

London Assembly Transport Committee – Tuesday 14 December 2021

Transcript of Agenda Item 5 – Vision Zero

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We have a huge panel today; we are still waiting for two of our guests to come, and we have one person who is going to join us remotely. In the room we have Jeremy Leach, Chair of London Living Streets, and Action Vision Zero; Tom Bogdanowicz, Senior Policy and Development Officer at London Cycling Campaign; Neil Liversidge, who is the Chair of the Motorcycle Action Group; Alan Clarke, who is a Senior Director of Policy in Northern Europe for Lime e-scooters; Lorraine Robertson, a former bus driver; and John Murphy, Regional Officer, Unite, has asked to join on Zoom.

I am going to kick off with a general opening question to everyone. I am going to go to Jeremy first just because he is right in front of me. How successful do you think Vision Zero has been to date?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Thank you, Chair. The approach that Transport for London (TfL) has taken over the last three years and from 2016 has been a real success. The plan that has emerged is certainly United Kingdom (UK) leading and it is potentially, for a significant city, global-leading. There have been some fantastic successes around bus safety standard and the reduction in casualties there. There are a number of areas where there are opportunities. This is the right time to review the programme, the Vision Zero Action Plan, owing significantly to the pandemic, but also because of the changes that have happened in the three years since it was launched. There has been a great deal of success and, certainly compared with other UK cities, casualties have fallen at a significantly greater rate than those.

There are some areas of opportunity, and we will talk about this at more length, but they revolve around the opportunities around working vehicles, removing through traffic on neighbourhood streets, encouraging and enabling the remaining boroughs to go 20mph and move to a 20-mile-an-hour city and bring in a wider agenda. What is really great about this version of the Vision Zero Action Plan, is that it is much broader, and ties into other agendas such as climate change and air pollution. There are opportunities for the indicators to be slightly broader rather than just focus on killed and seriously injured.

One of the most important things is the idea of the real importance of reducing traffic volumes. The safer systems on its own is a really good strategy and TfL has recognised the need to deliver lower traffic volumes, but there has to be political will to help that. We would say that it needs smart road user pricing sooner rather than later.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much. Tom, can I come to you next? How successful do you think it has been?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): It has become much more pleasant to ride in. I either have cycle lanes or reduced traffic pretty much the whole way from North London to here. That is very good to see and we strongly welcome Vision Zero as an aim. It is not only about tragedy for the individuals involved, but also about transport choice. The key reason why people choose not to cycle or not to walk is because they feel unsafe, in the same way that people choose not to use public transport if they fear COVID. That is a key step that we have to push. We can increase the levels of cycling and walking, there is no reason why we should not be at Dutch levels, they are at around 25% of all

trips, we are at 2.5% in the case of cycling, obviously much more in the case of walking in Holland, it is 95% cycling.

What we have seen in terms of Vision Zero has been progress. The trouble is that some of it is patchy and we are not moving fast enough. There are a whole range of things, which could be done right across the board, and they are only in silos or uneven. We had 100 kilometres according to TfL of cycle route introduced in 2020. Previously, the rate was less than half of that and we are in danger of heading back to that sort of level. We have 20mph in 18 boroughs but not in 15 other boroughs. We have Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) planned for all the buses but not necessarily for all the heavy goods vehicles (HGV). We have automatic emergency braking for motor vehicles, but it is not being introduced for HGVs. I know it is available, therefore we need uptake of all these things.

Something like Safer Urban Driving, an excellent programme for HGV drivers which gives them practical experience of cycling as well as an understanding of how cyclists move. That is available for HGVs but not for bus drivers. We have 43 junctions treated but then the latest plans say that the next 30 junctions are not going to be treated unless the funding comes through. The London Cycling Campaign (LCC) has just identified 22 junctions, which are in urgent need of attention. It carries on. There is fatigue management for the bus drivers, yes, but for the delivery drivers, no. There is camera enforcement of yellow boxes but not of keep-clear signs. A problem like that, you think it is a detail, but there is a junction in Islington where you get 1,500 cyclists per hour and then they are blocked by a single lorry just standing across the keep-clear sign. That really does endanger people.

