

## Transport Committee – 15 October 2015

### Transcript of Agenda Item 6 – Motorcycle Safety

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Item 6 is our exploration of motorcycle safety. Can I welcome our guests today, who have voluntarily agreed to give us their time.

From left to right the way I am facing you, we have our old friend Ben Plowden, who is Director of Strategy and Planning at Transport for London (TfL). We have another old friend, Lilli Matson, who is Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning at TfL. TfL is well represented today. Thank you. David Davies is the Executive Director of the Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety, otherwise known as PACTS. You have swapped seats? My apologies. Welcome, David. Dr Leon Mannings is the Campaign and Policy Adviser from the Motorcycle Action Group (MAG). Leon has very kindly laid around some presentation material that he will want us to look at and we will put that into the public arena. Next to him we have Graeme Hay, Government Relations Executive from the British Motorcyclists Federation (BMF). Welcome, Graeme. On our right here we have Craig Carey-Clinch, Policy Advisor from the Motorcycle Industry Association (MCIA). Again, thank you to all of you today for coming along.

I just want to ask you a few opening questions, if I may. If as part of that there is something very important you want to tell us about your organisation and the work you have been doing on this and what you have learned, you might want to just make one or two introductory comments. We have a lot of detailed questions to come into.

It is obvious from the data that motorcyclists are over-represented as victims of road crashes and there is a tragic level of deaths and injuries amongst motorcyclists. Perhaps you could one by one just say something about why that is the case in your view and, in particular, is there a reason why this year the figures seem to be worse than in previous years? Shall I come to the motorcycling organisations themselves to begin with? Craig, do you want to say something?

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** Yes, thank you, Chair, and thank you also to the Committee for the opportunity to come and talk to you today about this very important issue.

The MCIA has worked for many years with TfL on various initiatives. I should say right at the outset that we are very appreciative of all the work that TfL has done through various individual initiatives over the years. If you look at the casualty statistics through the early 2000s, for example, there was quite a marked decrease in casualties at a point when we were starting to look at initiatives that went beyond just safety and were also about how motorcyclists can operate within traffic. We had issues like bus lanes starting to be considered. We did research into the use of advanced stop lines and various other things.

Since the economic downturn, mileages have decreased a little bit for motorcycle usage and the market has gone down. Since 2013, we are looking at about a 12% year-on-year increase. The market is very different now. There are a lot more commuter motorcyclists on the roads. Scooters, mopeds and what you could call multiuse larger bikes seem to be the most predominant bikes being sold in London and the southeast.

In terms of the increase in casualties, it can only partly be explained by increases in usage. We have seen a lot of redesign of London streets in recent times, which has narrowed road space in many cases. We still feel that what TfL is doing - and it is good work - in the area of specific safety needs to be much more enriched by the

consideration of the linkage of motorcycle use, traffic use and transport policy. Maybe a lack of that is not helping in terms of bringing casualties down.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Thank you very much. Graeme, why do you think that motorcyclists are disproportionately represented amongst casualties?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** This year, as Craig [Carey-Clinch] has pointed out, there is a growth. There is an increase in economic activity. There is an increase, we believe, in motorcycle activity on the roads.

In terms of education for riders and new riders particularly - they are the ones who are at particular risk in this very demanding environment - the compulsory basic training (CBT) and the training undertaken by riders prior to going on the road is 25 years old. The Department for Transport (DfT) has only just recently revised that. The MCI is setting standards for riding training and the DfT is also, through the Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency (DVSA), going back into the business of scrutinising the training and the content of it. Therefore, we have come to the end of what had previously been a very successful initial training scheme and we are now embarking on something slightly better.

In terms of engineering, I would echo the view that the demands on London's street space are considerable, as they always have been, but the diminution of some areas is causing a problem. Many things have been done in London streets to improve safety for many user groups, but access to those areas is not universal. Access to many of those areas that may offer safer travel and remove the need to overtake into oncoming traffic and so on exists on TfL roads but not in all of the boroughs. There is such inconsistency in areas of the highway that motorcyclists do and do not have access to as they travel through London that it leads to general confusion.

Therefore, I am optimistic for training. The end of something has been part of it. Road space is under pressure and is discontinuous. To use again the expression, 'road safety for all' needs to be enriched in London. In terms of the enforcement of transgression, I do not believe there are any more motorcyclists committing traffic offences today than there are on any other day.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** We are going to have to dig into some of this. We are looking for some evidence base on some of this, but those were very helpful opening comments, Graeme.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** In terms of why motorcyclists are disproportionately represented, I am going to start from the point that travelling at speed on two wheels is inherently more risky than on four wheels with the protection of a car. That is why they are disproportionate. Therefore, the key thing really to look at is the trend and obviously we all want that to be coming down in terms of absolute numbers and casualty rates.

On the question as to why this year there has been an increase in deaths, which is worrying, there has been an increase in motorcycle sales. I do not have the latest figures on usage but what I understand is that there has been a general increase in motorcycle use on London.

I do not think there has been the focus on motorcycles that particularly pedal-cyclists have had over the last few years. That is not to criticise the focus on pedal-cycling safety; it is say that we also need to raise the focus on motorcycle safety. That is in the media and to the public at large.

I do not have evidence, I must admit, but there may well be something in the issue of congestion, the narrowing of lanes and the taking away of road space, which is leading to motorcyclists taking more risky

behaviours, undertaking, weaving and that sort of thing. That does require some quite detailed analysis, which I must admit I do not have.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** That was very helpful. Thank you. Very good. Leon, I should say that you have two hats on in a way. You are also a member of the TfL Roads Task Force, are you not?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** Yes, indeed. I am in many committees in TfL; the Design Review Group for Cycling as well.

The simple answer to the question of why motorcyclists are disproportionately represented in, let us say, people killed or seriously injured (KSIs) is actually grimly simple and it is that they are particularly vulnerable road users and almost identically to cyclists, ironically. What is important is to recognise that when you look at KSI figures in London, fairly consistently, cyclists are around about 20% and motorcyclists are around about 21%. It gives us a clue right from the start, which is perhaps misinterpreted at times, because we have a slightly different approach to two groups of two-wheeler riders. We are all very aware that cyclists are vulnerable people when they are on a two-wheeler, but there tends to be some view of motorcyclists that they are inherently dangerous and that therefore they are in a different category. However, in terms of the facts, we are talking about people on a vehicle on which they are completely exposed and often not seen.

I do not know if you want me to illustrate that with an example of where this takes us, but we have had some very important progress in TfL in one regard. It is talking about something that has come up so far and that is in terms of the adverse impacts that are inadvertently created by schemes that are very genuinely designed to enhance safety. In this little pack is the first of these pictures that you may see<sup>1</sup>. Ben [Plowden] and Lilli [Matson] have seen these. Although it started off as a difficult thing, it has turned into a good story.

One of the keys to increasing safety for motorcyclists is to be more observant as to what we are doing in London that actually increases risk. If you look at this first picture of a traffic island, what could possibly go wrong for powered two-wheeler (PTW) riders? “Nothing at all”, would be most people’s normal reaction. However, if you turn over the page, you will see that the ‘keep left’ sign, one of those flexible things, had been bashed away. As a matter of fact, this occurred in my area. Prior to the scheme going in, some of us - including me - said, “That ‘keep left’ sign will get knocked off by a truck. It is not ‘if’. It will”. It did. As a consequence, the unfortunate scenario was - and Ben and Lilli worked very closely with me on this because, as it happened, it involved a member of Ben’s team - that it was a bright, sunny day and there was a cyclist on the left-hand side as you are looking at the scene. There was a chap on a scooter and he saw the cyclist and thought to overtake him. There was no speed issue here, incidentally. It would give the cyclist as much room as possible. He saw the big ‘keep left’ sign on the right of the island, saw the cyclist, picked the middle path and then found himself on the tarmac with what police described as ‘life-changing injuries’.

That was all very grim and it has taken us three years from starting to look at this. This is about is one key to reducing casualties: it is to enable designers of schemes to think about this other third group of vulnerable road users.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Yes, that was very helpful.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** If I could just finish, the last bit of this is that - again, thanks to Lilli - we tracked how this incident was treated. If you look at the accident report that ended up with TfL and is all that TfL would have to work on, it says that the cause of the crash was a hit kerb.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 2 to the minutes

The great thing about this that I would like to report right now is that Ben and Lilli have been very supportive and a handbook is being designed as we speak to try to address those issues. That is one of the keys.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** That was a really helpful illustration of the sorts of things that can go wrong. We will dig into the data issue a little bit more. Ben and Lilli, does one of you or both of you want to say something?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Yes. Probably just because of the statistics, it sits more with my team.

Just to give a little bit of context, motorcycle collisions are one of the most difficult things that we work on and that we work with the London boroughs on to address. Over the longer term, the trends are, apparently, positive. If we look back at the baseline period against which we monitor, 2005 to 2009, there has been a 34% reduction in the number of KSIs. It is down 50% since 2000 and so that is good news. However, we are absolutely focused on the fact that last year and particularly this year there has been a real increase in people being killed, in particular, on motorbikes.

You asked why. As soon as we identified that spike in January this year, we were doing additional data analysis and taking as early as we could the information we could get from the police. What we found was consistent with what was in the fatalities report that we commissioned back in 2013 on motorcycle fatalities. Cyclists, pedestrians and motorcyclists are all vulnerable road users in London. They are our key priority and focus.

They have different causes of their collisions. When you look at the fatalities, there are different factors. Around 48% involved excessive speeding. Around 32% involved no other vehicle being involved. It was interesting that around 19% of the riders had less than one year's experience and so this training point is extremely important. There was an over-representation of big bikes over 500 cc. This is not the same as what we are dealing with for pedestrians. It is not the same as what we are dealing with for cyclists. It has very particular measures.

The recommendation from the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) in that fatalities report is that we focus on things like speeding, on training, on getting riders to wear personal protective equipment (PPE). The road design is important and I hope we will get a chance to talk a bit about that because it is important, but it is those other factors that we really need to work on and we have been working on them with the London boroughs. They would be really interesting for your inquiry.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Lilli, what was the source of that data?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** This is a report by TRL. It is publicly available on the website but we of course can send it to you. It is a detailed study of the 90 fatality studies that the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) provided to TRL on our behalf so that it could go very much into the data.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** We would really appreciate that because we were distressed by not finding enough data.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** No. If you remember, we have talked before about the Road Safety Action Plan, which absolutely prioritises the three vulnerable road user groups in London: pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists. For all three we have a safety working

group, for all three we have done a detailed fatalities study and for all three we have an action plan with, in this case, motorcyclists, 29 actions --

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** We knew about the actions. I had not seen the detailed data.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** -- and the fatalities study, absolutely. If you need more data, obviously, just let me know because this is fatalities but there is also detailed information on serious casualties, which is similar but not exactly the same.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Yes. There have been quite a lot of near-misses as well. We have read somewhere that something like 60% of drivers experience a near-miss. Any kind of data that you have would be extremely helpful to us. Ben, did you want to add anything?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** The only thing I would add, Chair, is that, as Lilli has suggested, the approach we are taking to dealing with the 80% of KSIs that are now accounted for by those three groups is completely consistent for all three groups. We have a very detailed analysis based on the police reports and other research like the TRL research on what we think is happening when these KSIs arise. We have a programme that is developed with all the key stakeholders that takes the form of the actions plans we have just talked about. That spans right across highway design and engineering measures where that is necessary and appropriate, marketing and communications, training, enforcement and all the things that you would expect us and our partners to do.

