

**Transport Committee  
12 July 2012  
Transcript of Cycling in London**

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** We will move all of our other business to the end of the meeting to focus obviously the majority of our meeting on our first session looking at cycling in London. This is an investigation that the Committee has launched, looking at how we can understand the issues facing current cyclists and the barriers to potential cyclists, examining plans from the Mayor and Transport for London (TfL) to improve cycle safety and increase cycling modal share, and we want to generate lots of recommendations for the Mayor and TfL on how we can improve the cycling environment and cycle safety issues in London. That is an issue I know that all Members of the Committee care very much about and want to see some good recommendations going forward. This is the first of two formal meetings that we are having on this subject. We have also had hundreds and hundreds of tweets, of emails, evidence starting to come in; so thank you to all the organisations and cycling groups who have been already contacting us and individual cyclists and non-cyclists.

Before I introduce our guests, we are just going to format this in sort of two parts: the first part we are going to take some questions from Members on improving cyclist safety. Then we are going to come to our fantastic audience – thank you so much for giving up time today to come in – and we want to have our roving mikes to take points from you around that. Then the second half is going to be on how we can increase the number of cyclists, and again we will ask some questions of our guests, and then again we will open it up to you to get some of your points in those areas. I am sure we will be able to get everyone in, but if there are other points that you have that you have not managed to get in, there is something on your chair that you are able to fill in to make sure that we capture all of the issues that you want to raise with us today.

Let me welcome our fantastic guests, thank you very much for coming along. I am going to start this side, we have Dr Ashok Sinha from the London Cycling Campaign; thank you very much for coming and all the work your organisation has done to raise the profile of cycling safety as an issue. We have Chris Bainbridge next to you, who is the London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group. I do not know if you are chair of it this year?

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** I am.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you for coming along to give us a Borough perspective.

Martin Gibbs from British Cycling is stuck on a train from Manchester but is due with us, it now looks like 10.45pm, so thanks to whichever train company it is that he is going to be late, but he is on his way. Next we have German Dector-Vega, who is from Sustrans, and is the new London Director for Sustrans, who is here today, thank you for that. We have Chris Peck at the end there from the Cyclists' Touring Club. So thank you all for coming today and giving up your time.

We have in our audience Alexandra Goodship, who is Senior Delivery Planning Manager Cycling at Transport for London, who is in the front row here, and we have Gordon Telling, who is Head of Urban

Logistics Policy for Freight Transport Association. We will be hearing from TfL and others and the Freight Transport Association at our September meeting, but we wanted to make sure they were here to hear all of the issues that are coming up today for our next session. So thank you for coming as well today.

I am going to sort of kick off with a question that, if there is one thing you could do to improve cyclist safety in London, what would it be? If somebody else uses that one, maybe try and come up with another one. I am going to start with Ashok at this end.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** First of all, Caroline [Pidgeon] and Valerie [Shawcross], thank you very much to the Committee for initiating this very important scrutiny process and we are very pleased to be participating in it.

If there was one thing, I think it has to be political. For us, we would like to see the Mayor give a clear direction to Transport for London, and the resources necessary, to put in place a concrete timetable and a durable plan of action to make good the promise that he made to 42,000 Londoners who signed our London Go Dutch petition, to 10,000 Londoners who joined the Love London Go Dutch big ride, calling on him to make our streets as safe and inviting for cycling as they are in Holland. That is the benchmark for us and that means planning, not for a city of today, or even the kind of conditions that might exist tomorrow, but actively planning to create a situation where every Londoner, whatever their age, their ability, their background, their level of experience, can choose to cycle for their everyday journeys, knowing that is going to be a safe and pleasurable experience.

Achieving those sorts of levels of cycling is actually going to be very hard, and perhaps the biggest thing that needs to be addressed is motor traffic capacity. We have to look at the balance of priorities on our roads and we have to give far greater priority, both in time and space, to cyclists, and indeed to pedestrians, and that means of course less priority in time and space for motor traffic capacity on our road. That is a huge political challenge. I do not underestimate that at all and it is going to take an immense amount of political leadership and will to achieve that. However, unless we do, unless we make our streets as safe and inviting for cyclists as they are in Holland, to facilitate that growth in cycling that we know is being suppressed, then we will never ultimately address the danger barriers that are preventing people from cycling more often.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Political leadership almost is a generational change, is it not?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** It is a generational change, it is political, cultural, it is multi-Mayoralty, it is multi-decadal, it needs cross-party consensus, but it needs leadership from the top that says, "This is the kind of city we need to create". Not just do the remedial action, which is happening now, but have a concrete plan to take us to another place.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Fantastic, thank you for that. Chris?

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Yes, it is a very difficult question, and I saw I was given that one, I thought, "Blimey, how do I answer that?" because whatever answer you give it over-simplifies. It is important there is not just one answer, there are several things. I would rather not be asked that question, I would rather answer a different question, but if I have to it is

heavily caveated and it is also a personal view in that it is not necessarily the view of all the boroughs or any of the boroughs or any of the boroughs officers who have written in with their views. However, I think, given the very high proportion of cyclist deaths that are caused by heavy goods vehicles (HGVs), then I think it is to tackle the HGV issue, because I think it is about 50% of deaths, whereas HGVs are only about 15% of the traffic. It is interesting that, although women are under-represented among cyclists, they are actually quite highly represented in the HGV deaths.

How we tackle that is another matter. I know a lot of the boroughs now are organising HGV training to make HGV drivers aware of cyclists, and vice versa, and they are being very successful. What has been a good move recently is that the professional training for HGV drivers, cycle training is one of those modes, and a lot of drivers do volunteer for that. Especially useful has been Crossrail stipulation that all drivers that serve Crossrail have to have had cycle awareness training. Now we are getting a lot of requests from firms who are saying, "We want to bid for Crossrail work so can we have that training?" So the HGVs would be the one I would have to take as top priority.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** The big issue that needs tackling. OK, thank you for that, Chris. German?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** I start from a very different point, and I will try to be very positive about cycling. I think to me the most important thing is to have safety in numbers, and by that I mean not only a lot of cyclists but safety in numbers from support from the whole of the population, even from those that do not cycle. To me it is important to have a vision for cycling. It is important to say that overall cycling is considerably better than it was ten years ago, let alone the 1980s. We have built momentum and cycling is at the forefront of every discussion. We have half a million journeys every day on the streets. Yes, there are problems we need to address, and safety is one of them. Perhaps we get frustrated because there is huge potential, but I think it is important that we keep going, that we correct the mistakes, we acknowledge the successes and build on them. What I am trying to say is, the next cycle growth is going to come from expanding the demographics and building cycling to the mainstream.

If you want to do anything, not only for cycle safety, but for cycling in general, we have to bring cycling to the mainstream: the political mainstream, the social mainstream, and more importantly the funding mainstream. To me it is very important that we convince Londoners that everyone is a cyclist and that everyone can be a cyclist. Safety is an important part of that and I will suggest three things, and we need to attract everyone into cycling, so the more men, women, children, old, young, confident, nervous, casual, the more the better. However, as I said, more importantly what we need to do is bring everyone into cycling, including non-cyclists. We need now more than ever to formulate a positive image of cycling for everyone. In a nutshell, what Sustrans believe are the quick ways to do this and increase safety is: 20-mile-an-hour default speed limits for residential roads, not only in London but nationally, and this could mean up to 40% reduction in all accidents, not only cyclist accidents; increase the investment and development of what is the greenways network, which is off-highway cycle network through parks and green spaces, which are safer by definition. They have a huge amount of impact potential, they are the nursery for new and young cyclists, they are the routes where new cyclists can get more confident, and more importantly in the future they are the feeder routes for cycle superhighways of the feeder groups. Then last, but not least, and I think the most important thing is that we continue increasing investment in behavioural change and education campaigns. Things we are doing with the

Freight Transport Association, for example. Also, a side issue, which is still very important, which is raising awareness of the strong link between cycling and health.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you. So really mainstreaming it I think is quite a good word from that. Chris?

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** Yes, thank you very much. I think, as we know, the main barrier to people getting cycling is fear of traffic and fear of being injured. That of course is the main way we also improve safety by dealing with traffic. Most collisions involve a vehicle that is doing the wrong thing, if you get that vehicle out of the way then the risks to cyclists are reduced. To reiterate and elaborate on one of the points that Ashok [Sinha] made, I think if there is one thing, and it is difficult to say one thing, as we have heard, it would be to continue and enhance the measures to restrain motor traffic in London. At the moment we have the congestion charge, which has been a really major part of the increase in cycling over the last ten years, but it has been watered down, parts of it have been removed, as we know. We would love to see a development of that methodology of really using a strong fiscal incentive to people to use other modes and to get out of private car use as the sort of normal mode of transport, particularly I think in Central London, but also to spread it around London more widely. I think that is the best way we can both achieve an increase in cycle use, but also it enables us to remove capacity from the road network and redistribute it to cycling structure, to other modes. We do not get space away from cars unless we get rid of the cars first, is a critical part of it.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** OK, thank you for that, and for the wide range of comments there, and we will be exploring some of these in more detail. If we could start off with looking at cyclist casualties.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Thank you very much, Caroline, and thank you all for coming. We have had a fantastic set of responses from cyclists and non-cyclists, so interesting to hear already some of the things you are saying chime very much with the personal experiences of the cyclists that have come to us. We all want to promote cycling and see the increase of cycling. It is good for all of us, but we have to tackle the negatives first. You probably saw a couple of weeks ago, at the same time as everybody was enjoying themselves on the cable car, some terrible, I think really upsetting, casualty statistics for 2011 were published by TfL, and they do show a rise in fatal, serious and slight casualties among the pedal cyclists. Actually they are paralleled I think by pedestrian casualties and powered two-wheelers. However, focusing on those cycling casualties, what do you think is going on? There is some implication from TfL I think that they feel that some of those statistics are not statistically significant, but clearly they have some kind of analysis going on at the moment as to what is causing them. What is your view on why we are seeing rises in casualties for cyclists across those categories? What is going on out there?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** I will have a first crack. I am sure that colleagues will amplify in further detail and bring more intelligence to bear, but so far as we can tell in London Cycling Campaign, there has been a policy that the Mayor has instituted, which we all know has been smoothing the flow. Now we understand there are congestion problems in London and everybody needs to be able to get around more easily, not just cyclists, but people who are in motor vehicles as well.

However, so far as we can tell, there has been a bit of a correlation between some of the policies that have been put in place to get the traffic moving better, the motor traffic moving I should say, and the

increase in death and injury rates among cyclists. Now I am not going to say that's a hard and fast conclusion, but I think it is looking a bit like the smoking barrel at the moment, and it is worth investigating further.

I mean I would say actually, the level that we are rising from was already intolerable; we were already in a very unacceptable situation, the level of killed and serious injuries (KSI) in London. When you look at the responses, which we have been gathering, which we will give to the Committee, we asked people from among our membership to tell us what is going on in the roads, where are the black spots, what is the problem. We have already had 2,000 responses, people identifying various locations, and the kinds of comments we are getting back - and this is one of the most common comments we get - is, "I fear for my life every day". They still do it because cycling is still the best way of getting around, but people are saying they fear for their life every day. There is an existing situation that is potentially being made worse by some of the policies around motor traffic, getting motor traffic moving. It seems to be the case; I am not going to claim it is hard and fast, but it seems to be the case.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Chris, do you want to comment?

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Obviously every death is a tragedy and when it happens you feel for the relatives, but the first thing, I would like to see that in the context of number of cyclists, because cyclists have gone up phenomenally over the last few years. What I do not know is how -- I do not think there are absolutely reliable statistics - TfL may have them - on just how much the numbers have gone up. If the rate per cyclist has not gone up so that, OK, there are 16 deaths where there were 10, but there are 200 cyclists where there were 100, then per cyclist it is getting safer, which is not to be complacent, but I think if you are going to analyse what is happening and try and get to the causes, I think we need to know these things.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Chris, if it helps, across all categories there has been a 12.2% increase in cycling casualties in one year, so the total number reported, and of course there must be many that are not reported. So this is fatal, serious and slight, is 4,497. I think 12% in one year, on that figure, is significant. German, do you want to comment?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** Yes, and I think this is a national problem as well. I think nationally accidents have increased as well, which my personal opinion I think that points to driver behaviour, perhaps speed and legislation. We certainly have a problem with driver behaviour. I think some of the investigations that took place from some of the very unfortunate deaths from Brian [Dorling] and Svetlana [Tereschenko] on Bow Roundabout; it seemed to be a driver behaviour issue where a lorry driver was on the phone. Legislation again points to it was not very clear whether he was breaking the law or not, so legislation is not clear, and I tend to think - and that is why we are having a campaign 20-mile-an-hour sign - that we need to calm traffic down. We need to reduce the speeds and that will reduce the accidents and increase safety. I tend to think that we might be having a problem with driver behaviour, which could be addressed by legislation.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Are you saying that you believe driver behaviour is deteriorating?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** I think so, and I think if you look at places like, for example, Copenhagen, the onus is on the driver if there is an accident with a cyclist. If there is an

accident with a cyclist in Denmark it is the driver that has the onus by de facto. There have been trials; there has been a push here in England to have changes in legislation so that is the case. That has reduced accidents significantly in Denmark and I think it will have the same effect here in the United Kingdom (UK). However, I do not think there is enough onus on the driver to look after the cyclist. I think we have all been in confrontations where you get told, "You need to look after your own safety". "Well you are driving a 5-tonne vehicle, if you hit me you kill me, if I hit you, nothing will happen to you." I do not think that the population is seeing that. I do not think people go out there trying to kill people, it is just they do not see how it is to be a cyclist in London, which goes back to my previous point of, if we bring onboard people that are never going to be a cyclist, but we do explain to them, "Look, cycling is still happening, you might not be a cyclist, but your friend may be a cyclist, you might have children that cycle, so you need to look after them".

I think there has been a precedent with buses; I know that TfL has done significant training with bus drivers. The majority of bus drivers do not cycle, but they receive cycle training. When you go and speak to the bus drivers in garages, they still complain a lot about cyclists, but at the end of the day what they say is, "We are professional drivers, we have to look after the cyclists". If we manage to have this change in mindset for the rest of the population that will not be a problem, but, in a nutshell, and to go back to my answer, I do think that driver behaviour is deteriorating. Whatever reason it is, maybe it is too much Jeremy Clarkson, maybe it is too much congestion and people get fed up with it, road rage. I think the media has a little bit of responsibility on this, on having what we have seen lately, which is this: "You, cyclist, versus us, drivers, and we all hate each other", but the reality is a lot of people that cycle have a car and I become a pedestrian and get on the tube. I do not call myself a tubist, I do not call myself a busist, I do not call myself a driver, so why do people identify themselves with one specific mode of transport, which is causing all this animosity between people?

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Aggressive driving is a problem, you think?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** I think so.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Chris?

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** Thank you. I think to reiterate some of those points, up until the last couple of years, the increase in cycle use, we do not have the exact figures, but various indicators show that it has been increasing a lot, and that has been outpacing the increase in casualties, up until the last couple of years. But now nationally and in London, particularly in the last year, we have seen the casualty increase far outstripping the rate of increase in cycle use. Yes, nationally, the same thing happened, we have seen increases in deaths of pedestrians and increases in deaths and injuries to other road users as well. There is clearly something more than just something specific to cycling going on here. I think again it may be to do partly with a fall of road traffic law enforcement; we know that there have been many fewer road traffic police out on the streets nationally, but also in London. We know that speeding went up last year on a national basis, according to the Department for Transport's (DfT) statistics. We know that there are fewer tickets being issued; we know that a lot more drivers, instead of getting penalty points, are going on diversionary courses, which may have some effect, but in the end it means that they stay on the road longer if they are a persistent offender. I think that is perhaps what is behind some of this.