One of the biggest ones from our perspective is the approach to procurement. Again, this is something that does not necessarily mean a cost for the individual boroughs or the highway authorities, but it can be very positive. TfL has in its procurement terms measures like the Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS) Standard, the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) standard, Safer Urban Driving, and the Direct Vision Standard (DVS) for lorries. All these things are standard in TfL procurement, but they are not standard in the boroughs. If they were standard in the boroughs, we would suddenly be heading in the right direction right across the board. That is what we need to achieve in London; we need more of these measures and faster.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much indeed. Let us come to John online. Welcome, John. How successful from your point of view has Vision Zero been?

John Murphy (Regional Officer, Unite): Good morning to everyone. Most importantly the statistics - and it is very hard to ignore them - there is substantial progress still to be made and the previous speaker has alluded to specific points. My area of - for want of a better word - expertise is very much with London buses. From TfL there seems to be a view that sometimes there is a mechanical approach to all of these sort of things where really there could be some more immediate low-hanging fruit gains by looking at the fact that buses are operated by human beings and they have to be treated accordingly. There is not always a mechanical fix.

The previous spoke about fatigue and things like there has been a Loughborough [University] report into the fatigue among London bus drivers. There are areas in there that can be picked up to move this along. But if we are talking about where we are at the moment, there has clearly been progress, but from our perspective there is more substantial progress to be made going forward if we were to look at the more root elements of what the causes are. I will stop there, thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Assembly Member Garratt, you said you had a tiny point you wanted to raise here?

Neil Garratt AM: As someone who cycles a lot, I have seen – as I am sure you have – things that are called cycle lanes but are not really fit for the name. I wonder what your view is of how we make sure that that 100km of cycle lane is really usable and how much of it is bits of paint that have then got cars parked in it? How do we make sure that, if it is supposed to be there doing a job to enable people to cycle, it is doing that and not just being a tokenistic gesture?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): A very good point. I like to think that the recent lanes that have been introduced do meet the standards. We are now fortunate in having standards, which are described by the Department for Transport and by TfL. There is a Department for Transport note called Local Transport Note (LTN) 120, which specifies what the minimum standard should be. Then there is a corresponding TfL note, the TfL Quality Route Standard, which must be adopted. They grade the particular routes and there is such a thing as a critical failure. If there is a critical failure on a route in a design then it simply should not be adopted. Therefore, we should not be getting to a situation where a junction – and junctions are key – is redesigned and critical failures are left in.

We had that terrible collision at Holborn. I remember personally being on television eight years ago saying that this junction has to be addressed. The judge in the case of the person who was killed there before said exactly the same thing, but nothing was done for eight years. Fortunately, this time around, somebody has addressed it and it has been addressed almost immediately. That is what we need to be doing. We need to be moving much more quickly. We need to be sticking to the standards, exactly as you said. I fully agree with you.

Neil Garratt AM: Specifically, you think the standards are being adhered to? The classic problem of a wide straight road, you paint in a cycle lane where it is not really needed, and then you get to a narrow bit or a junction, it becomes difficult and it just gives up. Are we still seeing that problem?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): Yes. No infrastructure should be delivered unless it has been approved and it meets the standards. That is the way forward. I saw some photos and videos yesterday of cycle lanes, which dodge on and off the pavement. I mean do not be ridiculous, that sort of thing just should not happen. I know TfL has a limited number of officers to police this sort of thing but that is how it has to happen. Either the borough needs to make sure that it meets the standards or TfL needs to be checking the standards. The authority responsible for introducing low-standard infrastructure is ultimately responsible. If somebody is then involved in a collision, they can have reason to complain.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Lorraine, do you want to come in on the main question about how successful, from your point of view as a bus driver, the Vision Zero has been to date?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): First of all, I would like to say how grateful I am for the opportunity to speak at the Committee today on behalf of other London bus drivers and transport workers. I have only just left work last week. Basically, I retired, and I am tired. I have spoken to a lot of colleagues and we do not think Vision Zero has been taken into consideration where the bus drivers are concerned. The companies, TfL, Sadiq Khan, the Mayor [of London], we are under the impression that it does not apply to us and we never ever hear anything about it. When I first heard about Vision Zero, I had to look it up because it is never spoken about. We never have any meetings. Our union reps do not talk about it at all.

In the last year we have had 50 deaths due to bus accidents, or incidents as we have to call them. That is 50 too many. We do not get up in the morning and say, “We are going to have an accident today and we are going to kill somebody” or “we are going to hurt somebody”, or even an accident on our bus where we have

had to brake sharply and somebody has fallen and hurt themselves. Vision Zero, I and my colleagues personally feel it is not taken into consideration for political gain. It does not serve TfL or the Mayor to change how we drive. We are professional drivers and we all do take pride in driving our buses. I just do not think enough is put into place. We are not trained enough. We do not speak about Vision Zero. We know about bikes, and we know we have to be aware of them jumping on and off pavements and going through red traffic lights. That is as far as our training goes and that is us ourselves. That is nothing to do with the companies and TfL, we just do not want to hurt anybody.