Therefore, I hope you are reassured that we are taking motorcycle safety very seriously alongside the safety of those other two vulnerable road user groups. Although the factors are different between the different groups, necessarily, because of the different forms of travel involved, the approach that we are taking in terms of analysis, scheme delivery and engagement with stakeholders is entirely consistent across all three groups.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** OK. That sounded like a concluding comment rather than an opening one, Ben. Before we accept your reassurances, Ben, we will dig in a little bit more, if I may. One of the things that has been apparent - and I think you referenced something there, Lilli - is the different safety record and the different size, weights and types of two-wheelers.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** If I can add a bit, I am sure the motorcycle representatives will actually know more than I.

As I said, in the fatalities study, the representation of the 500 cc bikes, the bigger bikes, was the most common bike in fatalities. From my understanding, around 50% of the vehicle makeup in London is scooters, but they are disproportionately less represented in the casualties. In short, if you have a bigger bike and you are not well trained, the chances of having a loss of control collision are greater. Also, the chances of the potential to go much faster also exist. Therefore, there is an issue there.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Would our colleagues agree with that? Yes?

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** Broadly speaking, yes. It is interesting to hear about the speed involvement in the accidents. It would be interesting to drill further into it to see how speed contributed towards that through lack of anticipation, other vehicles on the road and that sort of thing. It certainly is a key issue. Certainly the market figures do show a predominance of scooters and mopeds.

It is important also to remember that to look at these figures we need to include what is going on in the Home Counties because so many people commute into London. It gives you a better idea of the whole market makeup when you do look at the Home Counties. The adventure sport machines seem to be quite popular now and they probably comprise the larger section of the higher-cc bikes that Lilli [Matson] mentioned just now.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** One of the things that we observed in the data was that motorcyclist casualties seem to have increased faster in London than in the rest of the UK. Any comments on that? Is that just about the economy?

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** I have a slightly tangential but hopefully relevant point. PACTS has published what we call the *Constituency Road Safety Dashboard*. We have looked at STATS19, the same police casualty records, on the basis of where people live rather than where the crash occurred. On average - not just motorcycles - 50% of those crashes involving residents happened outside the constituency. Of course, it is very relevant to what happens in London, but if you are trying to get messages across to motorcyclists, for example, it may be more appropriate to target them where they live. Looking at it on a residency basis can be quite useful.

On that basis of residents, of the top ten constituencies with the highest levels of motorcycle casualties - all casualties, including slight - London had seven out of the top ten. Brent Central had about three times the national average. I am just saying that there are different ways of looking at it. Particularly with the large bikes, it may well be that Londoners are going out into Kent or wherever and the crashes are occurring there.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** In terms of drilling into the data, part of the point of that first illustration was that we actually do not know a lot of stuff that we would like to know. For example, the illustration of that particular casualty will have been listed as a 'loss of control'.

Part of the problem that we have when looking at this data is a frustration with not having rich enough data. STATS19 is helpful, but part of the thing that Lilli [Matson] and I were interested in was to see - and we happened to know, because we had a connection with this particular incident, what had happened - what we ended up with you and your Committee Members actually looking at in terms of data. I would make a strong plea for any efforts you can make to encourage more resourcing - primarily from the DfT, I would expect - in terms of enriching that data and the casualty record. That would be great. It is a very, very difficult problem.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** It would be helpful if we could have some comments from everybody on whether or not they feel that the data that is collected on causality of accidents and contributing factors is robust. I have had it commented to me by somebody else that the way the police collect this data is rather clunky and unreliable. Handwritten records are passed down the line and there is loss of information. It is not just necessarily that it is not well captured in the first instance. Does anybody want to comment on the data collection? I have seen Craig first and then Lilli [Matson].

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** I would like to address the previous question first of all, which was about the overall situation in the UK.

Looking at the figures there, all casualties are down over the baseline by 11% with a 38% reduction. That gives some comparison. In fatalities, London is 37% over the baseline but had a 14% increase in overall casualties. There is certainly a different situation. It is partly because when you come into London there is almost no facility given to motorcycle riding in the same way that you get for some other modes of transport.

Long term, though, in London, we have since 1993 a market increase of around 100% in the numbers of bikes in use on London streets, but the long-term historical trend is 29% down on deaths and 5% down on casualties. What we are looking at here is trying to tackle a short-term and very worrying shift-around in the stats rather than a long-term issue of more motorcycling leading to more casualties. That simply is not actually the case.

In terms of data collection, STATS19, I believe, is the form that is still used for that. Getting changes to this is quite difficult and that is something you might want to talk to the DfT about at some point.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** The worrying thing there, though, is that to assume that this is a short-term trend is to miss the possibility that there might be some long-term things happening. Things have been changing very rapidly on London's roads, not just the engineering you have been talking about but other things going on. We have seen a huge increase in minicabs, for example, and congestion has risen. There is a lot that is changing and so I do not know that we can assume that this is a blip. It has been put to me that this is just a spike but it might not be and we need to get on to that.

Are there any comments from people about the quality and the robustness of the data that we are all looking at? Lilli?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** I do not want to keep going back to the data point. It is worth us writing in because the information that we have in terms of our comparison with other big cities such as Birmingham, Newcastle, Manchester and Leeds is that they last year saw a 16% increase in casualties whereas we were seeing a reduction in some areas. It is not going to help you if we start having a discussion about data, but I would like to have the opportunity to be able to set out the casualty data on motorcycles and submit it to you for consideration, if that is helpful.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** The point that Leon [Mannings] was making - and I think we are all alive to it as well - is that the data as collected and passed on is not very rich. The [police] officer onsite might not be somebody who would see that issue.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** No. We are absolutely agreed on that. This is a current and ongoing discussion between TfL and the MPS.

Our ideal is to get handheld devices for the police so that we do not have a three-month delay with handwritten information, which may be partial even though I know they are trying to do their best in the situation. We would like handheld devices so that we can have instant access to that data. That is our wish and that is what we are talking about. It would be much more free and flexible. The officers could record exactly what they see and it would not be limited. It is actually a little yellow paper book where you tick boxes. It is very restrictive.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Yes, that is what I have heard about it.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** We miss valuable data, which could be the data that Leon [Mannings] is talking about.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** In terms of the work that you have been doing, Lilli, on this, did you say that you had been doing some more qualitative work like reading coroner's reports, for example?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Unfortunately, when there is a fatality, you go much beyond the yellow book. There is an actual police investigation and a much richer source of information. Nevertheless, it all starts from the handwritten notes. First of all, getting every incident even the near-misses recorded gives you more data. Thankfully, there are only 30 fatalities, but it is not enough data to really get hold of. We want to know about all the collisions because that will give us patterns that we can follow.

Other things we have been looking at are things like hospital episode statistics. Someone might have just a little near-miss and it is not recorded in any police effort, but it is recorded if they then go to hospital. If we start collecting that data, again, we get a richer picture about where these incidents are happening. That is an example.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** I have one more question from me and then I will come to Dick [Richard Tracey AM], if I may. I hear what you say about motorcyclists: by definition, they are on two wheels, they are on powerful vehicles, they are exposed and they are vulnerable. However, motorcycles are also disproportionately involved in collisions with pedestrians. Would anybody like to offer some explanation as to why that is apparently the case?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** I am afraid that the data on this is fairly robust in the sense that, when you look at pedestrian casualties, the number one contributory factor is failing to look properly. It is a very, very high proportion. The tragedy is that in London, which is one of the biggest cities in the world, it is a very different business if you fail to look properly if you are a pedestrian in London than in many other parts of the UK. Almost every day when I am riding in on my scooter or motorcycle, I have a pedestrian step in front of me. I happen to be very keen on staying alive and keeping everybody else alive, but other people maybe have their minds on other things. Therefore, this is quite a critical issue.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Leon, we are talking about a population where children and older people are disproportionately represented amongst pedestrian casualties. When you say they failed to look properly, it does throw some blame triggers. We are interested in this environment being safe for anybody. Why would people fail to look adequately for motorbikes but --

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** There is an incredibly important distinction between blame and responsibility. 'Blame' is a very pejorative word and it is not one that I use. The reason that pedestrians fail to look properly range from being on the phone to looking at something on the other side of the road and, to be blunt about it, being intoxicated. There is no training for pedestrians, etc, anymore and so, in terms of --

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** That might explain some pedestrian casualties. Why are motorcyclists over-represented in this scenario?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** I am not sure about the extent to which they are. I have not seen that data. Have you?

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** As Leon says, if you look at the statistics and the STATS19 police report, quite rightly, it does say 'failed to look' and it records that as a contributory factor in a very high proportion of pedestrian casualties, not just motorcycle casualties. However, it is a contributory factor; it is not about blame or responsibility. There is also a big question mark about the validity of that coding. Almost by definition, if a pedestrian steps into the street, it is easy for the police officer to say 'failed to look'. We and others have questioned the meaningfulness of that.



You could equally ask if the driver should have looked a bit more closely or if the motorcyclist should have looked out for the possibility that a pedestrian might step out. The STATS19 data is very good for when and where and so forth. It is not very good at explaining causation or attributing blame.

In terms of why motorcyclists are more likely to be over-represented, first of all, there is a perceptual issue about what one expects to see. Drivers and other road users expect to see cars or buses. They do not expect to see cyclists to nearly the same extent.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** They are less visible, yes.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** They are obviously smaller. They are travelling, often, more quickly. They may be nearer the kerb. There is a whole series of practical reasons.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** That is very helpful.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** That is not to say that there are not issues about pedestrians looking at their phones and all of that.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** Just to add quickly to that, it is very illustrative of the clear need for initiatives such as BikeSafe. This whole issue of being aware of other road users, the promotion of the sense of shared responsibility for using the road, in a wider sense the need to improve training and improve the quality of instruction and so on is an area we are very interested in and so is TfL when it comes to dealing with taking responsibility, as Leon [Mannings] puts it. I do not want to see a blame game here, but we can avoid that by upping the game with motorcycle training and, of course, awareness of road conditions and road safety amongst other road users.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Thank you for that.

**Richard Tracey AM:** There was just one follow-up I had to what Lilli was saying about the data collection and the desire for handheld devices to be used by police officers.

I wonder if I could ask the other guests what the experience is with other forces in the country. Clearly, if Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe's [Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis] statements of yesterday come to pass, the Road Traffic Division in the MPS is going to be even further stretched than it is now and it seems to be understaffed, in my experience. What are the other forces like? How well do they do on this kind of thing?

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** It is a mixed bag. One of the reasons that the work Lilli [Matson] outlined is so important is because it helps to enrich what we are lacking from the basic STATS19 form. When you are looking at police officers and how they are trained to use STATS19, we know that tends to vary around the country. Most of them are very good but, in the heat of that particular situation, particularly if an officer has to deal with a very unpleasant, distressing situation, having to then immediately start collecting data and filling all of this in or even looking at somebody who has gone in an ambulance and trying to decide if they have a slight or serious injury and not actually knowing, can sometimes lead to some skews in the data.

Certainly from a national sense, I know that PACTS, the MCIA and the user groups have all thought from time to time that a more robust look at how we get the initial collection data done and how we train police officers in an ongoing way to use the STATS19 form or something else is something that really does require urgent

attention. At the end of the day, with the screeds of data that we see in the accident reports both in London and outside, we rely on these forms to record these things accurately.

**Richard Tracey AM:** Are there some particularly good examples?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** If I can just elaborate on this point, I totally support Lilli's [Matson] view about this, but in the end it unfortunately does come down to cost.

There is another aspect that the Committee should embrace and that is this. A police officer's job is to prevent crime. They are not researchers. They are not data collectors. Again, going back to the incident I showed you, the first police officer on the scene had finished his shift and we were expecting him - or in fact his colleagues - to come along to collect data. Therefore, it is important that we do not start being overcritical about the collectors of the data. It is the mechanisms.