There is one small point, which is that the gap between 2010 and 2011, there was a very strong seasonal signal that 2010 was a very severely cold year, there's a lot of winter weather going on for three months of that year, so there may be a little bit of rebound in that, particularly among pedestrians and cyclists, there is much more use in 2011 than in 2010 that is not showing up in the less-detailed figures we have on cycle use. That is just one sort of caveat to think about, but yes, a 20% increase in serious injuries in one year is really worrying and it is obviously a far bigger increase than the increase in cycling we have seen, which was probably about 7-8% as far as we can tell from Transport for London figures.

I would say that Transport for London have suggested so far in their press release on the casualty figures that they think it is possibly to do with mobile phone use by drivers. It is interesting they say that, because clearly they have spotted something coming out of some of the reports they have from some of these crashes. Again I think that is an enforcement issue. If you do not have traffic police out there catching people breaking the law, then these things happen. We know that the distraction value of mobile phones is incredible and it is becoming part of people's business life to be on the phone all the time, and of course now there is all other sorts of distractions that are a problem. I think there is possibly something going on there.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Definitely an issue that needs constant pressure though, and we need to attend to it. TfL are actually carrying out a road junction review. I think it has been widely discussed, because of the number of issues that have come up over the last year and the tragic deaths, but very helpful with the Times campaign. It would be helpful if you want to comment about the TfL's road junction review, what the priorities are on it, and whether or not there are really some potentials for wider changes to benefit cyclists, as well as focusing on these dangerous junctions. We know junctions are very often implicated in accidents. Is there some wider practical changes that we could be looking at, for example cycling-specific traffic signals? What good things might fly out of this review do you think?

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** We are not technically involved in the day-to-day operations of the review, but we are aware that it is probably tackling way too many junctions to really make a substantive difference. Doing these junctions is very hard work; it is incredibly expensive just to do one junction. We know they have about £15 million to spend, but it is nothing, it ...

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** You could spend that on one junction.

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** Exactly, so it is going to be really hard. But I think what you are alluding to there is, yes, there are all sorts of ways to make things easier for cyclists to negotiate major junctions, which are an incredible barrier to cycling safety and to cycle use. One junction can basically turn what would otherwise be a perfectly acceptable route into a nightmare and essentially stops any form of cycle use, apart from confident young people, which is more or less where we have come to in London. So, yes, some of the simple things: cyclist-specific traffic lights; there is a lot of DfT regulation that affects the way transport engineers and so on implement schemes, which makes it very hard to do simple things for cyclists. I think the Mayor has suggested in the past, "Turn left on red", it is very slowly -- the DfT are thinking about it, but it takes a very long time to get these things through. So, yes, there will be all sorts of things, which I know we and colleagues have been badgering DfT on for a long time.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** But you feel that doing the 500 review is probably spreading the resource too thin at the moment?

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** I think so, yes.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Ashok?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Yes, thanks, Val. I mean let us reinforce the importance of looking at junctions. I mentioned earlier the data we are going to be passing over to you. Some of the other bits of information that we have drawn out from this feedback from our members, we have asked them, "What are the most dangerous locations that you are experiencing in London?" and they are mostly junctions. In fact, the top ten are mostly one-way systems, gyratories, so we know this is a major problem for getting around our city by bicycle. I would actually also say, when we launched the Love London Go Dutch campaign, we ran a YouGov survey, we asked people, "What are the problems that are preventing you from taking up cycling or cycling more?" and people said, "Junctions", but they also said, "The lack of a safe and convenient network of lanes, tracks, facilities across London" as well, so it is not just the junctions, it is getting between the junctions as well that matters.

I think we need to look at all of those issues, and not just things like signalling, not just things like rules of the road, being able to turn left on red or whatever; but actually the physical space that we give to cyclists is far too often inadequate and presents too much danger to them. Going back to the smoothing of flow, and that applies at junctions as well, it may well be laudable to get traffic moving more quickly, but then you are increasing the impact speeds. It may well be laudable to get motor traffic moving more quickly, but then you are making it more attractive to get into a motor vehicle as opposed to a cycle. All of these things are coming into play.

Now, going back to the junctions specifically, I would echo everything that has been said before, we are delighted to be working on the junctions review. We think that some really innovative work has been coming out of TfL staff, and we have said that; we are really pleased with the level of engagement and thinking, but the problem is I think it is way too much, I agree with what Chris is saying. We have asked for and we have not yet received any kind of indication as to what the priority junctions are, what the timetable of implementation will be, what the criteria will be for selecting which junction gets the most amount of money and so on. We are engaging, but we feel like we are engaging at the moment in the dark.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** OK, and did you feel, Ashok, that - you mentioned gyratories - obviously speed is an issue at gyratory. Would you be arguing that really they should be attending first to the gyratories?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** If we look at it in terms of where the most amount of danger seems to be presented to cyclists, it is generally at junctions, and gyratories tend to have the faster speeds as well, and they are difficult to negotiate. That is what we thought would be the case and the evidence that is coming through from our consultation with our members is reinforcing that view.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** OK, Chris, anything to say?

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Well, there is no doubt that gyratories are certainly the big barrier to cycling. The question what you do about them, again I have not been involved in this junction review, there are representatives of - -

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Yes, they tend to be TfL roads by and large.

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Yes. But what we can do firstly would depend on points other people have made, are you prepared to lose a bit of motor traffic capacity, or is that politically not doable? There is a big movement to remove gyratories altogether in I think Tottenham Hale, which I have been involved in, in the past, they are actually going ahead with that now after many years. The one I know about, Hammersmith Gyratory, which always comes up in our list of hot-spots, we have actually managed to put in a scheme in the last couple of years that actually does give cyclists a way across the south side of it without negotiating it. Now it is not a perfect one, there are problems and cyclists say they do not get enough time at the lights and too many lights are given to the traffic. However, it does mean, whereas previously I have had to go around a gyratory under a subway where you had to get off and walk, you can now do it at surface level, and a lot more cyclists are doing it. Now that scheme cost about £3 million itself and it was benefit to buses and general traffic, not just cyclists, but if it is £3 million for one gyratory, £15 million between 500 is obviously, as I said, not going to get you very far.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** That is a minor fix in a way, it is an improvement, but it is the lipstick on a pig in the sense that the gyratories probably need to be completely redesigned. German?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** My background is as an engineer, so I put myself in the position of engineers. I will go back to DfT and I will make a pledge for you guys to see the more pressure you can put on the DfT to change the regulations. They are absolutely ridiculous; I have not seen anything like that in any other country that I worked in. They need to change. They are going to change in 2014; I think it is too late. Now they are saying sort of late-2015. If we want to put a traffic signal that is good for cyclists, a traffic signal that you get, as we were talking about, - - in every little town in France you see them with repeater signs for cyclists, which you can go now and buy off the shelf from Siemens. It takes four years here of an off-road trial to get it approved in London. That is absolutely ridiculous. Pushing innovation is absolutely the hardest thing you can ever do. We worked between Cyclists' Touring Club (CTC) and London Cycling Campaign (LCC) and Sustrans, some time ago when I was in TfL, to introduce a Trixi mirror. It took three years to get a £140 mirror that does absolutely nothing wrong to anyone and it could save a life. It changes nothing in traffic signals, it is not connected to anything, it does not reflect anyone, it is not going to be vandalised; three years to put it in, just because of the regulations. We need to put pressure on DfT to change that. All these cycle signs, which have to be 3 metres up there, no cyclist is going to see it, absolutely ridiculous.

It links to a second thing as well, which is traffic engineers, myself when I was one, absolutely scared to death of this increasing congestion so that London comes to a standstill. It does not happen. This issue of disappearing traffic, people do not accept it, the DfT does not accept it, and the profession does not accept it. The truth is, when you reallocate space in a junction and you give it to cyclists or pedestrians, a lot of unnecessary trips do not take place and disappear, and you see in a very short period of time that traffic is normal. The opposite does happen. If you give more space to cars, then more cars will come, and we have seen this everywhere in London. We should empower engineers, we should empower

transport directors, to say, “You can remove traffic; you can reallocate it to cycling, and nobody is going to come and accuse you of running London to a standstill”. Come from Mexico City, if you want to see standstill go there, it really is standstill there. I think we have a lot of space to manoeuvre.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** That reinforces very much Ashok’s point that you came in with, yes.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Absolutely, and I wholeheartedly agree with that. Engaging directly with the review; I am happy to say again that we are pleased with the innovation that is coming forward. When we try to put forward our own takes, our own perspectives, we are told, “You cannot do that because the computer model says we will have congestion and it will be backed up miles, the motor traffic will be backed up miles, therefore you cannot have the solution that you are proposing”. German is absolutely right. The evidence seems to be crystal clear that people adjust, and that shift, the ability to facilitate and also anticipate modal shift, is just not being included within these new redesigns for the junctions.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Very good, thank you.

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** I would like just to add two more things, which I think are important, something that I was having a chat with one of the volunteers yesterday, there is positive provision for cycling, so making sure that when we build new infrastructure, if we are going to build something new, just make sure that it has cycling included. I think Sustrans’ job has been for the last 30 years retrofitting cycling infrastructure. We want to disappear as a charity, we really do. If cycling provision is there from the beginning, then we do not have to do a job, and then we can become a health charity, thank you very much.

The other thing as well, which I think is quite important, is that we allow business as usual to take place. After the review of the junctions has taken place, and TfL is working on a whole number of other junctions and other improvements, to me I think it is important that that process still takes place and that is not stopped by the junction review. That they can still keep going and improving safety on other areas, on maybe not main roads, but side roads, etc, again with positive provision for cycling. So not the whole design process to come to a standstill; yes, the junction review is extremely important, but the business as usual is important as well.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Can I welcome Martin Gibbs from British Cycling. I know you have been delayed on the train, we blame the train company, we often do here. Thank you for getting here and arriving. We are just asking some questions, so Members will bring you in, and then we are going to have some open mike sessions to get some points from our audience.

Richard, you wanted to come in on this, and you have the next question as well.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Yes, thank you, Chair. I do really welcome all of you here because it is great to have you all together to give your opinions to us. I wonder if we can just get London into context with other places and there are a good many other cities that are quoted about the cycling conditions, as compared to London. Obviously Amsterdam and several of the Scandinavian cities, and Barcelona, but London, it seems to me, having been here for 40-something years, is a very big and different and

dangerous place. How actually does it compare to those other places that are regularly quoted on cycling? They are so much smaller, are they not, and they are so different in volumes of traffic and driving conditions?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** One way of looking at it, I am a Londoner too, and very proud of it, and one way of looking at it is that phrase, London is a collection of villages. We do not actually have to look at London in its totality. We do have to take into account commuter routes across London and the journeys people want to make along those routes, and so we have the cycle superhighways. But actually how many town centres are there in London? How many opportunities therefore are there for us to say, "Do you know what, those town centres could be so much better for everybody who wants to use them, by foot, by cycle, they could be so much safer for everybody who wants to use them". The kids can go to those town centres by bicycle, to a shop, or go to the library, or to the supermarket. I think those are exactly the same challenges as people have faced in other countries. It is just in London we may have to look at it, not just in pan-London terms, but on location-specific terms, and look at it in terms of the local journeys. That is the way I would couch this. The huge potential, as identified by TfL for cycling in London, is actually potentially in our town centres, not in the big commuter routes. The town centre challenges we face, I do not think are fundamentally different to the town centre challenges that have been faced in all of those cities that you have talked about.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** You are really suggesting virtually a different policy for each one of the 32 London boroughs, and yet you were calling for the Mayor to take a lead. OK, he can take a lead, but, as Chris Bainbridge will probably tell you, and all of us, the boroughs are very jealous of their independence and they do not want the Mayor interfering all the time.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** I did recognise the huge political challenge that would be involved, but nonetheless the Mayor does control some of the roads that do go into those town centres, so that is one thing. Moreover, I think there needs to be a positive engagement, as there already is, but an even stronger positive engagement between the Mayor's Office and the boroughs. There needs to be partnership work. The principles need to be established; the basic principle that says that we will not deal with the danger barriers preventing people from cycling in our city unless we take a radically new approach and say the city needs to be fit for people of all abilities, all ages, and so on. Once you establish those principles, once you say that is what we are going to try and create, we are going to put money and resource towards that, but then we will also use the suite of tools that are available to us, segregated cycle tracks, built-up permeability, speed reduction, shared space, just in fact as the Dutch do, on a location-by-location basis, on a partnership basis, then I think we can make progress. Each location will need a bespoke solution.

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** I agree with that. It would be a terrible shame, would it not, to say it is all too big and it is all too difficult. I think what people like Amsterdam and Copenhagen have done, they have looked at their city and they have said, "No, we will make cycling central to this city and central to our policy", and that is what we need to do here.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** But it is not so much the big, it is the dangerous difference, it seems to me. I mean Amsterdam is very different from London, is it not?

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** Yes, in terms of size.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Very different. I mean, if we were talking about a comparison with Paris or Rome or Madrid then it might be right, but Amsterdam and Copenhagen are just very different from ...

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** But crucially it is very different in terms of policy as well, is it not?

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Sure, yes, but it is the physical difference I think that is really quite critical that we have to get into context first.

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** There is no doubt we need to work with the physical constraints that we have, but if we want to transform this city we need to put cycling at the centre of it, as we were hearing earlier on. Let us have a policy decision that from now on, when we create junctions, we will think about cycling, we will build cycling into them, so we do not have to retrofit.

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** I have always been interested in Berlin. Berlin has around 5 million people, it is a big city. They have 10% modal split for cycling, quite a lot. They do have the advantage of wider roads, but that poses a problem to them in terms of they have higher speeds for vehicles, less congestion, more cars. I think the average population has more cars in Germany than it does in the UK. It is a very interesting example where they have done a lot for cycling. However, I think the big difference, and it probably applies to big and small cities, is that the population as a whole are onboard. If you speak to a German or you speak to someone in Denmark or in the Netherlands, is they do believe in the virtues of cycling, even if they do not cycle. For example, Copenhagen has a policy where they take away 2% of car parking every year and give it to cycle parking, and I do believe this is not due to a brave politician, but is due to the population that empowers the politician. That is why for me it is very important that we start engaging with this 60% of people that have said, "I will never cycle", to tell them, "OK, do not say never, you might cycle one day". We were having a chat that we should aim to include them into cycling, but also to say, "Look, even if you do not cycle, the people that do are not using cars, they are not using the underground, less congestion on the underground, less congestion on the buses. The people that are cycling are producing less noise, are producing less emissions, so it will benefit you. If you want to drive that is your decision, that is OK with us, but come onboard with the cyclists and empower people to make these changes." I think there is a big difference with every city, is the population as a whole is onboard? We need to bring the population of London as a whole onboard into the cycling agenda.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Could I just briefly touch on the point you made about danger, and the fact that our city is very different. I take that as meaning it is an older city, the space is more constrained, for example. I mean for me that is not the reason why we should not be promoting cycling, it is absolutely the reason why we should be promoting cycling. If you have a dangerous city where conflicts are occurring between different road users, where the space is limited, is it not far better to pursue a policy where that space is more safely and more efficiently used? If you do believe that is the right policy then logic dictates we need to be prioritising cycling more.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** It will just take longer I think. I would like to move on to the relationship between - we have already mentioned - HGVs. I think it was Chris [Bainbridge] who said that he thought maybe that was the major cause of accidents, major contributor.