At the end of the day, John Murphy, our union rep, the Regional Officer, spoke about the fatigue very briefly. The fatigue has been shelved. Since the pandemic, we have not heard about the fatigue. We are tired. Us bus drivers, and especially through the pandemic, covered shifts because half of our drivers were either furloughed or COVID, and we lost 70 bus drivers, higher than the national average. We covered that. Nobody spoke to us about Vision Zero and fatigue. We are just bus drivers, like we do not matter.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That is really helpful, thank you. We will get into some of that detail later. That is really helpful that from your point of view it has not reached buses. Neil, what is your view on this?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): I have not had a lot of involvement with Vision Zero in London, but I have been involved with this on an international level for more than 20 years now from its origination in Sweden. While it is absolutely fine in theory, if it is pursued dogmatically to the exclusion of all else it is bound to fail because there is a certain element of danger in life, which you cannot get away from, and it is multifaceted.

Just listening to what Lorraine said just now, I completely empathise with what she said. My own mother was knocked down and killed by a bus on 31 July 2007. This is not meant to be a harsh statement in relation to my mother, but it was her fault. I went to the inquest, I heard all the expert evidence, I heard the evidence that the lady bus driver gave, and when the West Yorkshire Coroner asked me for my input, I stated my honest view then - and it is the same now - which was that the lady bus driver concerned was not to blame. My mother was 83 and she had lost all hazard perception and she literally walked out into the side of a bus that was swinging around in a right turn and the lady bus driver was looking to her left front, because the overhang on the bus means that it is in danger of encroaching on the pavement where people stand right up to the kerb edge.

It is a completely wrong thing to assume that every time a pedestrian or a cyclist or even a motorcyclist is killed, somebody else has to be at some kind of criminal fault. There are elements of life - this is the way life is - that people sometimes do silly things, reckless things and thoughtless things, which result in harm to themselves. I have done it myself in a motoring context and in a home context. Whereas there are some people around this table I know are not going to want to hear this, I speak about the world as I find it and as I experience it and not according to any political dogma.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much. I am going to move through most of my questions and then I will bring in Assembly Member Garratt. Really these are aimed at you, Jeremy. What do you think are the main challenges to achieving the targets set out in the Action Plan?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): We think they fall into a number of categories, but three main ones for now. First of all, progress has been good for vehicle occupants. If we look at the 2022 target of 65% reduction from the 2005 to 2009 baseline, essentially 'all vehicle occupants' is falling at around two-thirds. Up until 2019, there were significant problems in relation to

pedestrians, motorcycling casualties, and in particular cycling casualties. The good news on that is the rate of casualty had fallen, but not to the level required. What I often term vulnerable users remain a real source of concern and the plan needs to particularly focus on them.

There is a real danger in the recovery from the pandemic and on the long-term pressure of funding for public transport, that we are going to miss the Mayor's Transport Strategy targets. LCC, in its work, has said that we need to go much further than that. We need to go down to around 10% motor vehicle journeys in London. In the context of the climate emergency, there is a real job to do and the danger is that, as we potentially move away – it does not look like it at the minute – from the pandemic, the move will be to private transport and not to public transport. There is a real problem with exposure for pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists, with an increase in private motor vehicle journeys. That is why we think there is a real need for political will to start to look at road user charging to drive down unnecessary and short motor vehicle journeys.