Lilli [Matson] says we now have technology that speeds up the process for the police. I am guessing that the police have to make decisions as to what they spend their money on, but from our perspective - and I think that is all of us on this side of the table - we would very much welcome any influence that the Members can have to get this equipment funded for the police so that we can know more about what is happening.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** It would be better for the officers as well, would it not? It would be more convenient.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** Can I just briefly come in on that point? The device is called CRASH [Collision Recording and Sharing], which is something like Computer Recording of Accident Statistics Handheld, I think. A number of police forces do have it. The rollout has been slower than was hoped. I could probably get you some figures on which forces have it and which do not, if that is helpful.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** That would be very helpful and also any feedback you have about how useful they find it.

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** You touched on experience and education being a contributory factor. Are there any statistics to show the breakdown of motorcycling casualties, be it the motorcyclist or someone else involved, by age? If so, to what extent are different age groups at risk and how can TfL focus its efforts on those most at risk?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** Yes, there are. One of the richest sources of data on this, strangely enough, is insurance companies because of course they need it to make the most astute judgements as to how much they charge for covering a particular age group.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** That is good.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** The casualty statistics are published by age groups. Perhaps not unexpectedly but unfortunately, the most at-risk or the ones with the highest accident rates are young groups, around 19- and 20-year olds. We are very aware that the BikeSafe product is quite difficult to get those groups to engage with. We have quite a lot of success. It is generally men who are involved in collisions and it is generally men who ride motorbikes in London. They are, primarily, the older and middle-aged groups, the 20s, 30s and 40s, and they will come to the BikeSafe training, but we are struggling, to a degree, to really hit that target younger age group. We are looking at working with

training colleges and working through the boroughs to try to encourage that age group to come along to training because that is actually who we need to target.

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** That covers the bikers themselves. Val [Shawcross CBE AM] mentioned that group of pedestrians who would be children and elderly people. Would that be in that data as well?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Yes, it is. London has a good record in reducing child casualties. They have come down very, very significantly and in advance of the national trends. That reflects the fact that all the London boroughs are very engaged in road safety with our schools. TfL works through the London boroughs to educate children right from preschool level about road safety. However, it is the specific, bespoke motorcycle training that we are really very interested in getting to that age group.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Maybe there is a thought for the future about whether or not the insurance industry would want to incentivise the youngest and most at-risk drivers by saying, "If you get this training, we will give you a discount", because the insurance costs are horrendous, as I know from my godson having written off my car. Caroline, we should move on. Thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Yes, I was going to pick up the Motorcycle Safety Action Plan, which was published 18 months ago. If I could start with TfL and ask what progress have you made so far?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** OK. There is a Motorcycle Safety Working Group, which representatives here are all part of. It oversees the ongoing delivery of that plan. There were 29 actions within the plan and 24 of them are underway. Some of the ones that are not underway relate to ongoing future pieces of research that we hope to do.

The main actions are looking at how we can target speed-related collisions and how we can promote PPE. That is a particular area we are interested in. We have been talking again about how we can increase not just the penetration of BikeSafe training but also the quality of the people who do that training. We have been working with colleagues here on whether we could get more people trained to deliver that training. I would say that with 24 out of 29 actions underway we are doing well, but obviously other members of that working group may also want to comment. I do not know how much detail you want me to delve into.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** I am more interested in the work around road design. What are you doing to really embed motorcycle safety in road design?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** There is an *Urban Motorcycle Design Handbook*. The draft will be ready to share with people around later this autumn. Members here such as Leon [Mannings] have been directly involved in helping to scope out and get that research done.

We are then going to be offering free training to all boroughs on how to use that handbook and we are meeting with boroughs on 5 November to take that forward.

I also personally have met all the boroughs that through our analysis we have identified as high-risk boroughs for motorcycling, boroughs such as Lewisham, Wandsworth, Westminster, Croydon and Barnet. I have met all of them this year to talk specifically about initiatives that they could take. That has meant that boroughs such as Wandsworth have now allowed motorbikes into bus lanes in that borough. That was on its own initiative but

it was sparked by the conversations we have been having. It is not just through the Action Plan. It is how it filters out into our wider activity.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** It is worth adding, Caroline, that any scheme that we commission - and the same would be true for the boroughs - would go through a formal road safety audit process. As part of the basic design process around new highway schemes, you would put that through a road safety audit process that follows very specifically designed criteria in terms of assessing the potential impacts not just for motorcyclists but for any road user of a change in the way the road is designed or operated. We are building on that with the design guidance that Lilli [Matson] has mentioned but, as a matter of design practice, you would always do a road safety audit as part of a scheme design anyway.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** How does that sit? We have this guidance about how to design roads so that they are safe for motorcyclists, but then of course you have your cycling guidance and you have pedestrians. How does it all mesh together so that it is not - I do not know - borough x going, "I just tick a box here and there is another one and another one"?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Urban Design London (UDL) is a group that sits within Ben's [Plowden] department and offers that training. The reality is that London's roads do have all those road users and that, when you design a scheme or any alteration to the road network, you do need to specifically think about people in vehicles, people on foot, people on bikes and people on motorcycles. These are ways of trying to step back and look at the network from that prism, if you like, or from that perspective. UDL through its training and through our engagement is helping to uplift the technical capability of boroughs. It is not that you should just go and look at one book. It is complex, as is the road network.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** OK. I am going to just pick up a couple of other actions. You were going to look at a new approach involving schools, colleges and others in order to reach out to younger riders. We have heard today that they are a huge risk group, so could you spell out a bit more what you have done on that?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Yes. One of the things that we have been doing is looking at whether we could redesign the BikeSafe training to not even call it 'training' and make it more engaging and appealing. This is actually the conversation that we have been having with representatives and so that is work in progress. We do not have the fixed outcome yet, but it is something that we are actually working on.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** That is one that you would not say has been --

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** It is not done.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** It is not done and so that is work in progress. OK. Let me just pick out perhaps one of the others. What about the tool to encourage people to take up PPE, particularly firms and so on, for people? We have had lots more people travelling in and bringing their suits to work, as it were. What progress have you made on that?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** We ran a design competition because one of the reasons why people do not wear it is because they do not like what traditional PPE looks like. We ran a design contribution to encourage new designers to come forward with attractive,

female-friendly or office-friendly protective clothing. I would say that so far the results of that design competition have not been amazing. We do not have, we think, a high enough quality yet, but we are going to go back around that. One of the barriers to people wearing it is that they do not like the style that it offers and so we need to keep trying to engage with the design community. We have had that design competition. It was not 100% successful in terms of getting something new and really stylist out, but we are going to go back around that one.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** Any activity that the police would do, for example, through the Motorcycle Safety Team, if they are stopping people by the roadside not necessarily when there is an offence but just in terms of engagement, it would always include an element around the importance of PPE to increase the chance that you will not suffer such a serious injury if you were to come off your bike. We are making sure that where we are engaging directly with motorcyclists both through BikeSafe and also through things like roadside engagement, the whole issue around PPE is part of that conversation. Typically, from another motorcyclist who happens to be a police officer but is obviously understanding the circumstances that the motorcyclist is in.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Probably what would be useful, if we have not had it already, is for you to write and give us details on your recommendations and your progress so far in your traffic lighting TfL's progress.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** Yes.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Perhaps I could ask our panel, then. How do you assess the success of the plan so far? Does it feel like lots of nice words and not enough action?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** The situation is this. Ben is quite right to say that TfL has a similar approach in the sense that it has Safety Action Plan working groups. However, when you compare TfL's resourcing for, for example, cycling - because that is the closest, which is not to exclude pedestrians - for these sorts of actions, cycling has a budget at the moment of somewhere around £1 billion. The Cycle Superhighways themselves are going to cost £160 million. There is an almost negligible amount in cash being allocated to the same process. We have the same process and we have working groups and, indeed, this handbook that both Ben and Lilli [Matson] - and we are grateful to them - have supported will be a step in the right direction. However, it is almost infinitesimally tiny relative to the other half, if you like, of vulnerable road users on two wheels. Therefore, there lies a problem.

Moving back to BikeSafe and the training that Graeme [Hay] is very involved with, again, this is a matter of resourcing. It is important to recognise that the BikeSafe schemes are not actually training.

BikeSafe is a fantastic asset, but - and Lilli [Matson] is quite right - it does not generally attract the people we want to reach most. There is a ScooterSafe scheme but, again, it is piggybacking on police officers and it is not the same thing as professional trainers. If we could have the same sort of approach to training and resourcing that there is going into schools, certainly in the upper levels of school life, it could well have an impact on these young people whom we cannot reach through BikeSafe.

The third thing is in terms of our whole safety audit procedure, which Ben [Plowden] mentioned. This is not just a London issue; this is something that we have been discussing with the DfT. The fact is that the scheme you saw at the beginning passed through the safety audit process. This is not a TfL problem and this is not a Greater London Authority (GLA) problem; this is a systemic problem in the safety audit process that we are trying to get some support from the DfT about. To some extent, TfL is addressing that issue in that it is

saying, "OK, you can design your scheme and it will get through your road safety audit. However, have you thought about X, Y and Z because it is not automatically picked up by the safety audit?"

Again, it is the resourcing that there is for getting that word out. What we would like to see is a greater proportion of resourcing allocated to making sure that, for example, with all 33 boroughs, it is not a matter of whether a borough designer feels like going to a course but is a matter of saying, "TfL will provide you with a course and we would expect every borough to make sure that somebody at least from the design team has attended it". Of course, it is always a cost of money but, as I said, one of the keys to reducing PTW casualties is having a step back and looking at the huge disparity in resourcing that we currently have. That is not to say that we do not want to improve cycling casualties because, of course, we do. All motorcyclists are cyclists. In fact, the Chairman of MAG cycles more than he motorcycles.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Basically, on the Action Plan, you are happy with it overall but you just want more resourcing behind it?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** I would not go quite so far as to say 'happy' but --

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** What are the things you are not? That is what I am trying to get at. I hear the resourcing bit, but what it is that you are not happy with that you do not think is being progressed enough or being dealt with satisfactorily?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** It is a step in the right direction, but ultimately the reach that it will have and the impact that it will have is not as great as we would like it. To make the impact greater requires more resourcing from TfL, which of course the GLA has to consider.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** The Safety Action Plan is an excellent piece of work. We have helped develop it with TfL. We are doing a lot of work to help implement it. It is excellent as far as it goes. To an extent, I would mirror some of what Leon [Mannings] has said.

We talked about resourcing and the resourcing into cycling safety was mentioned. A lot of that resourcing comes from the point of view of improving accessibility and can be classed as being under some of those budgets. Perhaps with the actual safety allocated figures for cycling and motorcycling, the disparity is not as wide as you think. However, much of those millions being spent on cycling help to improve their vulnerability by improving accessibility.

Going back to the very core point about why riders are more vulnerable, the big problem with that is that, as money gets poured into promoting very much one mode of transport over another, motorcycling gets squeezed and so motorcyclists are proportionately more vulnerable on the road. The industry feels very strongly that there needs to be a greater linkage between the Safety Action Plan and overall command policy when it comes to London's road transport and an overt recognition that motorcycling has a part to play. If that can be done, then we feel that would help to release, in a psychological sense, more support for specific safety actions and also road engineering and other publicity actions to reduce rider vulnerability.

The problem we have at the moment is that any projects that are suggested or any ideas that are suggested that might even remotely be construed as even in a very tiny way promoting motorcycling tend to be rejected. What that does is to sustain high vulnerability levels. The work that Ben [Plowden] and Lilli [Matson] and their team are doing is absolutely excellent, but it is constrained by this overall attitude towards motorcycle use in London. That is contributing to wider vulnerability in the industry.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Is it that in a future Mayor's Transport Strategy you want to see motorcyclists far more recognised and so on?

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** More recognised as a legitimate mode of transport that can contribute to reducing congestion and pollution and, at the same time, that 'mood music' may be of great assistance to TfL's efforts to improve safety.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** The Safety Action Plan is good as far as it goes. At the moment, our efforts are committing to supporting it and seeing that it is delivered.