**Chris Bainbridge:** 50% of fatalities I think.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Yes, of fatalities. I think we do really need to discuss special measures to deal with them, if we may, because that is very much part of the danger element that I feel is inherent in London. So who is going to start on HGVs and what we ought to be doing?

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** As I raised it, I may as well start. Obviously there is again a whole gamut of measures, starting at mutual awareness, which TfL and I think there are about six boroughs, who are doing this training of HGV drivers. Also we have awareness sessions where we will park an HGV on a square and stop the cyclist and stop the HGV drivers and give the cyclists the experience of what it is like to be in a cab, and obviously with the training the HGV drivers, the experience of what it is like to be a cyclist. The danger with that is it is only really a drop in the ocean at the moment; it is only a very small amount of HGV drivers that are reached. Of course the question is, the problem with any training is people do it, they are all enthused by it, and the feedback we have received is all the HGV drivers really enjoy it and really love it once they have overcome their scepticism, they love riding about on bikes. But then, after a while, with all the daily pressures they face and all the deadlines to get their deliveries on time, they forget it and it gets lost.

There have been all sorts of more technical solutions being proposed in terms of putting warning signs within the lorries so that the lorry can detect when a cyclist is beside them ...

**Richard Tracey (AM):** That is perfectly possible, is it not?

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** It is certainly technically possible, but I think it goes back to the point some people were making, how hard it is to get legislation changed, both in this country, and particularly in Europe with this; that we have been talking about these ideas for a good ten years, but we have not really progressed much with them.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Of course the Trixi mirrors, what about them, do they make a serious contribution, do you believe, to ...

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** As was said, they are a very low-cost solution. They must help. However, we do not want to get carried away thinking that is all you need to do.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** No, of course.

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** So that is the only danger with them; you need other things as well.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** We are very lucky in LCC that we have a former HGV driver who is responsible for looking after policy on road danger reduction. I think he is here today and he may be able to amplify further when the questions go to the floor. I think you are right, HGVs are a big issue, half of all cyclist deaths are due to collisions with HGVs. There are a suite of technical solutions that can be employed, and that is great. We have been working directly with industry in various fora, which has been very productive. I mean let us really enforce that there has been no division

here; the industry and the cycling groups and the sustainable transport groups have been working really well together to try and identify solutions. That has resulted, for example, in the freight operators recognition scheme being rolled out and more on-cycle being available for drivers, and all of that is helping, and it is fantastic. A little bit of anecdote: I come quite frequently, I cycle down the Old Kent Road, and the very few – and it has been relatively few – number of occasions, which I have found myself in some serious difficulty, not through my own fault I hasten to add, has been negotiating with HGVs moving fast and between lanes. I am thinking to myself, “OK, I use this because I am going into work. Would I like my teenage son to be going down to the cinema in Surrey Quays on this road negotiating with HGVs?” We can put in place technical solutions, we can put in place driver training, but there is also the issue of whether it is civilised to be putting young people, as they should be, on bicycles to get around, to be fit and healthy, enjoy their freedom, become more independent, in the same physical space as a 30-tonne lorry going at 30-miles-an-hour. It is uncivilised and that we also need to address.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** It is very dangerous, I quite agree with you, very dangerous for young people to be in that sort of environment.

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** I agree with that, and there is a suite of measures. There is also an issue that I think we need to look at is how drivers are remunerated, because if they are remunerated on the basis of that they will be paid more, the more drops they do, then that I am afraid creates incentives for them to drive more dangerously, and I think that really needs looking at.

**Richard Tracey (AM):** Of course, obviously dealing with foreign drivers, it is all very well for us to be legislating for our UK drivers, but the vast numbers coming in from Europe and elsewhere, and it is very much more difficult to bring in that.

The other thing I wanted to deal with on this question of safety was, I have been receiving quite a number of emails and letters from cyclists who feel that motorcyclists are a danger particularly in pulling to the advance stop boxes at traffic lights, which I gather they should not do, and then they cut across in front of cyclists when the lights change. Do you agree that is a real problem, or not?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** The problem with motorcyclists and cyclists is the speed differential and the acceleration; that is the main issue. I think the answer for the advance stop boxes is a very technical one and we go back to the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD). These are the DfT regulations where in theory a motorcyclist should not be on the advance stop box, but due to the technicalities it is impossible to enforce it, and so it is with drivers. There is a solution there to be addressed with making sure that regulations from DfT allow for enforcement of advance stop lines and I completely agree it is always a package of measures, it is about training for motorcyclists, it is about awareness, it is about sort of sharing experiences, trading places, so there is no easy solution, but there is a technical issue with advance stop boxes and motorcyclists.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Richard, there is also a broader issue, or an additional issue, when it comes to powered two-wheelers, to use the jargon. I am a physicist, not an engineer, so I understand relative speed. It is the powered two-wheelers in bus lanes issue. It is not a bad behaviour by the motorcyclists, not at all, if you are a motorcyclist you are allowed to use a bus lane, you will see the space in front of you and you will go for it, why not? I would do the same if I am on a motorcycle. The problem is, if you are cycling in a bus lane, which for experienced cyclists – I will not say novice

cyclists - but for experienced cyclists is a good option as compared to the general traffic lane. Before you know it, a fast-moving vehicle has come within a hair's breadth of you at high relative velocity. You are in danger then potentially; at the very least it spooks you. There are a number of issues about the way in which we put, at the moment, both legally and illegally, the fastest moving traffic on the road next to the slowest moving traffic on the road, and that again does not make sense to me.

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** I should just add to that, when Westminster experimented with introducing motorcycling into their bus lanes, before Transport for London rolled it out, it found that the speed of motorcycles leapt up, as soon as they were allowed into bus lanes. In fact, the average speed was over the speed limit for motorcycles in bus lanes, because it is a free route. I think motorcyclists said, "We will use this because we can go to where we need to get to very fast", and people were opting to use motorcycles, like cyclists opt to use bicycles, because it is a very quick way of getting around. Anything that allows them to go as fast as they would like is good for them. It is an issue that obviously - that and advance stop lines - I come back to the enforcement topic. We just need better enforcement of these things and advance stop lines are not just infringed by motorcycles, they are infringed by all motor vehicles.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Police cars sometimes.

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** Indeed, police cars sometimes. That is a bit of a problem when the police will not even abide by the regulations themselves.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Murad, do you want to come in, and then I think we will open it up to the floor.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Just on the casualties issue as well as that, I just think it is healthy to look at these issues, not solely in cyclists, but the fact is that we are not all cyclists, but we move between cycling, using the tube, buses, and what have you. Just one comment in defence of car drivers, I think most of us who passed the test several decades ago would have a lot of difficulties passing today, so it has actually, I think, become better. I have been just looking at the figures for the casualties that we have in front of us, and the statistically more significant ones are, in general, in Central London, over 200 cases-plus, where we have had in Westminster a 20% increase, Camden 21%, Islington 20%. Is there something happening in Central London, apart from things we have discussed so far, which we should be taking note of?

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** If half of the casualties are from HGVs, that needs looking at for a start. I think part of the answer to your question is HGVs.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** What I was trying to allude to is basically, when I use a cycle, the bike hire scheme, I am aware that, if I go through the Royal Borough of Kensington there is a kind of shared space approach, and when I go into the City of Westminster there are lanes on the London Cycle Networks, which are soft surface, and then when you go to Camden it is hard surface. There are different approaches by different local authorities, and I am not sure whether that helps or does not. We have different approaches by local authorities in somewhere like Central London.

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** That would not account for the change, would it, because there has always been different approaches by different authorities?

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** True, but you need quite a bit of local knowledge to be able to negotiate that. You could find yourself, for example, going along the City of Westminster, going into Camden, and realising when someone beeps at you that you should be on the hard surface lanes.

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** That inconsistency is unhelpful, I agree with that. Just picking up on your point about cars and cyclists, I have always been very keen not to polarise this debate. British Cycling, nine out of ten of our members drive as well, so I agree with you, there are sometimes when I bike and sometimes when I car, so it is not trying to be a sort of tribal divide ...

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** We just touched on something, which I thought was interesting, because you talked about the hire bikes, and when they came in a lot of people thought there were going to be masses of collisions because there are all these inexperienced people on these very clunking lumpy bikes, nobody will know what to do with them. That has not happened really. In reality, the casualty rate is very low and I use them occasionally in Central London and I was a bit worried when I started, but I have actually found the bus and taxi drivers are quite tolerant. They give me more space, and so maybe there is a more general lesson that they are more visible, and so the idea that you have to have helmets and high-vis jackets and need all the equipment, the borrowed bikes tend to point in the opposite direction.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** So clunky bikes and ...

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** That is another problem, we will not go there.

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** Just to pick up your point about differentiation between boroughs and the different figures emerging, in the last year there was a 12% increase or a 13% increase in Inner London in cycle casualties, but there was also an 11% increase in Outer London, so it is not just an inner/outer split. There is considerable variation, so Croydon for instance, there was a 62% increase in one year; I do not know what is going on there. Interestingly that is mirrored, if you go outside Croydon to Surrey, has seen a doubling in cycle KSIs in the last three years, and other Home Counties also see similar huge increases. What might possibly be going on there is a big increase in sports cycling, particularly in the run-up to the Olympics, and a lot more sporting events going on. I certainly agree that the variation between the boroughs needs to be looked at and there are some statistically significant things going on, which we could be learning from.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** TfL may probably suggest that the Croydon figure is not statistically significant because there are not over 200 fatalities there. Another observation on my part, I have noticed, for example, pedestrian rails have disappeared in Central London considerably. I do not know if that has been a help or hindrance; there is about 700km worth. They are meant to help pedestrian, but I do not know if they have actually been a problem right across the board or not.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** I do not have the data to hand, but the general thinking, certainly from sustainable transport groups in general, cycling groups in particular, is that this is

a good thing, because it is about this approach to road safety or road danger reduction as a whole. You mentioned the hire bikes just a second ago; one of the best things about the hire bikes is the signal that says, "Come as you are, you have your clothes as you are, you pick up the bike, you cycle as you are. It is fine." The message is not, "Get kitted up like Mad Max because it is death out there". That is one of the great things about the hire bikes.

The removal of the guardrails for me is a really positive step, because it is not saying to a motorist, and I drive as well occasionally, it is not saying to a motorist, "You can take this like Brands Hatch because you have a guardrail there to keep pedestrians ..." It says to the motorist, "Watch out, people are crossing. Watch out, cyclists are making turns." I think that is really positive.

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** There is another dimension to that in that, often in the cases where HGVs are turning left, cyclists have actually been trapped because of the guardrails, they have not been able to escape, so if they are taken away they can escape.

**Murad Qureshi (AM):** Just one more observation. I actually think, to the credit of the bike hire scheme, it does tell cyclists not to overtake on the left, which does cause a lot of accidents.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Murad asked a question which I think was not perhaps fully answered, in a sense you answered a lot of the other bits. What is your view on whether it is safer to segregate? One of your questions concerned that and I thought that was very interesting. Could you just go back to the question that Murad asked about that, about whether you think it is safer to have it segregated or whether you think it is safer to have it shared?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** I feel I really ought to answer that question, because when we ran the Love London, Go Dutch campaign, it was predicated on a vote. We asked our members what campaign we should run in the run-up to the Mayoral elections, and the majority of people came back saying, "We want a campaign looking at the way in which the Dutch approach cycling".

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** We are coming on to a separate question on the Dutch.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** The segregation, yes?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Yes, it is just that we are coming to a separate question about the Dutch. I just wanted to refine a little a bit about the specific question that Murad asked, because we are coming on and I do not want to take somebody else's question on that, so maybe you could ...

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** But is the question about should you segregate or not segregate? Is that what you are asking?

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Yes, but I think there are further questions we want to ask about the Dutch system, so maybe, if it is easier, ask that first.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Why do we not hold that there and come back to that? I really want to get some of the audience in, because people have been sitting very patiently. If we could bring the mikes down. What I want to say to our audience is how safe do you feel cycling is in London? Do you think

that the initiatives that have been coming out from the mayor and TfL, such as the cycle superhighways, and we are going to talk in more detail about those in a minute, have improved safety? What else might improve cyclists' safety? If you could give your name and either which part of London you are from perhaps the borough, or, if you are representing an organisation, which organisation. We will take your contributions in clusters.

Let us start at the back over here. Donnachadh in the back row and then we will move forward. We will get all you all in.

**Donnachadh McCarthy:** Thank you, Chair. Donnachadh McCarthy, Southwark. I have been involved in planning on cycling for 20 years and you ask is it safe? Every time I cycle I feel I am in danger of death. If I make one wobble I am in front of a truck. I also want to say that 3% in Southwark are cycling, 40% of them want to cycle. When you ask the question is it safe to cycle in Southwark, Southwark children are saying no. They are not here today, so I hope I can say that on their behalf.

If I may say, the thing you should be asking for, as a Committee, for London I believe first and foremost it is budget. We need to know what does it cost to put a proper integrated transport network of cycle lanes in London, divide it by five and allocate that budget and in five years we are there.

Secondly, the job descriptions for the people in charge of Transport for London should be changed. We should actually re-draw up the job descriptions for all the senior officers to implement the Go Dutch for London proposals. If they are not qualified to do that, then we should find people who are.

You are not examining the borough transport plans properly. You need to change what you do. Southwark submitted a transport plan last year with three years' funding. There was not a single metre of segregated cycle route in that plan. That is not acceptable, and you are giving the money to the boroughs to implement that with zero.

Fourthly, you need to put in a system to protect the routes of the Mayoral superhighways. Southwark has built an entire block along the cycle route leading by Vauxhall Tube. That means that that route will be locked for a century. You must have systems in place to protect the current routes, otherwise you are blocking them.

Look at the Japanese regulations on junctions. In Japan they recognise that the elderly and the kids are not HGVs and so they allow them to pass the junction when the green man is showing. That means that the conflict between cyclists and traffic has been eliminated. This awful row they were having in London between traffic and cyclists has been eliminated in Japan. Look at it as part of your report. Please ask the Metropolitan Police Service to start charging people corporate negligence on the designed junctions like the Elephant & Castle, with no provision for left-hand turns for cyclists, when they were told that is where we were being killed.

Finally, in your could report could you please as Transport for London, any time they are doing new transport infrastructure or refurbishment projects to please include cycle provisions. We are looking at the moment at the Aldwych: four lanes for traffic, huge widening of the footpath. Where are we? We are invisible again. If you could take those seven points and put it in your report I would be really grateful, thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you very much for that, Donnachadh. Some very useful points about the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Programme between TfL and the boroughs, and what TfL should be expecting in the boroughs I think is very important within all the points you raised.

**Susan Hoffman (Living Streets campaigner):** Hello. Susan Hoffman, Living Streets campaigner and pedestrian. Will the Committee ensure that the investigation considers the need of other vulnerable road users and pedestrians when looking at potential solutions? We hope the report's findings will benefit all these groups that share the same desire for safer, better-quality streets.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you. I know Living Streets, for example, were very involved with the junction review and I think it is maybe trying to not have a conflict between pedestrians and cyclists, and vulnerable road users have been very much together. Thank you for that point.