The other final area is just this single focus on the numbers of people solely killed and seriously injured. When you are really working hard to bring in other agendas such as the climate emergency, air quality, and all the healthy streets work that London has done, there is a real need to bring in other indicators. Potentially along the lines of healthy streets, you could have perceptions of safety on road, especially while walking and cycling. Also, indicators that track progress in relation to reduction of vehicle speeds, volumes and intimidation. There are three areas there hopefully.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Is there anything else that you think is missing from the Action Plan? Is there anything else that is missing or needs improving?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): We will probably come on to those in a bit more detail later, but there is a whole issue around – exactly as Tom said earlier – how the boroughs are managed in terms of their procurement practices. There is a real opportunity around autonomous emergency braking and intelligent speed systems. I perfectly understand Neil's context, but what we are trying to do with the safe systems approach is we are trying to make the systems safe for people so that when they do make mistakes it is not fatal. I perfectly understand that once casualties are reduced to a significant level there will be a number of ones that are going to be very tough to reduce. That is the experience in Helsinki and Oslo. Through introducing safe systems, they have got to a very, very low level of casualties on the roads, but there remains a number of ones – exactly as Neil said – which is difficult to address in the short term. There is working vehicles, and there is how the boroughs are encouraged to introduce it.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We do not have RNIB here, who we wanted to pick up some of the vulnerable road user points, particularly people with disabilities. I will leave that; we may want to write to them. Just very briefly, to everyone, do you think that the Vision Zero targets for 2041 are achievable?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): I do not think it is all or nothing. Oslo achieved Vision Zero in terms of fatalities. I certainly think we can try to achieve that. To what extent it will be also true of serious injuries, we will see, but we have to head in that direction and I am relatively optimistic in the sense that, if we have shown that we can deliver infrastructure at a faster pace, if we can do 100 kilometres in one year, why can we not do 100 kilometres of cycle route, for example, in every year?

We have seen that we can reduce motor traffic. Congestion charging has reduced it over periods of time; therefore, we can reduce the traffic. During lockdown we saw that, as traffic reduced, collisions reduced, therefore there is obviously a correlation between the number of vehicles on the roads. At the same time, we saw cycling soar. I do not know whether Members are aware that, according to the Department for Transport,

cycling in London increased by 46% during lockdown. That is a huge increase. That is on top of the doubling that we have seen before. TfL recently did a survey and found that 40% of respondents felt that they would like to cycle or cycle more.

The potential is there, and this is coming together with the technologies. If we introduce – and I apologise for using the acronyms again – ISA and Autonomous Emergency Braking (AEB), there is no reason why we cannot get speeds down to 20mph in residential streets, which will mean that, if there are collisions, and we hope there are as few as possible, then they are of lower severity. AEB, if it is introduced on HGVs, buses – and we know that it is now already being made available – can reduce the levels. If enforcement improves and cameras are an obvious way of improving enforcement, I understand that some of the camera enforceable road offences are being extended next year, which will be a positive step. If cameras are there, people will behave in a more reasonable manner, therefore that will improve crash avoidance.

If we have much wider adherence to the measures that we talked about earlier, CLOCS, FORS, DVS, then those vehicles too will be less involved in collisions. Ultimately, we have the potential to head in the right direction. Lockdown has shown that we can move further in that direction, but there is of course a danger that people will go back to cars and drive more, there will be more congestion, more pollution, more emissions. We are now campaigning for climate safe streets. That is what we really need.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Alan, do you think it is achievable?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Just to be very brief, I would echo everything that Tom and Jeremy have said so far. To add some additional evidence to what you were saying about the increase in cycling, and in terms of looking forward to the Vision Zero targets, it is certainly achievable to reduce fatalities down to zero, but it is going to take the type of step change that we saw the beginning of evidence of during the pandemic.

For example, in addition to what you were saying about the increase in cycling more generally, on streets where pop-up cycle lanes were introduced during the pandemic, we also offer e-bikes alongside e-scooters in London, we saw an increase of 136% in the usage of our riders travelling on the roads that had pop-up cycling lanes introduced, where previously there were none. That is obviously in a very limited case, it is a very specific case, but it does show the potential is there if we get this question of infrastructure right. Certainly, that is one of the things that we want to work very closely with cities around the world on.

On the broader point, and your initial question, which I can touch on briefly, in terms of reflections on the Vision Zero in London as a whole, we deal with cities all over the world, we operate in about 150 cities at the moment, including all over Europe and North America. Although there is still a lot of progress to go, it is without doubt within the last few years that London has become a leading city in that area, alongside obviously Oslo, Helsinki, a lot of the other places in the Nordics that you guys will be familiar with.

In terms of progress in the last few years, London has certainly become a leading city. One of the things that we are really encouraged by as a private business, and as someone who wants to do business in London and provide a new form of transport, is the way that we have been able to work with TfL and with other partners to try to introduce a new mode into London that is something that is very new, very innovative, but also still with a focus on that Vision Zero target.