Particularly around the issue of training, there are actions and activities going on in partner organisations like the police activity to stop motorcyclists on the side of the road in two seasons this year to introduce them to BikeSafe on a 'goodie-bag' basis, "Here you are. Your riding is fine, but had you done this?" It is pushing huge numbers of people into BikeSafe, which, as Leon [Mannings] says, is only an awareness experience but it can be all it takes.

The reason I mentioned that as an example in connection with the delivery of the plan is that the delivery of that plan depends on the funding of more organisations than this one. Whilst I hear all the concerns about funding - and they are real - I am also aware of the vulnerability of the delivery of the plan because they are budgets that may fall outside the control of that.

With regards to the suggestion of integrating motorcycling, my life's ambition would be to have, simply, motorcycling recognised and mainstreamed as part of the solution. With the forthcoming electric motorcycles, for an ultra-low emission city, that is what it is going to be. It is no good, as I say. I support the plan and we need to just crack on and deliver.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Are there any actions in the plan that you are concerned are proving harder to achieve than perhaps you had originally thought?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** No. The one I have concern about is actually the external funding. I do not need to remind anybody here that it is a bumpy time, is it not?

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Yes. David, any comments on the Action Plan, anything you think is proving difficult to achieve?

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** Broadly, we support the Action Plan. In contrast to much of other parts of England, it is streets ahead. I was very encouraged at the last London Road Safety Steering Committee meeting to hear a presentation about how that is being refreshed with a whole battery of new measures.

I am not aware of the resourcing issue exactly and so I cannot say whether the resources are right or wrong. Cycling has been promoted for certain reasons, not all about safety, and so you cannot simply compare one budget with another. However, certainly in terms of casualty figures, it warrants good, adequate resourcing.

Just one issue about motorcycle safety is that very often the focus is on the motorcyclist. Often the way the statistics are presented is in terms of victims. What can the victim or the motorcyclist do or not do? With

cyclists, we have seen a lot of effort going into things like detection systems so that trucks detect pedal cyclists alongside. Something like 50% of motorcyclist casualties involved a turning vehicle.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Just like cyclists, yes.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** Indeed. This is not the speed crush of cyclists. This is junctions. Technologies are coming along so that cars can be fitted with detection systems to alert the driver. Whether more could be done on that I know is not within the powers of TfL, but more along those tracks --

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** TfL can lobby as it has been for heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and things.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** Indeed.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** It could be part of the next phase to lobby for some of those modifications.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** Yes, vehicle technology is something that is an active consideration by manufacturers at a global and a European level. Following those developments technically would be a very good thing to do.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** To pick on David's point, something like two-thirds of motorcycle KSIs are at junctions precisely for the reason, Val, you were implying. You have people turning across one another. Quite a lot of our activity around broader road safety marketing campaigns is absolutely about making sure that other road users are aware of the chance that there will be somebody approaching a junction at speed. We are about to launch a new campaign where that is one of the key messages. We have done a particular campaign about junctions already.

It is very much about - as the other members of the panel have suggested - making sure that anybody who is out there on the network is fully aware of the chance that they will come across somebody else doing something in their path because motorcyclists are generally going to be going faster certainly cyclists and going faster than stationary traffic and because they are going to be, in some cases, coming up alongside a line of stationary traffic. If you have a car pulling in or out at a junction, it is obviously part of the reason why they are more vulnerable and more susceptible to these sorts of more serious collisions and casualties.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** Moving slightly tangentially but on to this point in terms of what has happened to junctions, I ran out of coloured ink but there is a picture here in your pack that is worth looking at<sup>2</sup>. It is about the Embankment. The picture at the bottom is the visionary view of how to make roads safer, in particular for cyclists but there are various aspects of this particular part of the scheme - this is one of the Superhighway schemes - which is designed to reduce the impact on vulnerable road users at junctions and, indeed, on carriageways.

However, look at the top picture, which is the reality of the lane that you can see with traffic in it. What is actually going to happen here is that whilst cyclists and possibly pedestrians - although we are still a bit unsure about how pedestrians are going to be affected - may well be massively protected as they go along the Embankment and encounter stiff traffic going around Parliament Square, etc, and may have their safety

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix 2 to the minutes



enhanced, if you look closely at the picture at the top, you will find in the middle of it is an emergency services motorcycle. That motorcycle is already in jammed traffic, which is difficult, but a consequence of the scheme on the left side of the situation, which enhances cycling safety, is that these three lanes of traffic will now become a contraflow. Two lanes will go in one direction and the other lane will go in the other. That means that, certainly in that section of highway, we are introducing a new prospect of head-on collision for PTWs.

This is something that needs further thought before we go too far down this route because, in very simple terms, this will make life more dangerous for somebody on a PTW.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** I do not necessarily agree with that but let us just park that, though. We have heard your comments on that.

My final question was around boroughs. How are boroughs engaging with this? You have a plan and most people are saying, "It is going fairly well but we would like more resource". If you do not get all the boroughs generally on board, it is not worth the paper it is written on.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** It is very mixed, in my experience. It depends not necessarily on politics in the context of Labour, Conservative or Liberal Democrat but on the outlook of the particular borough. In some boroughs, certainly from the motorcyclists' point of view, we find a great deal of co-operation. Perhaps ironically for me personally, Westminster has become one, despite the fact that we had a distinct disagreement about its policy on parking. Other boroughs vary between being neutral to, frankly, being broadly hostile to anything that is about motorcycling.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Lilli, you said you have been out meeting boroughs. How is it going with the boroughs?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Within the context that the London boroughs are under pressure, obviously, in terms of resourcing, they are very engaged in this. We identified through analysis which boroughs had the greatest problems in terms of motorcycle safety, boroughs such as - as I mentioned before - Croydon, Lambeth, Lewisham, Wandsworth, Westminster and Barnet.

Lewisham, for example, has a very good approach. It has updated its website. It is offering discounted BikeSafe training. It is trying to get into the colleges. In Barnet, for example, we did a special initiative at the Ace Café on the A406 where there is a particular problem around speeding motorcyclists in that community.

As I mentioned, in Wandsworth, they are now doing the motorbikes in bus lanes. When we provide them with real evidence on the problem and they can take it to their decision-makers, I have found them motivated and engaged in dealing with this. We just recently - a couple of weeks ago - ran a special workshop for all boroughs about dealing with and planning for motorcycles and they were very engaged in this.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Did they all come?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Not all of them came, but it would be the utopia and we do not always get all boroughs to come. There is not a discrepancy between pedestrian safety in their attitude or cycle safety. They are engaged in this within the context that resources are tight within the boroughs.

**Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair):** Yes. That is fine.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** I know it is utopia to get all the boroughs along, but sometimes there are some boroughs that come to things more often than others. Are there any areas that you really would like to get into?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Not so much on this issue but, when that happens, we go to them. On this, we have been going out proactively because we know there is an issue.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** I wanted to raise the parking issue that Leon [Mannings] just mentioned. Is that not a safety issue as well and is there anything that is covered in the Safety Action Plan on parking for motorcycles?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** Not really.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Is it not at all?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** It is an issue but not a safety one.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Here is an example. You can see quite a long of angst on the streets of the West End over people trying to park. You have that anyway. There is a competition for road space. Then a motorcyclist puts up in a car-parking space and all hell can break loose. That is what I mean.

When we have that kind of competition and most of the vehicles are heading in one direction, we could save ourselves a lot of grief if the road designs and the Safety Action Plan actually dealt with that perennial problem. The last time we saw motorcyclists in London mobilising in a very big way was when the City of Westminster threatened to charge them for their parking spaces.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** It did not threaten; it did.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** They attended the council meetings at Westminster more so than the black cabbies have done at Mayor's Question Times here recently. I am just trying to find out if there has been any thought about that issue from TfL.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Obviously, most parking allocations are borough decisions on borough roads.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Yes, I realise that.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** It is not coming through as a key causal factor for why collisions occur, but it most probably is an issue and we are happy to look at it and work with the boroughs on that. I must admit it has not been coming through for us as a key safety issue.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** There is a broader point that might be the subject for another inquiry, which is that one of the resources that is now under huge pressure in London is kerbside space.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Yes, it is a competition.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** If you think about residents' parking, on-street paid-for parking; car-club bays, electric vehicle charging points, motorcycle parking, parking for loading at shops and bus stops, particularly in the town centres, in the centre in London and in inner London, you have a finite resource under huge pressure. Clearly, if you use it for one thing, you cannot use it for another thing, certainly, at any given point of the day. There is certainly an issue there. I am not sure it necessarily has safety implication but there is certainly a broader question around that.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** If you go to Cavendish Square on any day of the week, you will see. Craig?

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** There was some work done a few years ago in Rome and we did some in London as well - this is going back to just after 2000 - which looked at the number of kilometres or miles travelled by a motorcycle during a given day looking for parking. It was noted as being a vulnerability issue due to the fact that riders were distracted. TfL should take credit for something it did during that period, which was to look at some of this work and to pioneer secure parking on TfL roads. That along with some other things that we did, I feel, partly led to the fall in casualty rates during that period because it gave a psychological message about catering for demand at the time.

Since then, the policy has moved on and, as I say, we are not seeing supply keeping up with demand as more people want to commute by PTW. Really, it would be a great area for TfL to look at again.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** There is one key part of the solution to this. If you look at any European city, it will not have a problem with motorcycle parking. That is for one simple reason: every European city treats motorcycles very much as bicycles and as things that ease congestion and enable people to get about. They are not regarded as something that you enforce parking offences against because you can. In the UK - and this is not the fault of TfL at all - the fact of the matter is that if you are a borough you have to raise revenue and one way of doing that is through parking enforcement.

One way of approaching this is a little bit difficult for us in Britain to contemplate because it is rather a suspension of rules rather than making some new ones. However, if we approached parking of motorcycles in London - particularly in central London - in the same way as they do in every other European city, which is the same as we do with bicycles, and if we did not have this charging regime, we would have much less time spent - going back to your point - riding around.

I happened to have somebody to see in the Bond Street area two weeks ago. It took me 25 minutes to come in by scooter. It took me 20 minutes to find somewhere to park. There were plenty of places to park but, if I had parked in them, it would have cost me £60. Your point is a really interesting one about the safety issue because nearly half of my time on that journey was spent, unnecessarily, circulating an area where I could have parked. Maybe we will talk about that again.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** I am sorry. We need to move on. You have logged the point about parking. I would just say that we have to protect the interests of pedestrians as well and there is obviously huge competition for pavement space as well.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Yes, exactly. The main angst I have seen, Chair, has been over, for whatever reason, motorcyclists parking their motorcycles on the pavement. That causes more grief. You have heard the circumstances. Westminster Council was responding to that as much as anything else.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** OK. Let us get back to motorcycling safety issues.

**Richard Tracey AM:** We have already touched on the role of TfL in dealing with motorcyclists, but there are one or two statistical bits that we ought to just drill down. Where does motorcycle safety rank as a road safety priority in the TfL general policy?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):**

Perhaps that was a remark I made pre-emptively earlier on when I was taken up by the Chair. Motorcycling safety is a critical issue for us as part of the wider problem around vulnerable road users, who now account for four-fifths of the KSI collisions in London. You have heard from the very beginning of today's session that there is a particular issue around the over-representation of motorcyclists even amongst those vulnerable road users.

My point earlier was simply to say that we are trying to address the issue around motorcycle safety in a way that is as consistent as possible in our approach and in the sorts of actions we are taking, as we are for pedestrians and cyclists. It is a critical issue within the broader priority given to reducing casualties.