**Ruth Mayorcas:** Hello. Ruth Mayorcas, a woman who actually cycles. I am not a cyclist, I am somebody who gets on a bike and cycles, and have done which I was ten. I lived in Holland where I learned to manage my bike properly, because it is done properly there. I have a list of comments as long as my arm but I will try to be very brief because I know we have a lot to say.

The point is that the traffic is too fast and too big. I do not know if any of you are aware I am only five foot tall. I cannot see over a four by four. I can see over a saloon car. We all can see over saloon cars, so can children. The amount of deaths in London from pollution is something like 4,000, as far as I am aware. Cycling and pedestrians are win-win. Even if you spend a huge amount on making cycle lanes, once you put them in they cost nothing. When you put in a metre of a road, how much does it cost? How much are the repairs? Look at the M4, Boston Manor Viaduct, and the one at Hammersmith Bridge and all those. Please look at it.

I ran a two-day stall at Bedford Park fair in Chiswick. I come from Chiswick, which is a village. I totally agree with Ashok [Sinha] and I totally disagree with you, Richard [Tracey]. The point about London is it is lots and lots of villages. If we get the driver behaviour right in each village, if we get people cycling and walking in each village, then it will spread throughout London, and I totally agree with what German [Dector-Vega] was saying on that.

I ran a two-day stall at Bedford Park fair on behalf of the LCC. The overwhelming comment was from women who will not cycle because it is too dangerous. I do cycle, I do get frightened, but I will cycle and I make my son cycle. He was knocked off his bike recently. A woman drove so close to him the hub of her car engaged with his derailleur and pulled it off. She screamed at him and drove off. The police form, which is 12 pages long, does not even mention cyclists, so can we sort that out, please.

Can we sort out the fact that Boris ran an advert where on the back of a bus it said that losing your car licence was going back to cycling, ie going back to being a child, because it was toddler on a moped. I do not know if any of you remember that one. We cannot get children to school to train because it is too dangerous for them to get to school with their bikes to train, which is why children are not taking up the off-road cycle training. We have to do something about that. Borough by borough it could be done in open centres on a Saturday. Surrey Council ran that and was very successful.

TfL consultations, the A4, Sutton Court Road, which divides Chiswick, they ran a consultation which we only knew about with two weeks' notice to it closing. Allegedly 500 residents and businesses were notified. I have yet to find a single resident who knew about this. They are pushing through with this. It is totally dangerous for cycling. They are going to have a left turn only, which means that cyclists will get trapped. Hammersmith Bridge. We recently did a consultation on Hammersmith Bridge. Two councillors said, "There is no point in putting in a 20 mile an hour speed limit because no one will take any notice". OK.

What else to say, very quickly? Cycle lanes which are not cycle lanes. How can a cycle lane stop being a cycle lane? The one that runs along Kew Road is only a cycle lane from 7.00am to 10.00am. Do I not cycle? Do I not cycle to go to Richmond shopping? It is nonsense, absolute nonsense. We have to do something about it. Money is being spent on retraining motorbikes to cycle in bus lanes properly. Sorry, it was an experiment that failed but we are still spending money on it. I will not have this thing, that Boris keeps saying, that it is the cyclist's fault when there is an accident. We have to make liability with the driver like it is in every other European country. Also may I say that in Tel Aviv the Mayor of Tel Aviv is taking 2,000 parking spaces unilaterally because she realises that we have to have more bikes less cars.

Sorry to get so emotional but I feel very, very passionately that we need more women on bikes, because we are the ones who take the children to school on the whole. It is very important. I am not lycra-clad; I do all my shopping by bike. Localism is encouraged by cycling.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Lovely. Thank you very much indeed, Ruth for your points there. Let us take some more points.

**Dave Suttle:** Hello. My name is Dave Suttle and I am a long-term London resident and I live in the Borough of Greenwich and I was also a primary head teacher for many years. I encouraged cycling at my primary school.

I wanted to make several points. Lots of points have been covered by many speakers but there has not been much said about cyclists' behaviour. I think we have to address the reality of the culture of behaviour that we have, both amongst motorists and some cyclists at the moment. In terms of motorists, there is an enormous frustration in terms of the fact that they cannot drive quickly around the capital because of the volume of traffic. That often leads to motorists jumping lights, taking risks, speeding. That is an issue, I think, that really we need to see greater enforcement. Enforcement has been mentioned to a possible solution to some of our problems.

I can think of a local example of a junction where a cyclist was killed where a lorry went through a red light, and I think that is a fact. I know that junction very well and every day, whether I am in my car or whether I am walking or cycling, I see two or three motorists jumping that red light continuously. It seems a fairly simple solution to put a camera there or advise available traffic enforcement officers to attend that scene. I am sure if that happened in all the London boroughs, that would greatly reduce risks and accidents.

I think a missing element in all of this is education and behaviour for cyclists. When you go to buy a new bike from a bike store you get told very little about your expectation as a road user. There is some guidance on looking after your bike but it is not made clear to you what your rights and responsibilities

as a cyclist are. For example, the issue around heavy goods vehicles is not going to go away in the short term, so we need to somehow address the current danger of HGVs and cyclists. Quite simply, if you are a cyclist you stay away from HGVs. You see many cyclists cycling along the inside of them. That is because people do not always understand how dangerous that is.

I would advocate some sort of short-term system whereby cycle owners can be educated and trained about safe road use. We have digital technology which enables people to be contacted very simply and efficiently in terms of emails and advice, so I see some sort of interim solution whereby driver and cyclist behaviours could be addressed while the longer-term issues of all the many positive suggestions that have been discussed here could be addressed.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you very much, Dave.

**Miranda Housden:** Hello, I am Miranda Housden. I live in Tower Hamlets and I commute in from Bow to Westminster every day. My concern is about the superhighways and the fact that there seems to be some confusion of whether vehicles can be in the superhighway or not. I think it would really useful if anyone, particularly commercial vehicles, were entering into a congestion zone, that they had to have a cycling awareness course and be aware of when they can and cannot use the cycle lanes. I think that would really help to do that.

The other thing I was going to say is that we are encouraged not to cycle to the left of vehicles, but all the cycling highways are to the left of vehicles, so there is always that confusion. Particularly if the traffic is slow, you are cycling faster than them in the cycle lanes and then you do end up with those issues.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you for that, Miranda. Let's come to the front row here.

**David Arditti (Co-ordinator of Brent Cyclists):** Thank you very much. My name is David Arditti. I am co-ordinator of Brent Cyclists, an outer London LCC group. I am also on the board of the Cycling Embassy of Great Britain.

I would like to address Victoria Borwick's direct question about is segregating cyclists safer. The answer to that, I think, to anybody who has studied this subject, is undoubtedly yes, if the designs are correct. We do not need to reinvent the wheel in Britain or in London. There is massive experience in other parts of the world, and in particular in the Netherlands and in Denmark, about designing correct segregation that works, that is safe for all types of cyclists, fast cyclists and slow cyclists, young cyclists and old cyclists. Simultaneously that not only creates safety but increases their priority and their space on the road so that they can actually make journeys efficiently and make cycling a viable alternative.

I will come to the Borough of Brent. In Brent we have a level of cycling to school of 0.2%, so it has virtually disappeared and it is not very hard to see why that is. Brent is severed by a huge road, the North Circular Road. It is not possible safely to cross that road on a bicycle. You have to cycle through huge motorway-style interchanges with design speeds of 40, 50, 60, 70 miles per hour at Staples Corner or at the Neasden Gyratory or at Henlys Corner, which has recently been made worse by the redesign by TfL, in order to cross the North Circular Road. The only other methods are to cycle illegally on footways

or across pedestrian bridges or go through dank underpasses with such a poor sense of social safety that no parent would ever allow their child to go there.

We have, in outer London, these huge problems of severance that require major engineering solutions. We have biking borough funding from the Mayor of £300,000 for three years. That is about 10 pence per member of the pollution. I calculated that at that level of funding, to build the type of infrastructure that the Dutch have built in 40 years, it would take us 3,000 years. Can we afford to wait that long and how can we address this huge divide between inner and outer London?

If you walk around the streets around here, you can believe the line that there is a cycling revolution in London. I can tell you that from my house in Edgware, cycling here on the A5, I have cycled in the middle of the day recently for three miles without seeing another cyclist. There is no cycling revolution in outer London. Cycling has virtually disappeared. It is less than 0.5% of all journeys. This is due to the unsuitable infrastructure. Unless we have serious funding to seriously change the infrastructure, all the calls for more cycling will go no further than they have in the last 30 years of cycling being encouraged in Britain.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Lovely. Thank you for that, David.

**Rik Andrew (Founder Member of London Cycling Campaign):** Well, said, David. My name is Rik Andrew. I am a founder member of the London Cycling Campaign. I am currently a board member and I co-ordinate and coach a junction review group. Formerly I was the LCC Lead on cycle superhighways.

I am giving evidence as an independent specialist who has worked in this field for longer than anybody else, possibly with the exception of Chris Bainbridge, which is about 15 years plus. I have worked in over 20 boroughs so I know London very, very well and I know what good practice and what bad practice is. I have also studied good practice in Denmark, Holland, Belgium and so on.

I think I would like to address the issue of driver behaviour first. It is instructive also to drive a car in Belgium and Holland, not just ride a bike there, because you are forced to slow down approaching junctions and especially roundabouts. You cannot overtake on the inside, nor can you change lanes at the last second. There is no doubt in my mind that UK road design encourages aggressive competitive driver behaviour. Do not take my word for it; Jan Gale said exactly the same thing recently when he was last over here, "Why do you encourage people to drive fast through junctions? That is not what we do".

Our urban A roads, as Ashok said, need redesign to reduce speed differentials and protect vulnerable road users, which is what superhighways promised, and Boris' aims on it were admirable, but it is not what TfL have delivered. It is just briefly worth noting that we are here today and we were doing the same exercise in 2004 after a spate of deaths on Blackfriars Bridge, and Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) were brought in to do a report on the poor state of cycling in London. They focused on the bridge and they said, "All the bridges are dangerous, they are all strategic, why are they still managed by the boroughs? They are all strategic and they should all be treated as strategic roads". We still only got two proper cycle facilities over them. I hope TfL are not going to ignore the recommendations of this review now.

We are here today not because any one particular thing has gone wrong but because two major projects have failed. London Cycle Network (LCN) and superhighways have both failed to deliver continuous safe routes. They have tried to do cycling on the cheap with no impact at all on other modes, and you simply cannot do that, especially if you choose to put cycle routes on the most dangerous roads in London. The Transport for London Road Network (TRLN) has been designed for fast, heavy traffic and HGVs and buses. It is grossly irresponsible to go for an engineering-lite approach on it.

We have said for years that poor-quality routes are worse than nothing at all. They mislead inexperienced cyclists into thinking there is a facility there which is going to give them some protection, when there is not. Part-time routes are a complete dead loss. That is why no schoolchildren cycle. They do not kick in until 4.00pm. That is hopeless for commuting to school. Advisory lanes are no use. This Committee said at the end of phase 1 that superhighways should have mandatory lanes 2 metres wide. It has not been implemented in phase 2. It is completely ignored by TfL. Lanes that are blocked by parking loading bays are no good to cyclists. Boris said you would no longer have to dodge around these obstructions.

Every bus stop is a hazard. There has been no attempt to redesign bus stops. We know how to do it. We have done it in Royal College Street, we have done it in Jamaica Road. Not a single bus stop on the superhighways has been relocated or redesigned. It is a constant problem.

I am afraid the deaths at Bow, etc, were totally predictable and a direct result of poor design. The design of highways give cyclists no protection and constantly puts you in the wrong road position at every junction, which is contrary to what TfL trainers advise cyclists to do. This is, I am afraid, literally incompetence. What puzzles me is why TfL management entrusted the design of superhighways on our busiest roads to the bus priority team who had never designed a cycle route before in their lives. That is quite staggering, really. They did not consult the boroughs, they did not consult LCC about their blueprint or about their route choice. They went in and we were not consulted until way, way through phase 1.

To answer your question is there one solution, no, there is not. I am concerned, and Chris [Bainbridge] will probably back me up on this, about what is happening with the LCN. It is just in limbo. The LCN was not completely rubbish. It was right to stop the project, because it was going nowhere slowly, but there are a lot of good routes on the LCN and I would like to see us retain the best of those and maintain quite a lot of it. Maybe the way forward is best of LCN, best of highways, because some of the routes just are not viable, and do not forget greenways. Greenways are really important.

If you want to pin down on one thing which is really, really important, it is zone 1. Zone 1 is an absolute nightmare to cycle in; it is just a horrible maze of one-way streets. When we were working with the Cycle Hire team three years ago, we put forward a very simple proposal to them, not a difficult proposal - I do not think any of this is difficult at all - for a bike grid in zone 1 of half a dozen routes going in each direction, using mainly the minor roads, because we were trying to get something in quickly but effectively within the timescale of Cycle Hire. There is a proposal on the table for a bike grid in central London, and that is probably the most important thing you can do. However, if you are going to progress superhighways, you have to go back and redesign the form they are in at the moment before you do anything else, to a much, much higher standard. They should be and could be exemplars of best practice, European best practice - that is what it says - and they are not.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you, Rik, that is very useful. Obviously the bike grid and some of those points we absolutely supported as a Committee before.

Lots more hands are going up, so if people could be, if possible, slightly briefer with their comments. Let's take the gentleman with the white hair and the gentleman there and then we will come over here and finish off this block here.

**Ian Brooks:** My name is Ian Brooks. I am a resident of 35 years of Hillingdon and currently chair of a residents group with a lead on road safety. Previously I have spent 30 years as a traffic officer, policing London. I have worked for Transport for London for a brief period of time in the force recognition and freight team and more recently I have undertaken a master's degree in occupational safety and health with specific research on work-related road safety, in particular the risk associated with HGVs and cycles.

The risks are disproportionate. Last year there were, as has already been mentioned, 16 cycle deaths, of which 12 of them were commercial and 9 of them were HGV related. The figure that frightens me is in the eight-year period, 2002 to 2009, there were 189 deaths in London involving HGVs. Nine of them involved HGV occupants, 180 were others. That is a ratio of 1 to 20.

The risks are all related to occupation, the use of the roads at work. There is a silo of good practice and understanding in general health and safety which is not embedded into road policing or work-related road safety. What is missing is a work-related road safety strategy for London that would include, amongst all things but not exclusively, a more intrusive process of road-death investigation which looks for, finds, addresses and ultimately fixes management underlying failures. It is not just about driver behaviour, because sometimes the drivers are being asked to do an impossible job in an impossible environment using vehicles that are not fit for purpose. Also the point was made here to my right that we have to stand up to the realities that we need competent cyclists.

The common denominator in this is the employer. The employer should ensure that they have appropriate policies and procedures to manage work-related road safety. Crucially, and this is where the local authorities come in, the public sector, they should have procurement policies and procedures that differentiate between safe operators and unsafe operators, and a little bit to do with encouraging the people to cycle to work, my last point. In addition to encouraging people to cycle to work as part of a workplace travel plan, some effort should be put into encouraging competency above and beyond that currently around.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you very much indeed, Ian. This gentleman here and then we are going to move to this block over here.