That is really encouraging because on the converse of that it would be a big negative if Vision Zero ended up in us limiting the ambition about what we can do, the ambition around innovation, the ambition around introducing new transport modes. What has been excellent is, through working with TfL, companies like ours

and the other companies that are operating in London to provide the e-scooter trial at the moment have been able to show how you can introduce an innovative new product, an innovative new travel option for people, but do it while keeping true to the Vision Zero principles. That is really encouraging, and it is something that not every city around the world has got right. Therefore, from our perspective, it is a really positive step in that sense.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Lovely, thank you very much indeed. John, you wanted to come in on this. Then I will bring in Assembly Member Garratt.

John Murphy (Regional Officer, Unite): It is very much on the question you asked, is it achievable? Will we ever get to zero? I would like to think so. It is a realistic target. If we can be there or thereabouts and going forward maintain that position, it is doable. To get there, there needs to be a broader view. The people who move the public transport will need to remember they are humans.

As I have said previously, the answer is not solely in a mechanical answer. If you look at the bigger picture, we need to have some proper assessment of things, like what works in London now, we have to take steps to that. Eventually, when we get to the Nirvana where very few cars are on the road and everyone is using public transport – and I do not mean to poo-poo over anyone else’s ideas here – but from a bus driver perspective one of the biggest concerns at the moment that keeps getting passed to me is people weaving in and out on e-scooters. Maybe at this moment in time, with the weight of traffic as it is, maybe now is not the time for e-scooters. We need to be used to introducing the ideas at the right time.

At this moment in time, if we want to achieve the move to public transport, we need to think about what the public wants. There are surveys going on and they are going to lead to cuts on public transport. At this moment in time during COVID, people do not want to be sitting next to each other. If we want to remove the hazard of car drivers from the road, then we need to offer the public a decent public transport system. That should include – and I appreciate that everyone wants the pandemic to be over but it clearly is not and several of us have made the mistake of thinking in the next six months everything will be OK and it has not been OK – I am not going to make the same mistake of thinking in six months’ time the pandemic will be clear and next January we will be in the same position. We need to start gearing for the here and now. If we want people to go on public transport, then it has to be appealing.

I am no scientist, I am not going to pretend I know, but I understand in operating theatres it is quite a simple mechanical mechanism to have air exchange systems where the air is drawn out of the bus. If we could offer people that, or on a train or the Tube, then surely people will be confident in going back to public transport. At this moment in time, I appreciate not everyone is going back to the office and less people now so, but before we got to this stage and everyone was starting to see the light at the end of the tunnel, the evidence will show that public transport usage was at about 76%. Road usage had returned pretty much to normal. That in itself should surely be an indicator that people are not yet confident in public transport.

If we want to – going back to the question – get to a place where we have Vision Zero in front of us, a lot of it depends on giving people confidence to use public transport to make the roads less busy so that the cyclists, e-scooter users, and pedestrians can be safer. Everyone understands that. Public transport is at the very root of this. To achieve the perfect standard, we are going to have to build confidence in the mode of travel and part of that also is looking after the people who operate the mode of travel, ie the drivers.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much. Assembly Member Garratt, you wanted to bring in a point here. Then we will move on to the next section.

Neil Garratt AM: I was struck by something that Lorraine was saying about how we are here having all these high-level conversations about Vision Zero and so on and then there the bus drivers are who are a key part of this and it is like an alien conversation that is going on somewhere else. That is quite alarming and that is something we would want to look into. I am just curious whether Lorraine had any thoughts on that fact that somewhere between the Greater London Authority (GLA), TfL, the bus operators, the depot and the bus drivers who are on the front line, that process message is getting lost; where do you think it is going wrong? Where it is getting lost? Or, perhaps more importantly, what could be done to try to make sure that it is a real thing that is happening and not just a thing that we are talking about in this room and none of the drivers out there are really following?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): I just think it is getting lost from the top downwards. We are reviewed as, "You are just only bus drivers." We do not need to know. But we are front line, we do need to know. It is down to us to make sure that it is Vision Zero out on the roads. But if we are not told about it, if we do not have a discussion, if nobody comes to our garages or the operators and says, "You know what, we need to educate the drivers on Vision Zero." Once that is done we will be more aware of it ourselves.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We are going to come on to this in a later section. Do you want to just pause it there and come back to that? Neil, you have indicated that you want to come in quickly and then I am moving to Assembly Member Bailey.