For example, I chair an internal road safety casualty reduction group, which involves everyone across TfL who is contributing to that, and I also chair the external safety group that David Davies just mentioned. There is a lot of activity both within TfL and between us and the other key partners in this agenda. There is, as you heard, a separate Motorcycle Safety Action Group, which is overseeing the delivery of the Safety Action Plan. It is very much up there in our priorities and we are doing as much as we can.

**Richard Tracey AM:** What about the TfL budget? You may want to write to us on this unless you have the figures in front of you, but how much money is allocated for motorcycle safety compared to cycle safety and pedestrian safety within the TfL budget?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** There are separate budgets for different programmes. Leon [Mannings] has mentioned the budget for the Cycling Vision. There is a road safety line in the business plan within TfL for all the activities around casualty reduction, which is about £260 million.

Can I tell you precisely how much of that is dedicated to motorcyclists specifically? No, because, clearly, engineering schemes or other things will have benefits for a number of different groups and so it is quite hard to pull out the particular part of it that is devoted to motorcycle safety. Similarly, other budgets like the Better Junctions projects and some of the other broader highway engineering schemes would also have benefits for motorcycle safety. Therefore, it is quite hard to pull out a specific sum for motorcycle safety specifically, but we can certainly have a go in terms of sending you something.

**Richard Tracey AM:** Yes, that would be quite helpful in terms of the discussions we have been having.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** We can have a look at that.

**Richard Tracey AM:** We have already talked about some people's perception of motorcyclists and whether, therefore, the perception sometimes drives policy one way or the other. One point that it seems to me has been coming out is about the benefits both in terms of the mass of a motorcycle as compared to a motorcar, a van or something like that and also of course the emissions.

Do you think that there is an argument that TfL should perhaps put the priority for motorcyclists higher in order to encourage more people to ride motorcycles and, indeed, reduce the congestion and potentially reduce emissions?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** We did a piece of work - and we discussed this with Leon [Mannings] on a number of occasions - as part of the Roads Task Force work looking at potential patterns of shift between different forms of transport. When we looked at motorcyclists specifically, the question was which journeys currently made by private car, van or lorry would it be sensible or desirable to shift to PTW, which would imply that those trips could not otherwise be made by walking, cycling or public transport. The number of trips where it would be beneficial to move from private car, lorry or van to motorcycling that could not otherwise be made by those other three modes - walking, cycling or public transport - was relatively small.

Therefore, in a sense, one of the issues of today's debate is where people are choosing to ride motorcycles, which you have heard they are, the critical priority is to make sure that those journeys are as safe as they can possibly. As you have heard, there is a clear mayoral imperative to actively increase cycling. That is not quite the same for motorcycling, I would expect.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** We need to be clear about this. The 'research', which I will put in inverted commas, that Ben is referring to is, I am afraid, deeply flawed. If I can put my Roads Task Force hat on for a moment, you will find in this pack that indeed there was a huge amount of work done for the Roads Task Force by TfL looking at the number of trips by car and/or van that could be shifted to walking and cycling and public transport. There was no work done at all about the potential for a PTW modal shift when walking, cycling and public transport could not meet an essential trip. The Roads Task Force made a formal recommendation that TfL engages in a proper study of this, which it has not done. The work that Ben is talking about was done on the back of the study that was on walking and cycling. I would strongly request the Chair to consider at least having conversations with TfL as to whether or not it would be prepared to look at that, but at the moment it has not been properly looked at.

My own back-of-a-fag-packet calculation is that there could be between 10%, 15% or even up to 20% of trips in London that could be shifted on a simple example as this. Every day we have white vans with one man or one woman in it who is a tradesperson and is going to work on a job. Let us take a plumber. The job is going to take him a week or ten days. He goes backwards and forwards from Essex, or wherever he lives because he cannot afford to live in central London, in a van. He could go to that job in a van on the first day, unload his kit and go backwards and forwards by scooter, but nobody has looked at the possibilities of that and indeed, as we said, in the Roads Task Force to investigate what the barriers might be.

One of them, coming back to Murad's point, is parking. If it were easy for a plumber to park their scooter in Mayfair or Wandsworth or wherever, then that modal shift might happen quite dramatically because my impression from talking to tradesmen, which I do, is that they do not enjoy spending an hour-and-a-half driving into London. If they could cut it in half, which a fantastic TfL study showed is an option in terms of real-time journeys, then that is an area that we would all benefit from in terms of some further work.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** In fact the Committee has been doing some work on white vans and the growth of light traffic and it was a question that we had scheduled to ask today because we thought about it in the context not just of services but of small deliveries.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** Absolutely.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Industry Association):** Just very quickly, we did submit to the Committee the motorcycle safety and transport policy plan as a framework for how we integrate safety policy with transport policy. One of the areas we are looking at is how you turn the 0-to-5-mile cycling paradigm into something revolving around two-wheeled transport at 0-to-35 miles. In considering modal shift, how do we utilise the best resources and the best tributes to cycling and commuter motorcycling in terms of encouraging modal shift among car drivers? We are working quite closely with the Bicycle Association of Great Britain on this and we hope to engage cyclists in this. That is just a bit of background about how modal shift ideas could be further extended through working with different road user groups.

**Richard Tracey AM:** Thank you.

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** I am looking at changing behaviour and education and some of my questions have been answered while Caroline [Pidgeon MBE AM] and Richard [Tracey AM] were asking.

My main question is: to what extent can improving motorcyclist training and education really reduce casualties? Graeme, just following on the point you made earlier, what specific things would you like to see happen to get people to see motorcycling as more of a mainstream way of transport? I am one of those people who looks at it more of a hobby than an actual valid way of moving from one point to another because it annoys me a lot. Yes, those are my two questions.

Leon, you have also mentioned PTWs in your pack a lot. I am not exactly sure what it stands for. I am guessing --

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Powered two-wheelers.

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** Powered two-wheelers. Sorry, I am new to the Committee and so I am getting the acronyms right.

How can motorcycling training and education really reduce casualties and are there specific things that you would like to see with that in general and more specifically in looking at motorcycling as mainstream?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** What we know in the insurance industry confirms that it is the younger age groups; it is the people 17-to-19 years old who are most at risk for motorcycle collisions. I have faith in the review of CBT by the DVSA. That starts now. It sits well with what the Motorcycle Industry Association has done with its accreditation. The problem with that training is that it is the only motorcycle specific training people get before going on the road. I would like that to be seen as the next step, if you like. Thinking of through education WalkSafe and then the Bikeability courses that most schools run, this is the next step.

The quality of the delivery of that training is something that has suffered. It has been market driven and it has been driven down probably to the basement. It is one-size-fits-all. It has been deemed a one-day event with two hours on the road at the end. The knowledge and experience of people who turn up for the training is evidentially, from the trainers surveyed by the DfT, hugely diverse. People turn up knowing all about riding a motorcycle apparently but with no knowledge of traffic signs. Some turn up having studied the Highway Code but with no experience of a motorcycle and this chap is going to take three or four of these people through in seven hours the whole process. It is unachievable.

The raising of the standard of that critical first point of training is really important. I fully support that and I am optimistic for it. Beyond that, in terms of additional training, the structure of the driving license at the

moment we genuinely believe, because it is only CBT, puts a person on the road on a bike with L-plates and an introduction to riding a motorcycle in live traffic. It is not a qualification. They remain an unqualified driver.

We have a system of drive-stratified licences that I know people would like to perhaps see for young people in motorcars. We have a stratified system which, because of the way it works, with the best intention it actively really discourages and evidentially is discouraging people from taking their proper test. If they take their test on the bike they can at that age, they have two years to do that in and they can ride a scooter-type similar to what they are already riding and so they do not see the need. If they wait until they are 19, they can then pass their test and ride a bike that they might want to take a pillion passenger on occasionally and have wider uses. We believe that people are spending three years on CBT plus a refresher CBT, which they have to do at 24 months. We think the system discourages training and this is still within that 16-to-19 year old age group. It is not TfL; it is in our license structure and we have rather fallen down on that.

**Kemi Badenoch AM:** That does answer the question, thank you.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** If you want to follow up with any advice, Graeme or any of you, on things like that, we would be very grateful for it because, as you say, we do not run TfL of course but we have a voice not just for London but in the national arena as well. We could maybe push some of those things forward if we get agreement.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Industry Association):** Chair, can I just have one more point? By way of background, what Graeme was talking about was the Third Directive on driving licences, which came out from Europe in 2009 and 2011 and in 2013 was implemented. It did introduce a situation of staging licence grading and an inability to move between them without just repeating the same test over and over again. It has produced enormous problems not just in Britain but also in other countries in Europe and we are looking to take a robust review on this in 2017 in Europe.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** OK, that is something else you could inform us about.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Can I extend the education discussion into police enforcement in particular programmes that the MPS has been running? Let me ask Leon. How successful do you think the MPS's BikeSafe scheme has been already given we are told that attendance on the programmes over the last two years has doubled?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** The honest answer is nobody knows because we cannot be sure about it but our best indicators are what the MPS itself sees. The indications are that this is having a positive impact. We certainly, having all experienced these things, believe that it does. In fact, I have never come across anybody who has experienced it who has not had some benefit from it. It is a great scheme but it is part of a picture because, as Graeme [Hay] was saying and Craig [Carey-Clinch] has been saying, it should not be regarded as training. It is a fantastic asset.

One of the things that it does is that there have been two episodes where they have gone out and positively promoted this, pulling people over who are doing something that is perhaps not quite right on their bike but rather than giving them a ticket are drawing them into an educational experience, if you like, and that is making a difference. It is breaking down the barriers between the attitude of some motorcyclists and the police, and it breaks that down which is positive. It starts to draw people in who are riding a bike.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** I will start off to echo what Leon says. We do not know how successful it is. As with all road safety training, you do not know what did not happen. However, we are in year one, I believe, I am told, of a three-year programme to start to

learn from that. The MPS road policing in conjunction with the BikeSafe team are using statistical capture for the people that they point towards BikeSafe. Do they turn up? What is their experience and where do they live? We will start to get a picture of the people over a 36-month period who are undertaking BikeSafe and, critically, where they come from because one of the other issues for all of London is that these people do not just move around in London. They come in from outside and this is the point where they engage with that.

What that will do is for the first time nationally - and again this is where London is really leading the way - is that we will have some understanding of what the subsequent experience of those people is. We are trying to understand if BikeSafe does anything. Does it encourage them to go on to further voluntary training? What are the outcomes? If that is achieved - and that will be another 30-odd months away - I am sure it will be we will be the first place to have some ability to answer that crucial question you have just asked.

In terms of the balance, certainly, we fully support the balance that the MPS has adopted between the critical elements in road safety of education and enforcement because beyond BikeSafe there is the Rider Intervention Developing Experience (RIDE) programme, which is on a non-voluntary basis. Do you want the points or do you want to go and get educated? We are so supportive of the balance that the MPS roads policing unit has on this at the moment. They push people towards it.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** I will come back to you on the RIDE stuff. Ben, the MPS is not here, but can you tell us how it must feel about it?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** Yes. Just a couple of bits of information specifically. One is that since 2003 in London there have been just under 30,000 riders on BikeSafe, quite a significant number. There has been some evaluation of the experience as far as the people participating are concerned. What the relationship between these numbers are and casualties is more difficult to discern but something like 99% in this evaluation of riders would recommend it to other people who ride motorbikes, 93% attendees have reported their standard of riding has improved, 91% felt attitudes towards motorcycles have changed and 99% say they benefitted. Inasmuch as the people participating in BikeSafe, as we have heard, it is not training but nonetheless is very useful, those are very high numbers for people's reported impact of the experience on themselves in terms of their awareness of their skills and how they choose to ride subsequently.