**Charlie Lloyd:** Thank you. My name is Charlie Lloyd, I am a Hackney cyclist, I enjoy cycling. You asked about the risks of cycling. I personally do not feel frightened cycling, but that is after 40 years' experience as a cyclist and even longer as a driver and a professional driver. I understand how so many people do feel frightened on our roads.

To be brief, if there was one thing that I think would help this Committee would do to start the change process that everyone has recognised as necessary. I think our experience - I work for London Cycling

Campaign, as some of you know - is that at hundreds of junctions on borough roads and on TfL roads within the London Cycle Network programme and the junctions review, competent safety measures are blocked by the Transport for London insistence on maintaining motor traffic flow. They use computer-modelling systems which quite frankly are not valid. I think German [Dector-Vega] made this point before. They have no scientific validity; their outputs are not reflected in real life. That is a major block to what the engineers know are safe options, and this Committee can recommend that London abandons the use of this modelling as a block to better road infrastructure, as has been done in most continental cities, as has been done in New York and many other American cities, comparable cities in size to London. That is one thing that this Committee could do: they could recommend that that adherence to inappropriate computer modelling is just abandoned.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you, Charlie. The lady behind you has a quick point to make and then we are going to move to this block.

**Katharine Harborne (Councillor, London Borough of Richmond):** Hello, I am Katharine Harborne. I am an environment scientist and Cycling Czar for the London Borough of Richmond where I am also a local councillor. I have had no family car for a very long, or I never have. I love the freedom that cycling gives me, and me and my family, and it helps me keep fit. My teenage son is working to get on the junior GB Olympic cycling programme as well, so we are committed to cycling.

However, we are still a long way to get cycling accepted. Part of my role as member Champion of Cycling is to get more people cycling more safely and for fun in Richmond. I would like to tell you later in the second half of your session about the positive initiatives that we are doing.

We need to encourage more people to choose cycling. In fact, the research from British Cycling Foundation has said that nearly a million women would like to start riding a bike but many of them are put off by safety concerns. I looked at this Committee's attitudes research report and found only a quarter, 27% of non-cyclists claim to be put off by cycling safety concerns in 2009. It is shocking that despite the millions of pounds being spent on cycle superhighways and measures to make London's roads less dangerous and cycling super, safety fears have in fact increased by half, 52%, in that period. Concerns over safety are now the main deterrent for preventing non-cyclists from cycling.

In 2011, the report also reveals that almost half of occasional cyclist, 48%, think that safety is a big issue, and yet less than a quarter of regular cyclists, 23%, think it is. It is fascinating that a lot of people who do not cycle much or at all see safety as a major deterrent, whereas regular cyclists do not. The roads and the trucks and the infrastructure are the same for both. The skills of the cyclist and their experience and, most importantly, their perceptions are different.

Let us look at the deaths from cycling in London. It has been mentioned that there have been six deaths in London this year from cycling. None of those have involved a lorry. By this time last year there had been 13 deaths involving 5 lorries, so things have certainly improved.

I have spoken to the British Heart Foundation to get the latest figures. Their latest figures are from 2006 to 2008, when 5,900 men under 25 died of a heart attack. In the same period there were 2,500 women who died of a heart attack, premature deaths. That is around 4,000 a year who die prematurely of heart attacks in London, so please can we put cycling deaths into perspective. I know it

is regrettable, but how many of these people would have lived longer and healthier lives if they had got on a bicycle?

Based on the facts and figures, if we want to encourage more people to cycle, we need to stop banging on about how dangerous it is, because, quite frankly, the statistics do not bear it up, so please can we all agree that we will stop putting people off cycling? Later on I would like to talk to you in the second session about the positive initiatives we are taking in Richmond.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you for your points, there, Katharine. We may not all agree with everyone's points but it is important that we hear them.

**Richard Bourn (Campaign for Better Transport):** I will be very brief. Richard Bourn from the Campaign for better Transport. I would just like to add our view to that which has already been expressed that the most important matter is the priority that is attached to traffic capacity on the roads, motor traffic capacity, and the fact that cycle safety and the numbers of cyclists takes second place. I would also say that actually many of the arguments that we have heard today apply to walking and to the fact that pedestrians have suffered by the efforts being made to smooth traffic flow. I suspect the Committee will have to come back and look at walking in much the same light in the weeks or months to come.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Absolutely. We have done a report before on walking.

**Speaker:** Thank you very much. I will be very brief, just one point. I am a cyclist, a motorist, a pedestrian and also a taxpayer, so I have interests in keeping ...

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Which borough are you from?

**Speaker:** I am from Southwark. I have an interest in keeping traffic moving and costs down, as we all have. Funding is limited. On the major projects, can we not always review cycling? Look at Exhibition Road, look at Pall Mall and Piccadilly. How much money is being spent on that? It would have been a tiny additional cost to make room for cyclists on those schemes.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Very good point.

**Ruth-Anna Macqueen:** Hello, my name is Ruth-Anna Macqueen. I live in Hackney. I am a junior doctor and I cycle to work, which is six miles away in Newham. I used to have a beautiful off-road commute down the Lea towpath and long the greenway. They have built an Olympic park in the middle of that, which is fine and wonderful. Hopefully in five or ten years' time we will all have a fantastic park on our doorstep.

It is nine days since they closed the towpath. In that time, just through social media, I have a letter in my bag signed by 150 people who use the towpath every single day to commute, saying, "We didn't know about this. We had no idea and there was no communication and no consultation and we are being forced on to extremely dangerous roads or on to overcrowded public transport, which is exactly what we have been told not to do during the Olympics". There are posters everywhere saying, "Cycle during the Olympics". I would love to, I really would.

I know this Committee, by the time you meet again, that will all be over. Helpfully my commute will be open again from 10 September and hopefully I will still be alive. My two alternative routes are via the Stratford one-way gyratory, which is a hair-raising cycle at the best of times, let alone during the Olympics, or via the Bow roundabout. I do not have a car, so I am going to cycle to work, but it is not very fun. This is a tiny, tiny thing in the wider sense, I totally appreciate that, but I think it is just a very small indication of how cycling and non-motorised transport is seen as peripheral.

I have a toddler. As I said, I do not have a car. He comes everywhere on my bike. Sorry, I am getting emotional. This is how I get around London. I have lived here my whole life, but the ignorance and arrogance of people making these kinds of decisions that impact on our day-to-day lives, with just no consideration. That towpath, it is like closing the A12 for motorists, with no warning and no consultation, on spurious security grounds. I think it is just symptomatic of a much, much wider picture that cycling is something that people might do on a Sunday for fun, rather than, for very, very many of us it is our main mode of transport. We would just like to be able to get to work and get to the shops and still be alive at the end of it.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you very much for that, and I think it is an issue we are going to pick up, any Olympic issues, after this session that we will be feeding in, but this we had raised previously as well. I think you would not dream of keeping the M4 closed, so let's look at that.

**Tim Lennon (Representative of the Cycling Embassy of Great Britain):** Thank you. My name is Tim Lennon. I live in Richmond with my partner and two children, and I am partly speaking today as a representative of the Cycling Embassy of Great Britain.

My daughter starts school in 2013, and we have five or six schools within a 2km radius from us. Not a single one of those schools can I access by bicycle without crossing a dual carriageway, using pavements I am not allowed to ride on or cycling down a street that is clogged with parked cars, or sharing road space with four by fours, trucks and buses. When London starts building facilities for my daughter to peacefully cycle to school with me, then you will start seeing the other people, who all of these surveys tell us are too scared to get on a bicycle in our city, actually get out and bicycle.

I am also a school governor in Richmond and I have spoken to parents at my school who drive their children there because the only available route in this particular case -- I believe she is about half an hour's walk from school. If she does not have time to walk, then she wants to go on a bicycle, but she cannot go on a bicycle because her bicycle route with her daughter starts off with a pedestrian route with barriers specifically designed to prevent you cycling on it in a straight line. Then you have to cross Richmond Bridge and share that with trucks and buses because you are not allowed to cycle on the pavement there. Then you have to navigate your way through other school areas where parents are dropping their children off on yellow zigzags and getting through a one-way system around Richmond that is solely designed to get cars through Richmond town centre.

As an Embassy representative, I believe that London will only achieve mass cycling in the volumes that the Dutch and the Danes have through the actual provision of high-quality safe infrastructure that separates cyclists from traffic and that genuinely aspire to support all Londoners in having a real transport choice.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you, Tim, for that very useful point. One more hand and then we are going to get some pace going through our questions so we can move on to our next session.

**Andrew Sutton:** My name is Andrew Sutton, student at Nottingham Trent University. With also the deaths and everything like that, you have potholes. When you are cycling over a pothole on a road bike, it is extremely dangerous. You can be thrown off your bike. It has happened to me before and I do not want it to happen again, so I think the onus is on the councils to actually fill them in and basically repair them before anything worse happens in the future.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you for all your comments. They will all be accounted for in our evidence, and some really powerful and useful points there.

Let's get through the rest of the questions in this first section.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Yes, thank you. Quite a few members of the audience mentioned cycle superhighways, so if I can put a question about your reflections on the cycle superhighways currently and how they can be improved, given that we are not Berlin and we do not have the same wide roads and so on, so there are limitations in London. How effective do you think the cycle superhighways have been in terms of safety, and what improvements do you want to see?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** I think I would build very strongly on what Rik [Andrew] was saying earlier. The concept of the cycle superhighways is a good one, the idea being to give people direct, continuous, way-marked routes into the centre of town for those who are doing long commutes. Fine, no problem. However, the experience that we have had from engaging from the design of superhighways to their actual implementation and use, and this is coming through from what cyclists are telling us, frequently is that the quality of the cycling experience on the superhighways is not what they had expected and it is not what they were hoping for. You have situations where at different times of the day you are dealing with parked cars in your way and at other times you are dealing with cars coming into your space because the blue lanes are not being respected.

Road surface quality. Two days I went along cycle superhighway 7, just for a short space of time. There was a difference in road surface quality and I skidded. The surface was not right. The surface was wet and then it could not cope with the conditions.

When we talk about space, Cycling Superhighway 2, I think it is, going down the Mile End Road and Whitechapel. I know it is hard and I know there will have to be a lot of compromises and a lot of hard discussions will have to occur, but there is plenty of space to build a properly segregated, wide, well-surfaced, useable highway so that anybody of any ability can cycle on it quite happily and not have to worry about any conflicts.

Then there is the issue of junctions as well. You can create a superhighway that is of the highest quality, but if you hit a junction, to use a phrase that has come up a number of times and has come up with us, where you feel, "Crikey, I have to knuckle down and get across this as best I can because it is pretty damn dangerous", that is going to put you off from using the superhighways. There are a whole raft of things that need to be addressed. We have always taken the view that you either do them all to the

highest international standards or, if money is a constraint, do what you can to the highest international standards, but do not put highways on the road that purport to be of the highest international standards and are not.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Certainly we have had a lot of complaints about people feeling completely abandoned at junctions when it gets to the most difficult and dangerous bit of the route. They feel completely abandoned. Is that the opinion of the others?

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** I would echo that. I think that the objective is good and that creating an environment where motorists expect people, if they are on bicycles, to be in a certain place, that must be helpful, but it feels like a halfway solution. It feels like a solution that has not brought with it some decisions about, "We are going to have to make some priorities here, we are going to have to make some choices, we are going to have to prioritise cycling". It feels like a solution where it is said, "With all the other modes, let's see if we can get the cyclists through without making anybody else suffer".

**Chris Pack (Cyclists' Touring Club):** I think it really shows a lot of the problems London has that each of those routes so far is costing about £10 million to implement. It is about £1 million per kilometre of route, essentially, and we are not even getting anything more than in most parts just a 1.5 perhaps in some cases 2-metre, on-street cycle lane painted in blue. I know some of the money has gone into promotional activities, which have been very successful and worked quite well and there has been a small increase in cycle use on all the superhighways they have introduced. There is a marketing part of it which has been very successful, but the implementation of the design of the route in terms of engineering has, as has been pointed out, been pretty poor compared to what people were expecting a cycle superhighway to be when it was first announced as an idea many years ago that we were going to do this. How, therefore, we are able to build really high-quality routes if that is what we are building for £1 million a mile is a question which is going to be something which you may need to investigate.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Chris, would you expect segregation on all the cycle superhighways routes even if we cannot do it on all routes across London and so on and some of the more local routes? On the cycle superhighways would you expect segregation as a basic standard?

**Chris Pack (Cyclists' Touring Club):** On the major routes which are being used, we would advocate segregation. I took part in one of the meetings in the run up to cycle superhighway 8. Everyone who attended that meeting recommended that the cycle route they were going to build along Millbank and beyond should be segregated. It was one of the rare examples where TfL were saying, "It is a two-lane road at the moment. We are prepared to lose one whole lane and make it into a cycle superhighway", because of the reduced motor vehicle use in central London subsequent to the congestion charge. They were able to take away an entire lane. There was no bus lane there so there was no conflict with buses.

All they did was build a wide-enough -- but, it is not fully segregated and therefore it is still only really suitable for the types of people that TfL were aiming at with the cycle superhighway, which was really commuting from inner London into central London. That is what it was aimed at. It was to relieve some of the pressure off the public transport network and I think to certain extent it has succeeded in doing that. It has not helped the other people who are trying to make those trips, such as getting to school, people who were perhaps less mobile, less fit, more worried about traffic to make local trips in the area. So they only really aimed it at one type of trip. Perhaps it worked for those people, but we were there

pushing for it to be fully segregated and they never did it. It is a cost factor, there is a maintenance issue there, but it is really just a commitment to do things to the highest quality which is lacking, I think.

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** I think I can pick up on that point, which is, I think it is very important that we build parallel quiet routes to the cycle superhighways. I worked on the design of the cycle superhighways; I built the first two cycle superhighways. I can go chapter and verse on the number of things that I personally would have loved to do better, issues of funding, a lot of issues on regulation, a lot of issues on politics. Some councillors did not want to segregate lanes. The reality is that some people did not want segregated lanes on the routes.

In other cases perhaps the cyclists that were going down those routes did not want it to be fully segregated. The case of the A24, which had a huge amount of cyclists and still does, they felt that they needed segregation, and I completely agree we should have mandatory cycle lanes and not advisory cycle lanes, which are in the DfT manual, which are not suitable. However, they did not want it to be fully segregated because then they thought, "If we want to cycle on the roads, if we do not want to cycle on the segregated lanes, drivers are going to kick us out". There is a huge discussion around it.

I will agree that the expectations were high and we did not manage to meet them for a number of reasons but there is a lot that can be done in terms of building parallel quiet routes that are not for the confident cyclists, so the confident cyclists can go through the cycle superhighways. We do need to un-peg the difficult junctions, not run away from that. They need to be safe for everyone, even for the very, very confident cyclists, but I will stress the point that parallel quiet routes that are suitable for people.

Two things: maintenance is really, really important. Invest £1 million and then you need to maintain it. Building on that, which I think is a huge, huge possibility and quite exciting, is continued improvement. Let's go back, revise cycle superhighway 7, for example, and say, "Right, we have done this. This has worked; let's replicate this. This has not worked, let's change it and let's address it", and then go back in another three years or go back in another four years.

A very interesting example for the cycle superhighways, the ones I built, 3 and 7, 7 was an on-road on the TRLN cycle superhighways. However, let's not forget cycle superhighways 3 was a completely or totally off-highway route that goes through a segregated cycle lane and then narrow streets, etc. We had a lot of other problems there.