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): As to whether you can hit Vision Zero or not, I am agnostic about this, but I very much doubt it. It seems to me it is a load of blame, it is a bit like encouraging every schoolchild to become an astronaut knowing that 99.999% of them will not make it, and that is probably a high estimate. If you really want to get anywhere near Vision Zero there are some key things that you need to address, which nobody wants to address. One of these is messaging, particularly with regard to cyclists who have been in essence put on a pedestal and led to believe that it is everybody else's job on the road to look out for their welfare and they do not have to look out for it themselves. I can tell you as a motorcyclist, and everybody else I know who is an experienced motorcyclist, that our view is that if we road motorcycles the way that a lot of pedal cyclists ride pedal cycles, we would have all been dead a long time ago.

I see appalling cycle use, day in, day out, and I can cite instances such as when myself and a colleague were going to a meeting at the House of Commons with a Minister and we were hit on a pelican crossing, on the green lamp, outside the Commons, by the cyclist representative who was coming to the meeting with us. Last week I saw a cyclist come through a red light in Castleford on a green man and knock down an elderly gentleman. If you want to go on the YouTube channel and look up Castleford Crimewatch, you can see a cyclist knocking down a young child in a pedestrian precinct. As long as you tell people that they have a bigger entitlement than everybody else, you make them feel that it is not their responsibility to look out for themselves, it is everybody else's responsibility, they are going to keep on dying.

If you encourage reckless behaviour by other people and you lead them to believe that whatever happens they will be made whole and held harmless, they will come to harm. It is an unpopular message, but it is one that you need to address.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): OK, thank you for that. Assembly Member Bailey, over to you.

Shaun Bailey AM: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to our guests. I am going to start with Tom. Has TfL missed an opportunity to improve road safety due to COVID? Obviously COVID gave us a break in traffic levels, it made people pay more attention. Have they missed an opportunity here?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): Firstly, I would like to disassociate myself and disagree entirely with the remarks made about making vulnerable people responsible. I am sorry I have to say that, but I want to make that clear. People driving or riding have responsibility to look out for more vulnerable road users and that goes right from the top right down to the bottom. Lorry drivers have to look out for everybody because they are driving the largest vehicle. Then if I am driving a car or a lorry I have to look out for the cyclists and the pedestrians. If I am riding a bicycle I have to look out for the pedestrians, for the children and so on. We really have to take responsibility for other road users and that goes from the top to the bottom, the bigger your vehicle, the greater the responsibility.

Coming back to your question, we have taken advantage of some of the opportunities and the introduction of larger quantities of cycle track has been a good thing to do. We need to retain the best of what we have put in and we have seen that in that first period of lockdown collisions fell by approximately 52%. That is the sort of level we would like to have going forward and that is what enabled people to - in those circumstances - choose to cycle. Yes, they were afraid of COVID, they may not have had access to whatever transport that they used to have, and they chose to ride bicycles.

We need to capitalise on that interest. If we have 46% more cycle trips out there, those are new people and the LCC - the charity that seeks to improve conditions so that everyone can cycle - also does work to try to enable those people to cycle. We organise rides and we have been holding cycle buddy events for people who wish to have assistance with a particular route, we direct people to things like Bikeability. If there are all those people interested in riding a bicycle or walking, we should try to keep them there rather than going back to motoring.

Going forward, that will meet the targets in here --

Shaun Bailey AM: Sorry to cut across you, Tom. It sounds like you have made great hay of the opportunity. I am asking whether you feel like TfL have made great hay with the opportunity to improve road safety while we have had the impacts of COVID? You have talked about 52% less collisions and that is great, but also we had a very, very low level of economic activity, ie less road users. There is a cost there. When TfL was looking at when they could do things, did they bear that cost in mind? Are they helping you continue to keep people on their bikes? What is TfL doing?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): As I have said, the measures that have been introduced, whether that is temporary cycle lanes, I rode in a temporary cycle lane most of the way here, that is a good thing. TfL have taken some opportunities. There are kids cycling in some of the low traffic neighbourhoods, I have never seen so many children on bicycles. School streets is a great programme, with 300 schools so far. I would love to see it being 3,000, every school. At my son's school, the cycle/scooter area is packed; it was not before. What we have to do is to keep those things and there is a danger that we are slowing down now. We need to maintain what is key.