It is more difficult to extrapolate from that then because, as you have heard, we do not know what did not happen but nonetheless, at the point where people have been asked having done the course, those are very high numbers for that kind of evaluation.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Is that something TfL funds?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** Yes, with the MPS and we also fund the Road Safety team as well.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** OK, that is some security then where we need to go to save that programme. Given Graeme's [Hay] points about how in some ways not a lot of motorcyclists may necessarily be from the boundaries of Greater London but further afield, how do we get them in the programmes if we are not overextending ourselves?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** That is difficult. We would really only generally engage with people when they are on London's roads but in a sense -



and David [Davies] has made the point - you need to know where they started their journeys as well to know what kind of trips they are making.

To pick up Graeme's [Hay] point, the targeted enforcement activity we have done in the form of the five boroughs that Lilli [Matson] mentioned that has led to 11,000 riders, this is not bikes being talked to by a police officer not necessarily being issued with a ticket but just being pulled over because of some aspect of their riding, and that has led to about 680 people expressing interest in going on a BikeSafe course. There is a broader process of conversation between uniformed police officers and motorcyclists not necessarily in the situation where there is any kind of malfeasance involved which is a very important part of that engagement because those messages come better from other people on motorcycles than from somebody who is not.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Just to add to that as well, in boroughs like Lewisham, where we know a lot of riders come from the southeast, there has been engagement with Kent on the other side, for example. Kent has its own initiative which is called Biker Down. It is about trying to improve the outcomes if a collision does occur and we are now modelling that in London and running a pilot at the moment and so we do have that engagement in the neighbouring boroughs. You can track where the key corridors of commuting into London are from.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Yes. My impression as someone who lives in central London is that by and large the motorcyclists are not necessarily coming from outer London. They are coming from further afield. Is that the right perception to have? You would have had more engagement with motorcyclists as a general population that we are having to deal with.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** If you tracked the journey, certainly there are longer commuter journeys coming in from places like Kent on the A21 and those roads through boroughs like Lewisham, which is why for areas like Lewisham they are perceived to have a safety problem. Of course there are plenty of people who live within the GLA boundary who are also riding motorcycles.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Graeme, can we come to what you wanted to talk about, RIDE, which stands for the Rider Intervention Developing Experience, which the MPS has developed to address motorcyclists' attitudes on the road, particularly those considering it as thrill- or sensation-seeking? I have to confess my main complaint if there is one about motorcyclists is that those in central London are always revving up their engines and going through it. I am used to road traffic in the background where I live but I do notice when a motorcyclist is doing that. Do you think that is being addressed through this programme?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** It is about perception of risk and we know that young people, particularly males, have a remarkably low sense of risk and therefore spirited behaviour or whatever - which is probably what you are describing really in general terms, making a noise and a fuss, perhaps travelling at a pace not appropriate and all these sorts of things - is exactly what that is to address.

I cannot give you numbers. I do not have numbers as a rider group but what I believe and what I experienced in my previous career is that when we look at the attitude, which is what it is all about and attitudinal response to a number of points on a licence and a fine, which is a negative experience likely to perhaps underline negative views towards authority, and we compare that with an educational day, this is really no different to the one that is offered to car drivers, it is different in detail but the principle is the same for minor transgressions. To have the opportunity to go and listen to people, in this case, police motorcyclists, who are

the most respected riders on the road however much of an urban warrior a person might think they are when push comes to shove they will generally acknowledge a MPS police rider as one of the finest riders on the road.

To spend a day in that company and have explained to you what those risks are I can only ever see as a positive response, but I am not in a position to give you numbers on the relative values of pursuing that as opposed to simply a ticket and a number of points on the licence.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Industry Association):** Just quickly, Ride Off is a fantastic opportunity to engage those who are offending and certainly we would like to see that pushed more for section 3 offences and perhaps also to building specific aspects of speed awareness as well within that. There is great potential on return for this scheme. Certainly, nationally, there is a need to roll it out.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** It is patchy nationally. Sorry, RIDE is operated elsewhere in the country but it is hit-and-miss.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Is London relatively better in that respect?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** Significantly.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Significantly? That is useful, and then I will come to TfL.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** Just a quick thing in terms of people revving up bikes. There are some people who do this because they want to draw attention to themselves, but it is also a mechanism for attracting the attention of the white van man who is on the phone or doing something else. I have an automatic scooter and you cannot do it on that. Part of what is happening in London's traffic is that aware urban riders will often use a little rev of a motor and it is quite extraordinary because most of us who have done this for a long time look into people's cars via their mirrors to see what they are doing. We all know that vastly too many people are doing something else, but that is part of what is generating this sort of issue.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Thank you, Leon. Just a final comment on RIDE from TfL. Do you have any views or opinions? We have heard from the motorcyclists.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Graeme [Hay] has said it all. We are working with the MPS to have this intervention delivered. Some evaluation would be --

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Is that something else you fund or not?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** No, not as far as I know and I will be corrected afterwards. We do not fund RIDE.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** OK, thank you very much.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** The participants fund it.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** Do they? Fine. I see. That is even better.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Police Adviser, Motorcycle Industry Association):** It is very similar to a speed-awareness course if you want to avoid points for breaking the speed limit but, again, you pay to go.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** That is how it goes. That is useful to know.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Advisor, Motorcycle Industry Association):** That is why it provides such an opportunity to do things like put section 3 offences as part of feeding people into RIDE. You would not say it is quite self-funding, but a massive proportion of the funding comes from the offenders themselves.

**Murad Qureshi AM:** That is even better.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** Very good. That was very helpful.

**Tom Copley AM:** Yes, thank you. First of all, I wonder if you can tell us - perhaps TfL to start with - what types of roads are hotspots for motorcyclist collisions.

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** There is not necessarily a particular type of road that is a hotspot. Motorcyclists tend to use more of the strategic road network. It is like the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and the bigger roads and therefore, proportionally, you would see collisions around 30% on the TLRN and around 60% on borough roads but more on the strategic road network.

That is not disproportionate to the distribution you would see of all casualties. As Ben [Plowden] mentioned, a large proportion of collisions take place at junctions. Again, that is not rocket science because that is where traffic is interacting and so this is where collisions are likely to take place. Compared to other types of road user, when you look at the causal factors, the road engineering environment is not seen to be as often a significant component in why the collisions take place. If you remember back to the statistics I gave at the beginning, in fatalities in particular speeding or loss of control often a very high proportion of collisions with no other vehicles involved. This is not the same type of collisions as you might see with pedestrians.

**Tom Copley AM:** Statistically speaking, you cannot point to a particular kind of road and say that is disproportionately high for motorcycles?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** It is the main roads mainly because that is where motorcycles are.

**Tom Copley AM:** Not more so than other types of vehicles?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** What we have done is looked very specifically at where motorcycle collisions have taken place. A lot of the work that lay underneath the Motorcycle Safety Action Plan has a very important spatial dimension and the reason why we focused activity on the five boroughs is precisely because the data suggests that both in absolute numbers and/or rates of risk of being involved in a collision there are parts of London and therefore roads in those parts of London that have a high risk for motorcyclists in London generally. There will also be specific locations where the data suggests that is some issue to do potentially with the design of a junction or the way the road operates. There is a very important spatial component to where we focus both our engineering effort and enforcement effort but that is not quite the same as saying that all roads of type X have a higher than average motorcycle accident than other roads. It is much more specific than that.

**Tom Copley AM:** OK, perhaps I can bring Leon in on this point and also ways that you think design could be improved to make roads safer for motorcyclists.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** The key to all of these things is the evidence of what works and what does not. The work that TfL did on the whole bus lanes issue was phenomenal. In fact it is the most detailed in the world and I know that because the industry commissioned me to look into global research into this sort of thing. In terms of engineering again I go back to the early key here for going forwards is to be much more aware and positively critical about proposals for enhancing a particular aspect of a junction's function for a mode whatever it might be, and the potential for adverse consequences on PTWs.

One example that has come up is - and I am happy to have a conversation with Ben and Lilli about this as this has only just come up - proposals for light segregation between cycle lanes and traffic lanes with things that are called orcas and armadillos. These are lumps of plastic that are bolted to the road which if looked at in one way are excellent and cheap delineators and have enabled people on a bicycle to feel safer. They have some protection. The problem is that they can and we now have evidence that they are a trip hazard for various groups including cyclists ironically. It is now a matter on the back of the work that we have already done starting to look a lot more critically at proposals like that because as I said we have now in MAG had a report where what starts off as a good idea for cyclists has caused a crash. It is a matter of taking a step back and having a look at this and seeing rather than proceeding just because it was deemed to be a good idea in the first place we actually think, "Hang on a minute, there are various other aspects". One of the things I have included in this pack is a little thing which we produced in MAG which is about improving risk assessment. The people that are designing cycling schemes are quite rightly very focused on an idea of flow of cycles and they are not required to think about very much else which is perfectly fair enough.

It is a matter of now saying, "OK, let us learn from what is happening", and that is the key. It is almost like a double negative. One of the challenges that TfL has is there is not much you can do in terms of hard engineering that will enhance the safety of a motorcyclist but there are things that some boroughs more than others will do that definitely reduce it. One example is if you have speed cushions in a road and it has bends, if you put a speed cushion in the middle what traffic tends to do is drive so they straddle it. You have people driving in the middle of the road and for reasons I will not bore you with but technical reasons the dynamics of motorcycle use are very different to cycles in going round bends. It is basically if you are going round a left-hand bend whereas if you are a cyclist you will be nearest to the kerb. If you are a motorcyclist, and this is the way the police ride, you want to be as near to the crown of the road so that you can see as far round the bend. That is a concept that unless you are a motorcyclist nobody could expect you to contemplate that. The problem is that if designers of schemes look at slowing down traffic by putting speed cushions in do that and do not realise that it is creating two hazards, one is it can trip the scooter rider up but the other one is, and it literally does happen, it encourages oncoming traffic rather than staying in its own lane to drive down the middle of the road.

This is something that we are very pleased that TfL is addressing in this guide but that is broadly the answer. It is not a positive thing; it is not doing negatives.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Police Adviser, Motorcycle Industry Association):** The industry has taken a long interest in this, the principles of road traffic engineering, the sort of guidelines and engineering measures that need to be taken. Working with local authorities and research organisations, universities and so on we did develop with the Institute of Highway Engineers guidelines some years ago. These are recently refreshed and updated and that work was funded by the DfT, the MCI and also the BMF. The work that is being done on the new set of guidance for London is extremely important and it is a project that we really support.

It is quite important that the very key principles about how roads are designed with motorcycling in mind that are already established are referred to within these guidelines, and the Institute of Highway Engineers (IHE) cross-referring with the work that is being done in London so that we are not reinventing the wheel and confusing borough road safety officers. Ultimately, the work that is being done is important here. It is quite appropriate that we set the IHE guidelines to the context of London's roads and that the principles contained within that are vital to any consideration of road traffic engineering.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** Can I mention just one broader point? The process by which priorities on the road network have been under way, generally moving space and priority towards walking, cycling, road safety and pedestrian crossings, has been going on for quite a long time, certainly since 2000 - Parliament's Trafalgar Square being an almost certain example - but every town centre in outer London now has some kind of town centre improvement. That is not a new phenomenon. There is, separately, a particular issue in the last two or three years around what looks like an increase in road cycling fatalities in particular. We need to be very careful about not assuming that those two things are causally related. I do not think we know enough about the relationship between the overall - this is a point that Craig [Carey-Clinch] has just made - way the road network is designed and managed where the dominant pressure is towards these other purposes, bus lanes, cycle lanes, pedestrianisation and so forth and a shorter-term issue - which hopefully is shorter-term - around a rise in fatalities. We need to be quite careful not to draw too many conclusions from those two things happening. One is quite a long-term process. The other currently now looks like it is a short-term problem. We need to make very clear that we understand if there is a relationship and what that relationship might be.