I am just trying to say at the beginning we were kind of experimenting with segregation versus non-segregation. I think I agree completely with Ashok [Sinha]. I think there are places where we should have segregation. We should be careful that when we have segregation cyclists are not discriminated from using the rest of the road, and there are places where we can do things without segregation because it is safe already, which is the quiet parallel local routes. So continuous improvement, maintenance, quiet parallel routes.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** I think those points are well made, thank you.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** Sorry, it is not the question Murad asked. I am really sorry; it is not about segregating the road. Murad [Qureshi] asked the question and it was not answered. I am sorry to make

a point about this but the point that was asked was about Exhibition Road, which is an entirely different road surface. It is not about segregating just cars from things, it is not about the sort of Dutch system, it is an entirely different experiment on a much larger scale than has been done in central London before, and the question that Murad [Qureshi] asked, and I was really, really waiting for the answer, was do you consider that this particular experiment, and others he quoted, was safe. You said you were going to take that up.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Exhibition Road is not actually that innovative. It is a shared-space approach, but that has been tried in other parts of the world, including Holland.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** I am so sorry, it is innovative in London.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** The key point about shared space is it works and can work well when traffic speeds and volumes are already relatively low. If you try to put a shared-space solution into a place where traffic speeds and volumes are high, you get what you get now, a place which is notionally shared but actually is still a place where traffic speeds and volumes are high and going directly through. It is a good solution in the right circumstances, it is the wrong solution, it appears, for Exhibition Road.

This actually points to something that we learned when our members told us to go and run a Love London, Go Dutch campaign. We went out to Holland and what they said to us was, "We are not zealots here. We are not segregationist ayatollahs. What we do here is say you mix where possible and you separate where necessary.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** I think separating is much safer, so that is why I am very concerned about Exhibition Road and I just want to know from the expert what are your views?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** I would not have mixed on Exhibition Road.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** That is very clear. Does anyone else want to specifically comment on Exhibition Road?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** I think it was a lost opportunity to pedestrianise it.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Absolutely. Hear, hear.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Anyone else want to come in on that? No. Jo, you were going to come in and then Jennette.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I was going to ask about how the voices of the cyclists are heard when roads are being redesigned or built. Someone has mentioned the North Circular before. I represent and live near the North Circular, Bounds Green, Palmers Green, where there has been a massive redesign and a lot of money spent on the redesign there, and dedicated cycle paths was one of the promises. I am receiving complaints that although the scheme has now been built -- I have a letter, for example, from the Haringey Cycling Campaign, with attached photos, which shows that cycle routes come suddenly to

an end, and to carry on in the same direction you have to cross a fast-moving dual carriageway with four lanes of traffic. Bus shelters along the routes with advertising hoardings on the sides, obscuring the lines of sight for pedestrians and cycle users, and lampposts are placed in the middle of the cycle route as well.

I am just wondering, from your perceptions, do Transport for London and borough councils when they are redesigning layouts actively seek out the voice of the cycle lobby. Do they have the right expertise? It seems to me that they were obviously designed by someone who was not a cyclist.

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** I think the evidence is there, is it not, that they do not. It is inconsistent. Surely we should have a transport policy, a TfL policy in place where it is not them looking to the lobbyists, it is that they have the expertise in house who, as a matter of course, are involved in the design of those junctions. Until we have that, we will always be having to retrofit or we as campaigning organisations will have to be bothering people. Surely that is wrong. The expertise should be in those departments making those decisions as they arise.

**Chris Bainbridge (London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** As a borough representative I do not necessarily go along with that. Firstly, I do not know what TfL do. I do know some of the people who have written into me before this meeting with points to make have mentioned Shannon's Corner redesign as a particular example where they think it has not been done well. I think boroughs, certainly my borough and I think all boroughs - others can tell me otherwise - will always consult with their local cycling campaign group on schemes.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** Do you do cycle rides through the area with them, for example?

**Chris Bainbridge (London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Not a regular issue. We had one only a week ago in Hammersmith, actually. We were doing that very thing. We will consult them and generally we have regular liaisons. The liaison is usually -- there is a certain tension there and it is not sweetness and light, but then why should it be? They are not our fan club and vice versa.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I think it is a point that the skills could cross over.

**Chris Bainbridge (London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Yes, but this idea that the borough should have all the experts and therefore they do not need to consult, they could come up with the perfect -- I think the cycling groups would not like that.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** I was not suggesting that.

**Chris Bainbridge (London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Even with so-called experts, there are widely differing views. There were widely differing views within the Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group on the value of segregation. I would probably tend to go along with Ashok's [Sinha] view. If you have a segregated track in a very busy street where there are lots of side roads crossing, there are actually more collisions there because the drivers are looking for the motor traffic. Sometimes it is better to integrate. If you look at the Netherlands, my memories of The Hague, where in the big square outside the station there are all the women with their kitten heels, or whatever they are, riding and sharing with the trams and everything. It is related to levels of traffic. I think segregation is valuable on things like the A4, say,

and the A40, where you have fast dual-carriageway roads and it really is scary to ride with the traffic. Sorry, I have come off the point a bit.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Just to clarify my position, I think segregation is absolutely the right solution in quite a number of circumstances in London where you have fast-moving traffic or high volumes of traffic. I think if you have a residential street such as the one that I am living in, we do not want segregated lanes, we want the cars to be -- the rotten ones to be dealt with.

**Joanne McCartney (AM):** My question was the voice of cyclists.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Voice of cyclists. I think the situation is patchy. We have a local group in every borough. Some of our local groups have a very good relationship with the local councils and there is constant dialogue, Hackney being one of them. So long as you know that the dialogue is meaningful, people are prepared to participate in it and if they get told, "We won't implement what you are demanding or suggesting or asking of us because these are the reasons", at least you are getting the feedback and at least there is some sort of due process being followed.

I think in other boroughs that is not the case. I think in other boroughs, for whatever reason, members of our local groups are saying they are not being consulted on important developments and even when they are consulted, it is a perfunctory exercise. I do not think it is black and white. I think there are examples where it has worked well but there are also plenty of examples where it has not.

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** From a Sustrans point of view, we were consulted by TfL extensively. I agree with the boroughs it varies. We have a very good working relationship with the majority of them, with some we are not consulting as well as we would like to be. I think the issue is not one of consultation. Even when you are consulted, of course there are individuals who are more switched on to cycling than others. There is nothing you can do on that. I received cycle training design when I was an engineer and most of the people around me were. I was very concerned about consulting with people, some other people were less. However, the problem I faced when I was an engineer was not the consultation problem but the decision-making problem. When you have to take decisions the reality is that, unfortunately for the population, congestion weighs more than cycling. Sometimes the population is not behind us in terms of cycling.

At Sustrans, for example, when we are faxed with the question, "Would you like to give us your car parking so we can put cycle parking", the answer nine of ten times is, "Don't take away my car parking. My car parking is sacred". So I go back to the same issue, which is bringing cycling to the mainstream, convincing people that it is good for them, even if they are never going to cycle. Then they empower politicians, then they empower decision-makers and that eventually empowers the designer and the engineer who says, "I am going to take away this space, I am going to take away your cycling lane. Can I have this approved?" "Yes, you can." So I think it is a much wider problem than just the consultation.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** What I want to do is the next phase of questions is we have some on Love London, Go Dutch. I think, Ashok [Sinha], you already touched on it and I am sure some will be in your written evidence. If it is OK, I think we can put that in that and I think we have picked up some of the improving cyclists issues, and I am sure you will all be giving us some written evidence as well. I would

like some feedback on Bike Buddy schemes and what people think of those and how effective those have been.

If we move on to increasing the number of cyclists. Jennette, you are kicking off with that and can pick up your other point there.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Thank you, Chair. The point I was going to raise was just dealt with. This area was also picked up by Members here today, and Ruth [Mayorcas] started it off by identifying the low levels of women who cycle. I know that Sustrans has done some work on this. Let's start, then, with the demographic profile of non-cyclists. You have done some work on this. Can you just feed this into evidence, because it seems to me outstanding?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** Thank you, yes. I think I will start with the demographics for cyclists. I think it is represented by the people invited to this panel, all male ...

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** White.

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** ... young, 25 to 44, all in employment, all confident cyclists. That says a lot about the kind of cyclists that we have on the streets now. That is all good. I think that was the right place to start if you were going to convince the people who are perhaps more prone to cycling to start cycling. We have reached that point and now we really need to start doing the hard job, which is getting the less proficient, the less confident people to cycle. This is an approach that has been used for every other single transport mode, which is provide for the vulnerable and everybody else will come. If you provide a cycle route that is suitable to a 10-year-old or a 12-year-old to cycle, then everybody else will cycle.

The interesting thing is the potential there is for cycling. I think we now have a significant number of people cycling a lot. About 20% of the population in London cycle and they produce this 2% of daily trips. That is great; we have a few people cycling a lot. Now we need to add on top of that a whole lot of people that cycle, maybe they do not cycle a lot, maybe they cycle casually. It does not matter; we need to build on that.

The interesting thing that you mentioned, and I really feel close to your case, is a lot of this potential for cycling comes from very short local trips that are done for leisure and shopping. It has been demonstrated that cycling increases turnover in the high street between 10% and 15%, so it is good for the high street as well. These are short trips that can be done with cycling. There are about 4.3 million trips a day that could be done with the short, leisure, shopping cycling trips. That would be about 23% of the model split. The potential is absolutely massive.

Now we need to start catering for the less confident, and the way we think we can do that is the traffic-calming measures really as Ashok [Sinha] said: mix when possible, separate when necessary. Absolutely. Start or continue building these off-road, quiet, local streets that act as feeders into your community and feeders into cycle superhighways when you feel confident to do so. But also, as Ashok said, the nursery for children where cyclists get confident and if you want to go on a leisure road you can do as well. And, of course, 20 mile per hour default speed limit.

We are not saying just suddenly stop everyone from driving in London. It is if you have a default limit of 20, the whole design process changes. At the moment the default speed limit is 30, so if you want to reduce it you have to go through hell to do that, so it needs to be self-enforced. Sometimes it includes speed humps, which not a lot of people like, or pretty much no one likes, and you have to consult with the emergency services, etc. If you start from a default from 20 and you suddenly decide you need a road that needs to be perhaps a bit faster, then you implement your segregation for cyclists, you make it faster, you work on that. We are starting from the wrong point. We should start from 20 and then cater for that, not start from 30 and then try to slow it and reduce traffic speeds.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** I should declare that I know of Sustrans' work in one of the boroughs I represent, Islington, and it is fabulous. That seems to me to be working on something we have heard, and that is deal with our boroughs and our town centres in a specific way and then you are then building up the improvements. I am just wondering how we can get over the blocks, because it does not seem to me that this is the message that is picked up strategically, do you see what I mean? Strategically the message is big and large and your superhighways for commuters, whereas our cities and our towns are about us and our living in them, and if you look at the allocations of funds, a gentleman here, David [Arditti], told us in one borough it is 10 pence per population. It just seems ridiculous, so how can we, in this time of opportunity when we are so active, when we are so fully engaged, get over this hurdle, it seems to me, to get people to understand that this is the solution?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** One of the things we have been very successful at and we have just started doing it more intensively, is community-led projects. There is a perception that they take a lot of time; they do not. They take less time than a normal project. I am not going to make an advert, but we had a DIY street in Haringey, Turnpike Lane. We engaged with the community for two years. It cost £400,000, which is not a whole lot of money. This is a whole, huge neighbourhood, and basically the community designed it. It was not consultation; it was much more than that. The community took ownership of it, designed it, calmed the streets, put in the measures they wanted, made the neighbourhood theirs.

At the end of the project we ended up with people kicking off their own things. We had someone contacting a street artist in New York, who flew all the way to London to paint a mural for free. Some people rescued some Victorian -- they were doing it on their own. We found that these community-led projects gave ownership to the community and then they suddenly started walking and cycling, met their neighbours more, and that has triggered a huge change in the area to the point that now the neighbourhoods next to it want to do the same because they are a bit jealous. We are hoping that kind of mushrooms out to the different neighbourhoods.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** You would still have to add on to that the issues about women wanting to cycle more, and those people. It is still not part of that, it is still yet another project, is it not, that needs to be done?

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** The interesting thing with that project is we have the infrastructure built by the community and now what we are putting in on top of that is the education. We have a school support officer that goes in there and we are trying to do bike sessions with women around this so they can go and cycle in their neighbourhood. So it is the infrastructure with a behavioural change that we think is really, really important.

Just finally, this is all attached to the funding and this is when I say we need to go mainstream with the funding as well. We need to give decision-makers the confidence, the absolute confidence, that investment in cycling and walking is cost-effective in so many ways. Just the health alone would justify it, just the health alone. On top of that, it is efficient in terms of space. It is cost-effective, as it requires less operational expenditure, less maintenance than any of the other infrastructure that we build, so it is a really good investment. If we mainstream the investment in cycling and walking, then we will get to the degrees of Copenhagen in less time.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Martin, from a policy point of view and from your organisational point of view, do you have anything to add to the points that I have raised?

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** Several, actually, but I will be brief. One of them goes back to what Ashok [Sinha] was saying about not looking like Darth Vader. I think that there is a real barrier in this city to people thinking about cycling being normal, not only women but anybody else. A lot of people you see cycling are looking a little bit like Darth Vader. I think that is improving and I think it is partly improving, Ashok, you are right, because of the Boris bikes, but I think that there are several things that we can do to encourage people to think of cycling as being normal. If we can evolve to a place like Copenhagen where people do just take their bicycle because they are taking their bicycle.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Chris, surely Boris should be pushing and getting more resource into this area.

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** I wanted to make another point that we have talked a lot about infrastructure but there is also the individual support for cyclists, which Ealing Council does a lot of. Certainly the one-to-one cycle training, which I think just about all boroughs do now, in my borough, Hammersmith and Fulham, the vast majority of people taking the training are women; it is about 90%. Probably the majority of those are ethnic minority women, so that does seem to be reaching to those groups who have not traditionally cycled. I am not saying it has manifested itself in the mix, but the other things Ealing does is to help people maintain their bike and try to get parking spaces at housing estates and flats where they do not exist. There is all that side to it, which does seem to help these not normally cycling groups.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** And much more to be done. Chris, have you got anything to say in terms of what you have heard from the others?

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** I certainly think that one of the aspects we are missing here that the Mayor has failed to do is there were three prongs on the Revolution for Cycling, which was originally proposed about three or four years ago. They were the cycle superhighways, the cycle hire and outer London quality neighbourhoods for walking and cycling, and that is the area which has not been really delivered. Biking boroughs, the money is not there to support it properly to be implemented. Where there is something through the LIP process to give a stronger emphasis on walking and cycling in outer London boroughs, we have heard some stories about how there are just not the resources to deal with the barriers that people face in those boroughs.

There are really good schemes out there which can be done on relatively little money to improve the conditions in the local area, but that is where TfL knows where the additional cycle trips are going to

come from. 54% of the additional cycle trips, to reach the target, which is a pretty low target anyway, have to come from outer London. We focused on the really easy-to-reach people, the commuters coming in from inner London, central London, trips around town on the Boris bikes. That has all kind of worked, but it is the outer London boroughs in making those conditions safer for everyday travel which we have not done anything about properly.

**Jennette Arnold (AM):** Ruth spoke so powerfully about it, and she has her hand up.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** I really want to finish. We have two or three more questions and then I am going to open it up for everyone here because there are lots of people wanting to come in, to make some final points.