Shaun Bailey AM: Thank you, Tom. Jeremy, do you think there are any missed opportunities? Is there something extra that they could have been doing?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Thank you very much. I must say, I felt that, from TfL's point of view, the pandemic, from July onwards, was a time of immensely taken opportunities. I thought the Streetscape programme was put together tremendously quickly. It probably did not deliver perfect change, but it has given us some examples, if we take those - and obviously it is all funding-dependent now - but I just think there is a template there. Purely in terms of road casualties,

the research that was done around the low traffic neighbourhoods, particularly for pedestrians, shows there is a real opportunity if we can reduce through-traffic in neighbourhood street.

Obviously, there is still huge amounts of work to do on main roads, especially for pedestrians, and we might talk about that. But it was a time of opportunities taken --

Shaun Bailey AM: Sorry, Jeremy, can I just quickly butt in. You said it reduced casualties, was that with pandemic levels of traffic or general levels of traffic?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Absolutely. Overall there was a pandemic element related to traffic, but the research around the low traffic neighbourhoods shows that where you reduce through-traffic on neighbourhood streets, exposure is reduced. Reducing through-traffic will deliver significant pedestrian casualty reduction, which is what has been so hard to find over the last ten years or so.

Can I just say one more thing, there was a missed opportunity and I felt it was really encouraging that the congestion charge times were increased to weekends and evenings. There was a missed opportunity to take the evenings back again and ideally one would have seen that continue until 10pm in the evening.

Shaun Bailey AM: Do you not think, we are using the word "opportunity", but do you think there would have been a cost to that particular opportunity you are talking about? You are saying they should extend it. What would have been the cost?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): I understand the idea that there could be a notional economic cost, but I do feel that by not going into the evenings you do make conditions less attractive for people on foot, who do form a huge part of the people using the night-time economy in Soho and the West End in the evenings.

Shaun Bailey AM: You believe the cost would have balanced itself out?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Yes. In terms of Vision Zero, which is what we are focusing on today but is not exclusive, for all of those people whom we want to encourage to use the West End and the city in the evening, there was an addition of danger to those people.

Shaun Bailey AM: The opportunity versus cost: are we sometimes getting a reduction in casualties, etc, because we are just reducing the numbers of people who are able to get there/who are there? There has been a lot of talk about stats this morning and we have talked about Helsinki, for instance. This is a question to all of our users. Is London comparable? Is the scale the same? Is Helsinki not --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That is a question coming up later so --

Shaun Bailey AM: Excuse me, sorry. Let me focus on that because this idea is beginning to trouble me. Let me move on. To all of our guests who would be talking to TfL, how much consultation has there been between yourselves and TfL during the pandemic on how to protect your users? For instance, you are leasing e-bikes, etc, in London. Did you have any consultation with TfL on how to keep them safe?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): On that specific question, that was complicated slightly by the fact that we were in an open tender process, being run by TfL for lots of the pandemic so there

was no contact in terms of respecting the protocols around that. What I would say is that certainly once we were awarded one of the three contracts to operate our e-scooters in London and once we were able to begin that engagement with TfL, safety was very much the first issue. Ensuring the safety of our users and other road users was very much the first thing that was approached by both us and TfL. In the run-up to the launch of our scheme, we worked for three or four months with TfL before it was launched and safety certainly was well over half of the time we spent, consulting and engaging on how to operate the trial in the safest possible manner.

Shaun Bailey AM: Jeremy, did you have a lot of consultation with TfL about how to keep your users, the people you represent, safe during the COVID period?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Yes. When the first lockdown started, everything went very, very quiet, completely quiet. Then there were some signs of optimism and there was dialogue about the development of the Streetscape Plan. I would say two main things happened on the Vision Zero side over the course of the last 18 months and, to be fair to TfL, these were things that they encouraged to restart. One of the devices for stakeholder engagement is this Vision Zero Reference Group where TfL works with stakeholder groups; it started that again as quickly as possible and there was the opportunity to feed in ideas to the progress report.

The other thing I would say is the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) was under, as you know, tremendous pressure over the last 18 months and it was not easy for them. There is a group called the Vision Zero Enforcement Reference Group where the MPS and TfL talk to stakeholders about enforcement issues and traffic justice issues. As soon as it was possible to have that dialogue, that started again and that has been a really fruitful group and is absolutely part of the original Vision Zero Action Plan.