**Tom Copley AM:** It is about making sure that by trying to improve the road network for one group, you do not then disadvantage another group at the same time.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** Yes, the challenge is that you have a very significant growth. If you look at the index, the growth, the changing use of the road network, cycling has grown faster than any other form of transport in the last five or ten years. We are trying to accommodate a very rapid growth in use of the network by one particular group, and, as Leon said, you have similar vulnerabilities, and try to make sure that that does not disbenefit either in safety terms or more general user of the network terms everybody else who is already there. We are seeing some quite significant effects, for example, on the bus network, on something we can be doing like that, and so we have to be very careful about optimising use and maximising safety for everybody if we possibly can.

**Tom Copley AM:** I want to move us on to what boroughs are doing and to what extent the boroughs are adopting best practice, and how is a local implementation plan process being used to support this? Does anyone have any comments on that?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** As a bridging link, really, I very much support the preparation of the street design manual for motorcycle safety, which we are contributing to. One of the things that I think sets London slightly apart from most of the rest of the UK is the intensity of streets and the intensity of different authorities, the inconsistencies between road space availability. As a rider travels through London on and off of the TfL network and through various boroughs, there are areas of benefit and safety which are available on one network and not on another.

**Tom Copley AM:** There is inconsistency there.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** Absolutely.

**Tom Copley AM:** Would you like to see it more joined up between boroughs?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** I would, and it is not just about motorcycle safety. Again, we always look at collision data, but so many collisions overtaking on the offside and so perhaps filtering on the right-hand side of the traffic where perhaps, on a TfL road, the bus lane is available. This I would link back - I did not get a chance to mention it and I am not being too naughty here - under pedestrian safety: why do motorcycles feature so often? I do not have the data; I represent a user group. However, I genuinely believe that the casual crossing that goes on away from the formal crossing point by pedestrians brings pedestrians in among otherwise stationary traffic, into conflict with those who can still be moving legitimately in stationary traffic, be they bicycles or motorcycles.

**Tom Copley AM:** Weaving in and out. Yes.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** The use of the bus lane introduces a level of predictability as to the whereabouts of these various things. In a bus lane, a pedestrian jumping between lights may expect to find cycles, moving buses and other things, but of course, once they are hidden among the static traffic, they come at you from all over the place. Sorry, that is anecdotal but --

**Tom Copley AM:** No, it makes a lot of sense.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** We all recognise that.

**Tom Copley AM:** That was interesting what you said about more joined-up work between boroughs. Does anyone have any more comments on what boroughs are doing?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** One of the great success stories in much of London that continues - going on from Graeme's point - is motorcycle access to bus lanes. The problem is that some boroughs are vehemently against this.

**Tom Copley AM:** Darren [Johnson AM] will be asking about bus lanes shortly. We might park bus lanes, as it were, for a minute. Is there anything else beyond that?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** That is going back to Graeme's point. I totally agree with this. This is an impossible task for TfL, I have to say in its defence, because it does not have power to tell boroughs what to do and, even if it found a very good idea, it has to be a dialogue because that is part of our democratic system. From our point of view, we would support anything that makes more coherence and that can encourage boroughs to have a common view about safety for all vulnerable road users. That is what we are most interested in.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** My impression is that boroughs resource road safety in general very differently and to very different levels. Some of the difficulties TfL has had sometimes is trying to work with boroughs, which may or may not respond and may not have the capacity or the incentive or whatever, and that is not always linked to the casualty problem in that borough.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** There are two processes that run in parallel. One is that the boroughs have a legal requirement to produce a local

implementation plan (LIP) in the GLA Act. It is a statutory requirement to demonstrate how they are going to deliver the Mayor's Transport Strategy on their roads. We separately give the boroughs money through a separate part of the Act which has become conflated. The LIPs funding is about £150 million a year. That process used to be, much to the boroughs' frustration, much more directive than it now is. There was an agreement between the current Mayor and the borough quite early in his first term where our determining of what the boroughs did with that funding became much less specific. Nonetheless, the LIPs guidance that we produce every year makes quite clear the sorts of things that we would expect the boroughs to do and certain things they have to report on, which include the KSI record for the year that they have just finished. Part of the process of engaging with the boroughs is using the LIPs funding and the LIPs guidance to help influence and support these sorts of outcomes.

As Lilli [Matson] and others have said, there is a lot of work that goes on generally on a very collaborative basis, although it is not entirely consistent, through the safety working groups and through the Urban Design London training that Lilli mentioned, making sure that there is, as far as possible, consistency in design inasmuch as we can influence that. As David [Davies] suggested, it is a process of persuasion and encouragement and using the funding within limits to influence what they do rather than directing them precisely.

**Tom Copley AM:** I just want to ask one final question, which is on the Cycle Superhighways. To what extent will the Cycle Superhighways create more danger for motorcyclists and how can this be addressed?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** This is a really important point for the Committee to focus on. If we just look at the distance of the North-South and East-West Cycle Superhighways, they represent about 1.5% of the Strategic Road Network in London. It is a very, very small percentage. Along those, there are only certain lengths where lanes have been narrowed or removed. It is very important first of all to get that in perspective.

Where that has taken place, do not forget we have published *London Cycling Design Standards*, and a key part in there is to be very clear that when narrowing or changing lane widths, we must not create ambiguity. If a lane is of a certain ambiguous width, you might encourage motorcyclists or other road users to overtake, and if there is any chance of ambiguity, the recommendation is to have central white lines, which will require all vehicles to stay in line. That may delay journey times for users of that road, but it is a safe imposition. In addition to the road safety auditing, in addition to the clear design guidance we have on this, these are safe routes, and they only represent a small percentage of the overall network, and they are crucially needed to improve cycle safety and to provide the safe environment to create the uplift in cycling, which is the current Mayor's objective. On that basis, they are absolutely the right way to go. None of the recent casualties or fatalities we have seen have been related to the recent areas of work. It is an important point that Ben [Plowden] was making. The coincidence in time between some activity taking place on a network and these fatalities taking place is a coincidence. It is not causal. We have to focus exactly on to the causes of motorcycle casualties, which we do know.

**Tom Copley AM:** We are all supportive of Cycle Superhighways, but obviously we do need to ask these important questions in case there is a link. We heard from Leon [Mannings] earlier about this. Does anyone else have any comments on the Cycle Superhighways and safety for motorcyclists?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** Nothing specifically on the highways themselves, but I suppose the design thinking behind the highways very much links with how one prioritises certain transport modes. It is important I think at this point just to quickly link back to the previous subject. Local authority areas around the country that are quite explicit in their recognition of

motorcycling as part of the transport solution tend to think more carefully about road traffic engineering measures and how cycling and motorcycle issues are allocated to create a safer environment. Again, the Mayor's Transport Strategy only mentions motorcycles at the moment explicitly in terms of being a safety issue. A revision of that strategy, if it started to look more closely at motorcycling as part of London's opportunity to solve problems, means that the boroughs themselves could think more explicitly about how they look at engineering their roads for motorcycling.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** A slightly different aspect of infrastructure, not Cycle Superhighways specifically but one that has not been mentioned, is maintenance. Huge amounts of attention and effort and so forth go into designing things and opening new schemes and so forth, which is all very important, but it is the quality of the construction and then the ongoing maintenance, which can be very important to safety and often gets neglected. Leon [Mannings] made that point about the absence of that 'keep left' bollard and that is an example, but there are potholes, road markings and making sure that signs and lines and so forth are kept up to date. The railways are a very good example of good-quality infrastructure leading to much-raised safety standards. It is not about going around and fixing problems that just happen to have cropped up.

As a related point, the systems for reporting road defects by the public could be improved. The public do not know whether it is a TfL road or a borough road and sometimes if you report it to the borough they will say, "Thank you very much. Go and tell TfL". You have to do it twice.

**Tom Copley AM:** That is a very good point. Thank you.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** The Cycle Superhighways are a site-by-site job. There are locations where there are great concerns. Parliament Square is one. By removing the left eastbound turn over Westminster Bridge, everything will now have to go around Parliament Square. Parliament Square is a demanding road environment for all road users. I will stop there but --

**Tom Copley AM:** Yes. It is case-by-case, yes, it is.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** Yes, it is, and this is not the place to do it. What I would say is that time will tell. That is not a veiled threat. It is an honest truth. Time will tell. Some lane widths on some roads with quite substantial traffic flows are undeniably being reduced remarkably and it will be interesting to see what happens. I cannot say more. I know on some of the comments, and certainly on the streets design manual for cycling guidance, I had to point out that some of the lane widths that are deemed acceptable in there are unacceptable under chapter 8 for temporary works, let alone anything else. You are treading a brave path, and best of luck.

**Tom Copley AM:** Thank you. Thank you very much.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** That is very helpful.

**Darren Johnson AM:** We will move on to bus lanes. What has been the impact of TfL's decision to open bus lanes to motorcycles?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Obviously the permanent decision to allow motorbikes into TLRN bus lanes followed two trials, which were very carefully monitored and showed that there was not a disbenefit in terms of safety for other road users. When you talk



to motorcyclists, they really like having access to those bus lanes. In terms of their customer experience, it has been a very positive thing, and that was reflected in higher customer satisfaction scores following that change.

We have been carefully monitoring it. There has not been a shift in casualty statistics, which would suggest that there has not been anything unsafe resulting. We have no plans to review it. It was a permanent change. It seems to have been successful, and it gives motorcyclists, as we have heard, a safe place on the main road network.

**Darren Johnson AM:** Cyclists were very concerned about this measure in the trials when they were being introduced. As part of this is about perception as well as actual risk, have you had a concern that it potentially puts people off cycling who might otherwise be encouraged to take it up? It is a point that Andrew Gilligan [Mayor's Cycling Commissioner] always makes about broadening the demographic of cycling so that it is not just very brave, very fit, Lycra-clad young men going out cycling but it is a much broader demographic. Does this have any impact potentially on that?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Can I just give a personal view on that? Clearly, we know that the type of demographic that does use the main roads does tend to be young professional males and so they are exactly in that category you are talking about. If you use a bus lane, it does involve mixing with traffic, as probably any journey along the length of that type of road network is going to, which is exactly why, in terms of the ambition to widen the demographic and increase levels of cycling, on busier roads, segregation is required.

**Darren Johnson AM:** Therefore, we are moving away from using bus lanes towards segregated Cycle Superhighways as the shift there, you say?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Where new provision is being made, yes, because that is basically what the *London Cycling Design Standard* says. It looks at the street types and says, if you are going to be on those busier roads with certain traffic flows above a certain level, segregation would be expected. On quieter back streets, on the Quietways where traffic is flowing at different speeds, people's perception of safety is very different and segregation is not required.

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** It is all good to say, though, that although that was very beneficial, about 100 kilometres of the length of the TLRN are the bus lanes that are open to motorcyclists. The TLRN is about 600 kilometres. Inasmuch as that was an issue, it would only be for those cyclists who had previously been not accompanied by motorcycles on that bit of the TLRN that now has motorcycles.

**Darren Johnson AM:** On the busiest routes, the aim should be for a segregated, separate route rather than sharing a bus lane, with or without motorcycles?

**Ben Plowden (Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London):** Yes, as Lilli [Matson] said, but my point was that of 100% of cycling journeys in London, only a relatively small proportion would have been affected by the introduction of motorcycles in the bus lane because it is only part of the TLRN that would have been affected by that. That is my point.