Darren, I think we have covered a lot of yours, but the second half of your question 8?

**Darren Johnson (AM):** Yes, this is looking at the effectiveness of TfL's initiatives to promote cycling and cycle safety. I particularly want to pick up on the outer London boroughs issue, which is crucial. Chris [Peck], we have heard from. Ashok, do you have additional comments to make on where to run the cycle?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** For me we can and we should be doing as much as we possibly can at the community level. It does bring a lot of benefits. However, there is a big kind of block for me, especially in outer-London boroughs, but not restricted to those, which is the planning process. We could talk about trying to make cycling safer, we can talk about training people up and engaging with community groups, all of which are good. But if you are in a situation where the planning process - I am going to use an inner London example - leads to a massive development like the Westfield shopping centre in Stratford, then you see notices on the back of buses saying, "2003 parking spaces". You might as well just say to people, "Get in your car and drive, folks, because that is the way to get around London".

There is this big sort of schism, it seems to me, between all of the great work that is being done on the community level by community groups, but TfL and everybody else, and a model of the development that the planning process is not getting a grip on, that takes us away from car-centric types of development and takes us towards more active travels forms of development. There are economic arguments in favour of making that change; there are environmental, global and local arguments in making that change. We marshal these arguments time and time again. Urban rail arguments, but somehow that is not getting into the planning decisions and the methodology of planning in the city, and I think that is particularly acute in the outer London boroughs where the distances are greater.

By all means let's look at the work that we do on the ground to try to improve safety levels, but if we are telling people, throughout the physical planning and the messaging, that the way to get around is by car, we are undermining everything we are trying to achieve.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** So it is also going to be addressed in the wider planning context; good. Chris, do you want to comment, Chris Bainbridge, on the boroughs' challenges particularly in Outer London?

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Well, Outer London covers quite a wide range of types of boroughs, so on the one hand, you get places like Berkeley and Dagenham which have very low cycling rates. Brent, as my colleague pointed out, very low. Places like Hillingdon, very low but then you get places like Richmond and Kingston which, OK, it is a relative term because everywhere is very small but the cycling rates in Richmond are about the same as in Central London in Hammersmith or Kensington or even Hackney. I know my colleague listed the faults with Richmond's cycling facilities but both Richmond and Kingston have relatively well developed cycle networks and, I am afraid, it does come back to demographics and it is maybe not a welcome message that there seems to be a cycling quantum in these boroughs because they're quite middle-class, educated, affluent areas where people who can afford cars are quite happy to use bikes occasionally, whereas in the more, and I oversimplify greatly, traditional working-class areas, if you ride a bike, you're a loser; as soon as you get a car, you use it. Now, I don't know if we as a local authority can change that.

I just want to say Outer London is not all the same. It is just like all these Continental cities people talk about, there are great differences. There are some places where you can get Dutch-type solutions quite easily; you know, the centre of Kingston where there is little traffic and it can seem like Delft, which is its twin town. Out in Hillingdon, there are big dual carriageways and you can get the segregated facilities in but I suppose a big problem is that in a lot of Outer London, it is very easy to drive, so there is the parking available and the congestion is not that great so there is not that push towards cycling which there has been, if you like, in more congested or more parking constrained areas.

**Darren Johnson (AM):** You have both thrown up interesting challenges both in terms of the demographics and in terms of the overall policy framework in terms of planning and so on, so I think it is probably best to hear comments on that from members of the audience.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** It is a very quick question just to make sure we have fully covered the options here. We just want to make sure that the various people's perceptions about why cycling is unsafe and if there are any easy ways. I know we have addressed this in many ways this morning, so if you try to avoid repetition, of any other ways we can get more people cycling because they've seen various campaigns, but particularly any other questions you wanted to raise that you felt haven't been raised. You may say they've all been raised about safety.

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** Certainly. So one thing people have asked me to raise, and it is a difficult thing to say, that campaigns like The Times' one are not necessarily all that helpful because those who are put off from cycling because they think it is not safe, that is going to reinforce that view if they were feeling that way anyway. They'll say, "I'm definitely not doing that until they make a big change in --". Hard as it is to say for somebody whose relative has been killed by a lorry, cycling is not all that dangerous. I mean, it is dangerous, there is a risk. There is a statistic that the average cycle commuter would have to go for 3,000-years before being killed but, of course, that statistic hides the fact that if you're the one who gets killed in the first of the 3,000, that is no comfort but it is not as dangerous as necessarily people think which is not a reason to be complacent.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** One other small item. There are other things which are important such as cycle parking. Supposing you are successful in persuading somebody to get on their bike, personally I think they're going to be more persuaded when we've built for the vulnerable,

then the rest will come, but they built it, say they have a great cycling experience on a world-class facility. They arrive at the shopping centre and they spend 20 minutes trying to find somewhere to put it and then the place they can put it is in a sort of dark alleyway where they think, "Well, the police are never going to be watching what's happening here". There are so many other obstacles that also need to be addressed.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** So it is the whole experience, not just the ...

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** It's the whole experience. It's the door-to-door experience.

**Victoria Borwick (AM):** OK, thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Great, thank you for that.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Thank you. I am just going to indulge in a small comment if I may, Chair. I have to say ten years ago, when I first became an Assembly Member, I used to find it quite difficult to do casework with cyclists because I would find different types of cyclists almost at loggerheads about what the solutions were and that was because of their different abilities and the different types of cycling they needed to undertake. What I am picking up now is a much more core, generic consensus about what is needed and a recognition that we need to cater for a very, very wide variety of cyclists; everybody's issues matter here and different environments and different journey types. I find that incredibly helpful that that is the case.

In terms of future discussions within TfL and within the boroughs, what more should and could be done to incorporate cyclists' views, experiences and technical expertises into planning? You might feel, German, and I agree with you, that the issue is really about decision making rather than consultation but nonetheless, we want to make sure that cyclists are well built into decision making processes at all levels. What would you recommend?

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** It is complicated because people will feel that they are genuinely being consulted if they think the process that they are embarking upon is a meaningful one and they feel that their views will really be taken into account and that is one thing. Secondly, people will feel more inclined to participate in consultations if they think the ambition levels are high enough. If you are being told that we are having a consultation in this particular location and by the way, it is only 5p that has to be spent on it and we're still going to be maintaining the traffic flows through it, well, kind of, what is the point? There has to be a combination of things both procedural, which needs to be hardwired in. You must consult with cyclists, pedestrians, shop owners, everybody around, proper community orientated consultation and a meaningful one so you know what the outputs are, it's all reported, you know where you have been successful in your arguments and you can see where you have not been successful in your arguments.

Really though, we are still looking for that ambition to be expressed through all the development work that is being done on our streets. Which is why part of the Love London, Go Dutch campaign was to ask the Mayor to commit to make sure that the principles of the highest international standards of design were fully integrated into the ongoing work of TfL so that every time there is a development on our

streets, the first thing that is being asked is how can I make this of the highest international standards so that everybody from 8 to 80 can cycle safely and happily? If I knew that was happening, if I knew that was the terms of engagement, I could get people beating the door down to TfL to say, "Well, look, this is how you do it, folks". So people need to be motivated by a genuine sense of ambition.

**Martin Gibbs (British Cycling):** I absolutely agree with that. A very strong policy statement along those lines would bring people to your door, definitely.

**German Dector-Vega (London Director, Sustrans):** I would like to see; we talk about London buses, we talk about London rail, we talk about the Underground and I was trying to find a little bit more information about the funding that is provided for cycling. We should have London Cycling. It should be considered the same as every other transport mode and I know that Alex [Goodship] looks after cycling – she does an excellent job – but it is not considered London Cycling as such. There should be a department called London Cycling. There should be a budget attached to London Cycling. There should be reports pulled on London Cycling. It should report to the board of TfL as London Cycling and it should be treated as a serious mode of transport. It should be embedded in the planning regulations definitely. It should be represented in the London Plan. It should be represented in the TfL budget; this is how much London Cycling is getting. That is what I would love to see that would be ideal.

**Chris Peck (Cyclists' Touring Club):** I think beneath that; it is symbolic that there is a representative of the London Taxi Driver Association on the TfL board but there is no cycling representative at all.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** The Mayor might think it is him but as one of the potential casual cyclists that you talked about, German, I don't feel that he necessarily understands what it is like to be a starter cyclist or a vulnerable cyclist.

**Chris Bainbridge (Chair, London Boroughs Cycling Officers' Group):** On this question of it is all right to consult with the cyclist, if you consult the cyclist and the residents and the cyclist's voice, he is very small and doesn't get heard, I think it's a case of building alliances between cyclists and other groups like pedestrians and residents. As German said, for people who would never even dream of cycling themselves, to recognise that it is in their interest because there's a lot of people out there who hate cyclists which is not ...

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** I think what you are saying to me is that organisationally, the capacity and the potential for cyclists to be involved in consultations is strong out there. What you want is a clear, strong, political message and the organisational capacity to deliver it; a priority.

**Dr Ashok Sinha (London Cycling Campaign):** Absolutely. The point about that is very good. We've seen this in Hackney as well. Grassroots' cycling organisations working with people around the Broadway Market area, so all the stakeholders, and if there's a strong shared understanding, a strong sense of how that area can be developed through cycling but not just cycling, that also helps but I wouldn't wait for that to necessarily be in place. That political direction does need to be there and I think all the stakeholder groups would come.

**Valerie Shawcross (Deputy Chair):** Very good, thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** All right; let us open it up to the floor. We have our mikes here. This is trying to focus on how we increase the number of cyclists, so what deters you from cycling if you don't cycle? What would make you take up cycling or take up cycling more? Now, the two hands I have seen very agitated whilst we were speaking. The lady with the blue scarf and our council colleague from Richmond.

**Ruth Mayorcas:** Yes, hello, it's Ruth Mayorcas again. First of all, the nomenclature cycle superhighway; actually listening to you all bandying it from one to the other, doesn't it make you think of Jeremy Clarkson? I'm sorry; I don't want a cycle superhighway. I won't go on it. It's too dangerous, it's too fast. We have to have grassroots cyclists and I love your idea of you build the cycle lanes and the greenways that go alongside them. I've cycled in Holland, as I've said, a lot and the equivalent of the A12 has a cycle lane alongside it the width of one of the lanes and it also has the right get-on, get-off. Kew Bridge, they've recently done a consultation, well, they didn't do a consultation but they decided to make it shared use cycling on the pavement, which is brilliant. All right, they put the signs up, they implemented it. I rang them up. They didn't know anything about them. I wrote to them and said, "How do you propose cyclists get on and off the pavement?" Now, you'll all laugh at this I hope because you're all cyclists. It took me a month to get a response. The response was, "There'll be a dropped curb". Now, was that what I was asking? No. It was how do you get back into two lanes of really fast moving traffic at 40 miles an hour? They got rid of the bus lane on Kew Bridge, by the way.

Can we get rid of this free parking amnesty business on Bank Holidays? You know, if I go by bus, and I agree with the pedestrian lady here, I am a walker and a pedestrian as well as a cyclist, I do actually drive. Every time there is an amnesty on parking, who gets stuck? The elderly, the disabled, the people who cannot cycle, the people who don't have cars. They are stuck in buses. They cannot get to Westfield shopping, the one in Shepherds Bush. The cycling to there is completely hopeless.

Can we have the western congestion charge back, please? Can we have a charge raised on 4x4's, please? Hounslow Council, we are very fortunate. Head of Transport is wonderful. They are consulting us every step of the way on the cycle superhighway 9, but the liaison between the councils and TfL is hopeless because he gets baulked. Everything that we put to him, he puts to them and they bounce it back.

Women really want to cycle. We are not commuters. The commuting cyclists will do it anyway I think. That lady put it very well, in tears, she's gone now, but there are the rest of us who want to shop, to cycle during the day when actually traffic flow is faster because there are no traffic jams and it is much more dangerous. Can we please get the policing properly done?

In Holland, the reason that people drive so carefully is because the policing is draconian. They are not allowed to be on the mobile phones. They are not allowed to exceed the 30km which is actually only 18 miles an hour. We have to do this and we have to take it seriously. It is serious. Children are dying, not because of the danger of cycling, but from congestion, pollution, obesity. It is a win-win. We have to get more cycling.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Lovely, thank you. Let us hear from, Kathy, our councillor there.

**Cllr Katherine Harborne:** Hello, thank you. I want to tell you about some of the positive measures that we have been doing in Richmond but first, I have to say in response to a Chris Bainbridge comment; not everybody in Richmond is wealthy. We have quite a large amount of social housing with 8,000 properties and one of the things, as a champion of cycling in Richmond, is we have been making sure we get safe, secure bike parking in the social housing because they cannot afford cars. Actually, they really appreciate having safe, secure places to lock their bikes and not being told off by health and safety for putting their bikes on the landings and under the stairways. So safe, secure bike parking is really important for everybody.

Now, I wanted to tell you about Strictly Cycling. This is a project that Graham MacNamee, who is a British cycling coach, came to me when I was first elected as a councillor and said, "I have this great idea to get competitive cycling in local schools" and I have been championing this. It is a joint project between Twickenham Cycling Club, Richmond Council, British Cycling, The Metropolitan Police and National Health Service (NHS) Richmond because it is good for everybody. Now we have five schools that are taking part in this scheme. It is about getting cycling as an athletic, or as a sport, in the schools and they have lessons and they can run grass track cycle competitions on athletic tracks. It doesn't need any infrastructure and it is all the sorts of sports that take place in a Velodrome can take place in athletic fields. Children also learn skills in cycling. It is not just about sport cycling but it is about confidence and going over bumps, round corners and things like that and it is great fun. We culminated in a bike festival just a few weeks ago at the end of June. There was a big, family, fun day of the races for the under-16-year olds, there was a mums and dads, anybody had a go and there was also elite cycling, so that the young people could see where they could go with sport cycling, to inspire them. It is great fun. It is all run by volunteers. It doesn't involve a huge amount of money at all and I would like to see this sort of thing rolled out in other schools. It has been accredited to the Olympic inspired programme, so it is part of Richmond's Olympic legacy and I am very proud of the scheme because it is fantastic.

Also, we have Skyride Richmond. We have been training ride leaders. We have a huge number of ride leaders who lead safe, secure rides round our borough. We have the most of those of any London borough. We have ten more than anybody else. Please go online and have a look at the Skyride Richmond; join in some of those rides. This is a partnership. This is being sponsored because of the mental health benefits, the obesity and heart benefits. It is actually not being paid for by the council. It is being paid for by NHS Richmond. This is a collaborative project to get more people cycling and also we support Breeze which again, is British Cycling's brilliant campaign to get women cycling. We have ride leaders in Richmond who run rides round Richmond Park and places like that. There is Breeze Cycle Your Heart Out programme which is getting women to cycle heart shaped rides round London and they are brilliant. They are building confidence. At the start of these rides, you get your bike checked over and they are great, I have been on some.

Also, we are getting a bike hub at Richmond Station where there will be 70 pay as you go bikes, so this is to encourage bike tourism, so that people can come by train to Richmond. We have some of the most historic houses; Hampton Court, Twickenham's Stadium and Kew Gardens, things like that, so people can come to Richmond, hire a bike and they don't have to drive to go and visit these historic places.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** I am sure you can put some of this in writing. Your final point because there are other people wanting to get in.

