seek to prevent the creation of new ones.</p>	<p>With every prospect of major infrastructure scheme that creates a physical barrier to cycling particularly affecting the new cyclist, we need to influence planning at an early stage, and it is very time consuming and means that it does not get the attention deserved by our hard-working staff.</p>	Philip Benstead	Colin Clarke	<p>Cycling UK's Policy Director already engages with Highways England on a regular basis. The central focus of this dialogue is on tackling the barriers to cycling created by major road infrastructure, and avoiding the creation of new ones. Within the rationale for the motion there is no indication or reasons why the proposers believe Cycling UK's policies on these issues need revising (although minor updates are likely to be made as part of a wider review of Cycling UK's cycling infrastructure policies, following significant progress on the UK and Welsh Governments' own policies on these issues).</p> <p>It would not, however, be a cost-effective use of resources to employ an officer "exclusively" to deal with Highways England. Bearing in mind Cycling UK's Strategy aim to get millions more people cycling, there are a great many posts that would need to be added to our campaigns or policy teams, before an officer focused exclusively on Highways England became our primary priority.</p>