**Darren Johnson AM:** OK. Thanks to TfL for your response on that. Let us hear now from the motorcycle lobby.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** I could not be more pleased that you have asked the two questions that you have. If we take the first one, that is actual safety and the experiences that were generated by this extraordinary series of trials, and in fact the first one started in 2004. You are right that cyclists were concerned about two things but the first one was that their safety would be reduced. In this pack I have included TfL's press release<sup>3</sup>, which broadly summarised why they were making the schemes permanent, and I have taken the liberty of highlighting a sentence in it. It said,

*"When comparing the second trial period [that is the last one of the whole series, really] with before motorcycles were in bus lanes, there was a [statistically] significant 11.6% decline in overall cycling collisions."*

That is a fact that often gets forgotten. It was very well respected by TfL. The bottom line is that cycling casualty rates improved by over 11%. In fact, ironically, they were the biggest beneficiaries of the measure.

**Darren Johnson AM:** Is there actually a causal effect, though, or are these two trends that --

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** What we can say is what the results were. To this day, I have never had any completely reliable and valid explanation as to why, but we do know as a matter of fact that cyclists are safer. My favoured explanation is exactly the one that cyclists are familiar with, which is critical mass. Once you get used to a group of particularly vulnerable people like cyclists or motorcyclists, various things happen less that are damaging. The facts are that cyclists' safety improved.

The other issue that the trial looked at was whether cyclists were put off. The interesting thing that was found was that, on the trial routes, actually cycling went up. The perfectly understandable fear and concern that it would put people off, in terms of the actual data --

**Darren Johnson AM:** Although it was going up anyway as part of the general trend in London?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** No. This was a comparison between trial sites that were more or less parallel, two sets of bus lanes, and there was a bigger rise in the bus lanes that had motorcycle access. It is good that you have raised these points because the facts of the situation, which may be counterintuitive, are why we are so pleased that TfL really did look at the hard evidence, and the hard evidence is good, especially for cyclists.

**Darren Johnson AM:** Following up on the previous question about the Cycle Superhighways, do you support what Lilli [Matson] and Ben [Plowden] have just been telling me now, that the trend has been to move away from having cyclists in bus lanes and on the busiest routes and having segregated Cycle Superhighways so that they are kept away from both buses and motorcyclists and the cars?

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** The problem with that is that, as a matter of fact, it is narrowing the space for powered two-wheelers. Whilst powered two-wheelers had access to the near-side section of a carriageway, where it was a bus lane in particular, that is being taken away. Therefore, we are going back to a position that is, in some sections of the Cycle Superhighway, even worse than it was before bus lanes were introduced because, as Graeme was pointing out, the actual lane width being specified for what is called 'general traffic', which includes one-third of vulnerable road users who are powered two-wheeler riders, is being narrowed. The thing for us to all think about is, in ten to 15 years' time, one of the things that Lilli mentioned was, which you may not have noticed, that the ethos of the design for traffic

---

<sup>3</sup> Transport for London press notice PN-371 of 21 December 2011: *Motorcycles to be allowed permanent access to bus lanes on TfL Road Network*

lanes for Cycle Superhighways is it will be so narrow, as Graeme points out, that a powered two-wheeler has to act as if it is a car and be in a queue. Therefore, the emergency service two-wheeler vehicles that we have in London and will increasingly depend on - and will, in ten to 15 years' time, be zero emissions - will not be able to get through, and the whole advantage of a motorised two-wheeler will be eliminated by narrowing the lanes. That is something that is not clear to a lot of people, but it is something that I believe all members should think about and hopefully discuss as we go on because it is a very serious issue.

**David Davies (Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety):** Just a couple of comments. The point Leon makes about whether motorcyclists should be expected to take a position as a car or should be expected to overtake, going between lanes, is a really important one. There is both what there should do and there is what they will do, and both need to be thought about.

On the bus lane issue, interesting statistics from Leon. Time will tell as we get more data, but there might be specific issues about design. With motorcyclists going a lot faster up the inside lane, you have queuing outside traffic, turning traffic is often let through or pulls out, it sees a bus, and pedal cyclists are fairly slow but most cyclists come in fairly fast, and some of the design issues around there may need at least monitoring of the situation.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** The key contribution that highway engineering has made to road safety is where it has been consistent. Consistency of expectation for road users, whether it is the traffic signs which we use in the UK, or in this case road space and the bus lanes. I believe in the critical mass theory. I look at these incidents where vehicles turn left across the path of someone effectively doing a near-side overtake, filtering along the near side, whether it is a cyclist or a motorcyclist. If we can increase that traffic use in bus lanes with motorcycles consistently across the capital, and it is a consistent expectation, I believe it will bring benefit to all road users, including pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists, and give everybody a safe place to go. It will reduce the overtaking on the off side into contrasting traffic. Again, consistency is the key thing. Thank you.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Industry Association):** When both trials were done, there was a useful piece of work done on how different road users see the acceptability of motorcycles in bus lanes. What was quite interesting was that more than half - quite in excess of half - of all cyclists thought that it was not a bad idea, were not that bothered, or even a great idea. I remember doing my own user surveys in some of the bus lanes during the trials to see how the dynamics of cycling and motorcycling worked together, and, to be honest, the grief that both seemed to suffer from and sometimes joined forces against were cars invading the bus lanes, or bus drivers at that time being quite intimidating for all cycle users. I know that situation has improved somewhat in recent years.

The fact is that acceptability between cyclists and motorcyclists, particularly on the cycling side, is a lot more than this Committee has been led to believe in the past. I remember appearing before this Committee in around about 2008 when an awful lot was said about how much cyclists do not like motorcycles in bus lanes, but the usage surveys just show that to be absolutely wrong, which then leads us on to another issue, which is consistency. For many riders, particularly those who are not familiar with London for visiting, where you can or cannot ride in a bus lane of course remains an issue.

The boroughs need to be more engaged actively with this and also be a bit more critical of campaigns launched against borough motorcycle bus lane schemes. We lost one in Ealing a year or so ago largely due to a vociferous campaign by certain groups of cyclists, when in fact the evidence they put forward was largely wrong, but unfortunately they did win the argument. This Committee should take a really dim view of things like that.

**Darren Johnson AM:** You are in danger in some ways of saying no to everything that cyclists -- either you can say that cyclists want the segregated cycle lane, Cycle Superhighways kept away from motorised traffic, or cyclists in bus lanes. To say no to both sets of cyclists' aspirations seems a little harsh.

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Industry Association):** That is not what I am saying. It is very much a case that they are two-wheeled vehicles. Cycles and motorcycles are essentially two-wheeled vehicles. One has engines; one does not, perhaps. It depends on how you look at 'powered'. Ultimately, these single-track vehicles need to share the road. We feel there are a lot of synergies between cycle use and motorcycle use. There is room in transport policy for both. They are complementary to each other. We feel there is great scope for cycle groups to work closely with motorcycle groups. I mentioned a specific point where a motorcycle scheme was campaigned against, but ultimately more can be gained by cycle and motorcycle groups working together.

**Darren Johnson AM:** I completely share that vision but I am just trying to tease out, within that vision of sharing the road, is there a role for segregation, that you are keeping non-motorised and motorised traffic completely separate?

**Craig Carey-Clinch (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Industry Association):** Specific cycle lanes, there is definitely a role for that. I have not commented too much on Cycle Superhighways because, as Graeme rightly said, there is a lot that we will learn as we go on, and some parts of it will impact more than others. The industry has never taken a view of supporting motorcycle use of specific cycle lanes, for example - there has to be that kind of segregation in certain places - but there are areas where we can live together, and bus lanes are definitely one of those.

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** Having argued, hopefully convincingly, for consistency as being a precursor to road safety in highway engineering, there are also behaviours according to environment. I suppose, if every London street was 120 feet wide, we would be able to have segregation for pedestrians, cyclists and so on. There is such a wide variety and that is the challenge that we face, and that is why I mentioned on the superhighway that it is site-specific. Thinking in terms of the boroughs, despite my passion for consistency of road space access throughout London, I would also observe that if we step into a vision of a fairly narrow street, predominantly residential, non-thoroughfare, the sort of place which would lend itself to a 20-mile-per-hour zone, virtually a shared surface. Clearly, that is entirely inconsistent to the Embankment or to another arterial route, say, in and out of London, but consistency within context of lane width and all of these things are covered in the excellent TfL manuals. Whilst I argue for consistency, I do not suggest for one moment that everything should look the same. Where we have been able to designate a road space as bus lane, there are advantages in almost all cases to having that access. Sorry.

**Darren Johnson AM:** You are arguing for consistency across similar road types, not one-size-fits-all for every street in London?

**Graeme Hay (Government Relations Executive, British Motorcyclists Federation):** Precisely. Yes.

**Darren Johnson AM:** That is clear.

**Dr Leon Mannings (Policy Adviser, Motorcycle Action Group):** Going on from this consistency in road types, one of the difficulties is that we are modelling our approach to cycle systems on countries that have roads that are fundamentally different to London, as Graeme says, not necessarily 120 feet wide, but the

systems of hard segregation that are working in European countries are working well because there is still space for the other vulnerable road users, pedestrians and motorcyclists. The problem of London, and it is very much a London problem, is that the streets we start off with are already much narrower than many places where cycle schemes work.

To answer your question to Craig in terms of what we support and what we do not, we are absolutely supportive of cyclists having their own tracks or lanes, or whatever you want to call them, and them having exclusive access to them. That is absolutely fine, so long as the cost of that, in addition to the civil engineering, is not a reduction in the safety of a parallel group of vulnerable road users that actually have similar amounts of KSIs. Whilst we support absolutely the protection of cyclists, and where it is possible to have a hard segregated route that does not have an adverse impact on powered two-wheelers, we are all for it. When it does have an adverse impact and it crams powered two-wheelers in with the trucks and the vans and the cars, we do have an objection, and it is a very reasonable one, and that is something that I would like Members to have another think about.

It is a matter of what the costs are in terms of safety because, if you are robbing Peter to pay Paul, it may be not the right plan. Is there a way, as Craig [Carey-Clinch] says and Graeme [Hay] was saying, where we look at this as a shared problem - we are two-wheeler riders with vulnerabilities - and how can we optimise the safety of both groups rather than one at the cost of another?

**Darren Johnson AM:** Thank you. Lilli, is there anything that you want to come back on that you have heard and can you also pick up on the point about consistency across boroughs on bus lanes?

**Lilli Matson (Head of Strategy and Outcome Planning, Transport for London):** Just on the safety point, there is clearly in a limited number of locations - and it is important to remember the context of this, that it is only a limited number of locations - a reallocation of space going on. I would argue that because we are following clear design principles and using full experience of the road safety audit process, it should not change the safety outcome. That is very much the objective that we are pursuing.

In terms of consistency across boroughs, I can see that point from a user's perspective. Of course, it is down to individual boroughs to make those decisions, but I am mindful of the fact that Wandsworth looked at its KSIs that were happening around motorcycles. They have just allowed motorcycles to go into bus lanes in that area. That seems to me a positive move. We can certainly have those conversations with boroughs, but ultimately it is their decision. The whole point about consistency across road type is important, and, as we develop the whole street types approach to managing and developing interventions, it is something I very much will bear in mind.

**Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair):** That has been a really useful session and we have covered pretty much the ground we wanted to today. Colleagues, in thanking you, can I just say that if there is anything else you want to feed back in to the Committee while we do our deliberations on this and put together our report, please do? We are very interested in specific examples and further data and suggestions and issues that you think the Committee, even if we cannot lean on TfL locally, should be taking a view on that might help in the national framework. Please do write back to us if there is something you have not managed to say today and that would be very gratefully received.

We did not discuss this in the pre-meet and so I hope my colleagues will bear with me, but it does occur to me that it might also at the same time be quite a useful thing if we put out either a questionnaire or a comment opportunity for motorcyclists in London for them to tell us what they think would be their highest priority in

terms of making them safe. They are the people who suffer from these accidents and also experience the near misses and know where the issues are and what is causing them. That might be a useful thing for us to do.

Thank you very much for your time today. We do appreciate having you with us and we will be working towards putting forward some kind of report that goes over some of these issues. Thank you very much.