**Cllr Katherine Harborne:** OK. There are a lot of positive things that people can do that we are doing in Richmond. I am happy to share them with people.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** If you put some of that in writing as well; there are some good things on getting new people cycling. Thank you very much for that. I have seen Tim at the front, David, Rick, Donnachadh, a gentleman who has not spoken so I don't know his name, at the back. Tim, here.

**Tim Lennon (Representative of the Cycling Embassy of Great Britain):** Thank you. Yes, I am a resident of Richmond and I just want to say that what we have heard there is, as the councillor said, a list of things that the council isn't paying for, a list of things that have no impact whatsoever on normal people cycling round the borough to do useful things. We have just heard the example of Kew Bridge, which is frankly hellish. It is two lanes of traffic. It is something the borough could do something about but we are doing nothing. All we do in Richmond is we talk about the fun things that people can do to get on a bicycle. We are focusing on, for example, competitive riding at schools. Most children in Richmond are not going to school by bicycle because there is no safe way for them to do so. Three weeks ago, I saw an eight-year old cycling on the A205. I do not think anybody here realistically thinks that eight-year olds on the A205 and the South Circular is an appropriate world of cycling that we want to see in our city and I am just worried that we keep hearing about minor itsy-bitsy campaigns that do not actually deliver genuine cycling for people who currently do not cycle. People who, as the lady from Hounslow said, just want to go shopping; they just want to get to work in a nice, easy fashion. None of these campaigns, none of these initiatives is actually going to deliver any of that.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you, Tim. David, from Brent.

**David Arditti (Co-ordinator of Brent Cyclists):** I don't want to be a bore and bang on about safety too much but I really want to address some of the things that Chris Bainbridge has said and the councillor we heard from Richmond. Unless we start taking the issue of cycle safety seriously, we will not make progress on this issue. People are not idiots. They can see for themselves how dangerous it is to cycle on the roads. If you look at the statistics in DfT reports, as I have done, you can measure the relative safety of driving and cycling. It is at least ten times more dangerous per mile to cycle than it is to drive. Now, we are saying that lots of these little journeys in London, two, three miles that people could easily cycle, but are not, and we are telling them, "Get out of your car and cycle it". Do the same thing as you are doing now; just change your mode of transport to a mode that is ten times more dangerous. They are not going to do that. They are not idiots.

If you look at what the Dutch have done, they have broadened the demographic of cycling so that young and old cycle. Not only are the casualty rates per mile at least three times better in the Netherlands, but many of the casualties are not collisions with cars at all. They are simply old people essentially pegging out on bikes. There are no other persons involved in the collision or collisions with bikes. We can measure the number of collisions due to motor vehicles and it is about eight times higher in this country than it is in the Netherlands. That is a vast safety difference. Unless we have the infrastructure that actually separates cyclists from fast, dangerous, high volumes of motor traffic, we are not going to make progress with all these promotional campaigns.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Lovely, thank you for that. I'm not quite sure of your technical term there but we understand what you are saying. Rik.

**Rik Andrew (Founder Member of London Cycling Campaign):** I probably should have mentioned I was the borough co-ordinator of Richmond for seven years a little while ago, so hopefully some good work was done at that time. One of things I organised there, with the contribution of lots of local experts, was to redefine their cycle network, so Richmond is one of the first boroughs to have a defined networks of safe routes, so avoiding the main road because they weren't going to do anything about the main roads. That is there and that is in place. That map was given out to schools. They had a very good school safety officer who organised the training and he gave out the borough cycle map, designed by local experts, to schools as part of the training. I also initiated the walk to school scheme there, by the way.

The reason Richmond has more cyclists than other Outer London boroughs is there is more green space and I focused heavily on getting green space made legitimate to cycling. That is why cycling in Richmond is successful. The reason Kingston has more cyclists is we have the best infrastructure. There are good examples of Continental style tracks leading into Kingston, over Kingston Bridge. The only other one is Southwark Bridge which I put in when I was working for the City. The middle of Kingston is also pedestrian free as it is pedestrianised. It has good cycle tracks going into it. That is why it has good levels of use.

There are two key points I want to make to try to take us forward. We have to get much better at route selection. A route alignment optimisation is supposed to be done and it doesn't get done and we don't get consulted about it.

There are two Superhighways that haven't been mentioned. Highway 8 is the wrong route. We were consulted on this. We made it very clear and everybody agreed, all the borough groups that were involved; the best route for the Superhighways was straight along the Southbank, Albert Embankment, Nine Elms Lane through Battersea and then through Battersea Park; a direct route and you could have put a segregated track on the riverside of that with no crossovers at all because there is no traffic between the river and the Nine Elms Lane and the Embankment, all the way along and into Battersea Park. No, no, no; instead of which we have a zigzag route which goes bonk, bonk, bonk, and is full of traffic. The route selection is very, very poor and needs to be better and at least half the Superhighways, as defined, are not viable and you need to redefine them.

Having chosen your best routes, your optimum routes, whether it is London wired level or sector level - we don't do sector level planning and we should - or borough level, the status of the routes needs to change. Cycle routes do not have any kind of status like the London Bus priority network has a status. Those roads are not just local roads anymore. It's a bus route; we must consider buses first on this route. Red routes have a status. Having decided which are the best cycle routes, and focus on those in a relatively small number of routes, they must have a real status. London Cycle priority network; as along the lines that Herman [Dector-Vega] was saying. Where there is no status, you have to actually change the status and say, "Right. It's now a cycle priority route. We will treat them differently and cyclists will get priority on those routes." We're only talking about 5%, 10% of the available red space. Thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you, Rik. Let's get the mike at the back. Donnachadh, a gentleman there; I don't know your name. OK, we'll go there first.

**Geoff Stello:** Hello, my name is Geoff **Stello**. I live in Lambeth near Waterloo. I have only lived in London for three years. I have been biking due to the hire bikes which are a very good way to get around London. When I first started riding, I did follow Boris' advice to assert yourself on the roads, which I did drive for a bit. I'd driven for ten years while I lived in Leeds but it soon became apparent to me that it was an absolutely ridiculous piece of advice to 98% of the population, which is why only 2% actually bother cycling because the conditions are terrible. I think everybody's heard this ad nauseam, so I'm not going to go on about that, but I think if we take one thing away from today, it should be we need to do what they did in Holland, in the Netherlands. If we want to increase cycling rates to anything above a few percent, we do need the segregated routes on the main roads and we do need to eliminate runs, not just reduce them but completely make neighbourhoods undriveable. You only get in there if you actually have business there. It should be impossible to drive through a neighbourhood.

Sorry, I have a few points here. One is the idea of London somehow being special, having narrow roads, is an absolute myth. If anybody wants to come out with me with a tape measure, I will prove otherwise. We do need to reallocate space. It will take some political cojones – for want of a better word – to actually remove parking or remove a car lane, but that is what needs to be done in certain places. If you want to increase cycling, we do need to allocate the budget to cycling.

In the Netherlands, across the Netherlands, 89% of children cycle to school. In some areas, it is 100%. I think Amsterdam is the lowest which is at 53% I think, which is obviously far in excess. I think across the UK, it is only 1%. I am not sure what it is in London but I assume it is around there. Now, our target should be 100%. That is achievable. I don't think any children live more than a couple of miles from their school. I mean, two miles is ten minutes on a bike or it should be ten minutes on a bike if the routes are there, but we simply do not have them. That is my point that the one thing, and if you could sum up today in one word, it should be segregation, where appropriate obviously. People on bikes obviously do not want to be with people in traffic.

Something else, another point that was made is that in the past when cycling groups have been consulted, there have been mixed messages. A lot of people have been saying, "We want to be on the road with the cars" and a lot of people have been saying, "We want to be separated". I think part of the problem with cycling groups historically is they have been populated by people who are Cyclists with a capital C and it is part of their lifestyle, a part of their ethos.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** That's the lycra clad cyclist, yes.

**Geoff Stello:** We do need to listen to people – that is going to sound a bit arrogant – people like me, but somebody who is not a capital C Cyclist, I am not a cyclist. I walk, I get a bus and I use the Tube sometimes. I choose to use a bike because it is easier and you will need to listen to the 40% of people who said they would love to cycle but don't currently cycle. They are the ones who really we should be listening to because they are the ones who are going to make the majority of future cyclists. If we are trying to get more "normal", in inverted commas, people to use bikes but not provide the infrastructure, then the accident rate will increase because if you are trying to get somebody like my mum, she is 57, she has not ridden in God knows how many years, she is going to be more at risk. If you get more normal people, more people who are not fit; young, fast, healthy men who are confident at cutting in front of taxis, you will find the accident rate increases because these people are going to be slower.

They are going to be less competent and less confident but they are exactly the kind of people that we should get cycling. They are the people who do want to cycle.

Another point I have in here is cycling is currently treated as a second rate mode of transport. I know we are all having this meeting here, which is fantastic, but when we actually leave and we go out into the street, it is very apparent in London, for decades, cycling has been seen as a nuisance really. If I bought a car and tried to drive around London, I'd be treated like a king more or less. They have a hell of a lot of carriageway, there's a lot of infrastructure there for me. If I choose to walk, I'm treated as a second rate citizen. If I choose to ride a bike, I'm treated as a nuisance really. There's a space somewhere between the edge of the curb and the yellow lines; it's about 0.1 microns thick I think but that is where I am expected to cycle, in this place that doesn't really exist.

My final point I should like to make is that cycling infrastructure in the Netherlands isn't just aimed at people who want to ride a bike. It's also accessible to everybody; wheelchair users, elderly people on mobility scooters, all these people use the cycle lanes as well, so it does increase mobility, not just for fit and healthy people but for disabled people as well who can use these to get around town and from town to town in a safe manner. I think I've gone for long enough. I'll just finish by saying, yes, we do need the infrastructure. It is all about the infrastructure.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you for that. Can we see how many hands do we have left? I am really conscious of the time. Members have to leave, so I have Donnachadh, a lady here, two over here. If we try and keep points as concise as we can, then I will get those four remaining ones in. Donnachadh.

**Donnachadh McCarthy:** Thank you very much, Chair. Donnachadh McCarthy living in Southwark. I would ask the Committee in your report to ask a lot of the councils to report every year the number of metres of segregated lanes they have installed. The Environment Agency asked Southwark to do that in their transport plan and they refused. They said, "We're opposed to segregated lanes" because they want cyclists to slow the traffic down. That is not acceptable for children to be slowing traffic down.

Secondly, the issue about theft. Getting people to cycle is a real difficult thing and when we do, some of them give up because a number of cycles are stolen. That is a point I think you should look on in your report and the problem is when you are removing thousands of metres of railings in key places where we used to park, we now have no -- I used to cycle, I go to exhibitions at the Royal Academy, they've removed all the railings. Where can I park? That's happening all across London. Thousands of parking spaces are being removed and you really should highlight that I think in your report.

Thirdly, regeneration projects. I have been to three public inquiries asking Southwark to include separate, physically segregated lanes in their Unitary Development Plan (UDP), so when they do regeneration projects, I have planning starters to say, "Put a cycle lane in". I succeeded in three public inquiries over 20 years and every single time I asked them to include it, they always say no. There is a regeneration project going on in Southampton Way and they will refuse point-blank to include a cycle lane in that new regeneration project, so please ask TfL to input into regeneration projects in the boroughs.

Just a general point about equalities. We often think of cyclists; we are only 1% or 2% of the population, as a minority issue. Actually, kids are a huge percentage of our population. Teenagers who are not allowed to drive are a huge percentage of our population. The poor who cannot afford public transport are a huge part of our population and what is really interesting, elderly people; there is no spokesperson here today of the pensioners. Pensioners (a) don't have money but (b) our joints, for elderly people, prevent them from walking but they can cycle. Look at the profile in Tokyo. The profile in Tokyo of cyclists is elderly people. It's not fit young men like out there in London. In Tokyo, it is the elderly who are cycling because it is easier for them.

Finally, a big issue is again, we think it's all right for poor people etc. It is the economic benefits of cycling. Please put in your report, we need an economic stimulus in London but if you look at the payback for every pound you spend, there is £18 of economic benefit. It is a short, sharp boost to our economy and it's doable, it's fast, it's easy.

So finally, can I ask you and say, "I want £1 billion a year spent in London for the next five years". That's my request. Thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Fantastic, thank you, Donnachadh. All right. Focus on how we can try to get new cyclists or more people cycling.

**Francesca Leadley (Sustrans):** Hi, I'm Francesca Leadley from Sustrans. Just to reiterate a couple of the points that have already been made. I think, in terms of getting more women to cycle, when we surveyed 2,000 women in 2009, safety was the biggest barrier for them and the change that women most wanted to see that would enable them to cycle more was more cycle lanes separate from traffic.

As has just been said, I think children, if you want to see a genuine shift in London, then the next generation should be leading that charge. Currently, almost a third of London's primary schoolchildren are driven to school. We would like to see 50% of school journeys being done by bike; there is real potential there. Our Bike It programme has doubled the number of children cycling in boroughs across London. Yes, so just to reiterate the points that have been made before I think. We need a combination of focus on infrastructure and on behaviour to each project.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you very much, Francesca. Thank you for your work at Sustrans as well. I have two more over there. I am going to the gentleman at the back, who we have not heard from before, and then ...

**Andrew Sutton<sup>1</sup>:** Yes, my name is Andrew Sutton. I am a resident in Camberwell. I think one of the most interesting devices is to make parking far more frustrating an activity, so I think any squeeze on parking, perhaps a slow squeeze on parking is the way to encourage people to rethink when they are actually at home, how are they going to make their way to the shops and to decide any idea of driving. I also like Edward De Bono's argument that you are allowed to park on the street if you leave your lights on. Instead of charging people for parking, which people can afford, you actually leave the car lights full on and you will soon find that people will start giving up on their cars.

---

<sup>1</sup> [A different Andrew Sutton from earlier in the meeting](#)

The last thing is it would be nice to have a sort of Boris-type scheme based on the villages of London to make it a far more local thing. I don't know how it would work but that is how you start people thinking locally about cycling. Thank you.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Lovely, thank you. I'm going to Charlie because I'm conscious of numbers, so no other Member can leave otherwise we are not quora so we'll whizz through this. Charlie.

**Charlie Lloyd:** OK. I'd just like to make a quick point really about the Olympics which are almost upon us. There was a commitment right from the start that if they closed routes that they should provide mitigation and alternative routes. They closed some of the best green, off-road routes through East London and the mitigation routes are appalling. They are badly signposted. The one where they have closed the canal goes through 42 road junctions including the Hackney Wick motorway junction and Bow Road; it is appalling. It is an indication of failure and that the people managing transport don't really understand cycling and don't give it priority. I think that is an opportunity that has been wasted.

We do have an opportunity with the Olympic Park for legacy that it could be a great place for cycling. The housing that is going in there, the activities in there, it should be a showcase for what could be done as well as it is done in the Netherlands. All the indications we have, at the moment, is that the people managing that have no idea how to do that and they are not addressing it in a serious way. Please recommend that they do address it in a serious way to Continental best practice.

**Caroline Pidgeon (Chair):** Thank you very much, Charlie. Thank you to our audience and those who have already left from our audience for your contributions. They have been really helpful and if there are any other things you haven't time to say, please complete the form or send them into us because we are still collecting evidence. Thank you to our fantastic panel. It has been really, really informative this morning. I have really enjoyed it. Ashok, Chris, Martin, German and Chris; thank you so much and again, if there are other things you haven't had time to raise and want to send in to us, please do.