Shaun Bailey AM: Did your level of consultation reflect what you felt would happen?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): Yes, it has been up and down, lockdown is lockdown and meetings would get cancelled. We have made every effort to try to communicate with TfL. When you have the Vision [Zero] Enforcement Group, for example, that was held up for almost a year and then it was revived. We had communication about programmes, advertising, that sort of thing, that communication was not ideal, and I think TfL now recognises that it could do more in terms of communication on certain aspects. Yes, I have to accept that lockdown does not make life easy. Some of my colleagues have been in touch with [Dr] Will Norman, the [Walking and] Cycling Commissioner [for London] and that communication generally has been productive. When we see things like junctions not being changed in full, that is something that could be improved. Yes, there is room for improvement, but I appreciate the lockdown does not make life easy.

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): Shaun made a brilliant point regarding the costs versus benefits. Jeremy [Leach] talked about a notional economic cost and this is not a notional economic cost at all. For the people that have to use motor vehicles in your charging zone, it is not a notional economic cost. It is a cost, which they pay out of their pockets, which they pay out of their hard-earned wages or which they pay out of their self-employed profits through whatever they do for a living. This whole debate, which seems to write off people who really do need to use motor vehicles to earn a living, is pretty much an upper middleclass, very self-satisfied attitude, which mirrors the attitude everybody can --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): The question to you is about your users and you are here representing motorcyclists, not about your ideology and your views. We want to know, in terms of --

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): Well, this is not about ideology.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): -- in terms of motorcyclists, how TfL during the pandemic worked with you to protect the users you represent. That is the question we are asking, please.

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): The answer to that is "Not at all". If you know anything about motorcycling, you know that you are riding on your own; you are not riding with other people. If you are, it is with a pillion passenger and that is not a problem. Guess what? Motorcyclists all accept their own personal responsibility for their own safety and that is a radical, revolutionary idea, which I commend to all and sundry, in particular the representative of the cyclists, who does not seem to accept it at all.

Shaun Bailey AM: Let me move to my last question. I do have to say, as someone who cycles quite a lot, I saw Neil's [Liversidge] comment as all road users need to take responsibility for their own safety partly as well. Let us move on. I can see the Chair is getting antsy.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Yes, to your last question and then let us move on.

Shaun Bailey AM: What impact do you think TfL's finances and the 11 December [2021] deadline with the Government's future funding will have on the ability to reach Vision Zero targets?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Thank you. It is not quite clear how it is going to play out, but they are considerable. There is an awful lot of capital spend, for example, on the rollout of 20mph on the red route network and some of the initiatives around the safety camera work that is absolutely dependent on capital spending. If they do not happen, then a lot of that will be jeopardised.

The other concern is in relation to the Police and Crime Plan and the potential around the enforcement levels. There has been a really, really encouraging story around enforcement levels and the proposal in the progress report is that the number of offences prosecuted for speeding goes to a million from 280,000. That enforcement is dependent on funding for the partnership of TfL and the MPS and if that does not happen there is a real danger that that enforcement will not happen in the longer term.

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): I share Jeremy's views. It is vital that we progress with all of the programmes that we have going. Without the funding available, whether it is Vision Zero or infrastructure, we will not meet the targets that both the Government and TfL are setting. We need to come out of this terrible pandemic with what is dubbed a Green Recovery and we need to invest in that Green Recovery because there is a potential for coming out of it well, and there is a potential for coming out of it badly.

Shaun Bailey AM: You are linking the Green Recovery to the Vision Zero? Is that a link for you?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): Yes, I made that point at the very beginning. Vision Zero and road danger are inextricably linked to transport choice. There are a lot of people out there, whether it is you or me or anybody else here, who make a decision based on what we see on the roads, and if we see danger on the roads, we choose to adjust our transport accordingly. If we want to move what the Mayor says is an 80% public transport, walking and cycling usage from a 63% level at the moment, then we need to make the modes that we seek to increase attractive and not impacted by fear of road danger. That is why the investment is absolutely vital; it is investment for the future. It will transform transport in London and make London continue to run as a city and it could become a city

that we are really proud of. Some other cities are already looking to London as an example of where you can go. It is not just Oslo and Helsinki; there are things that are happening here that other people are asking about. I was called by someone, who is a former Canadian Minister, to ask about the progress on lorries and I was happy to pass on some of the measures that we have introduced here. We need to go forward and we need to keep investing in order to have a satisfactory city. We wrote a letter, in conjunction with lots of other organisations, to the Minister [of State for Transport] to make that very clear.

Shaun Bailey AM: If you link the Green [Recovery] and the Vision Zero, there might be places that the Mayor could spend money that would be more impactful for our green agenda than they would for the Vision Zero?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): As I say, they are linked and one helps the other. If we progress with Vision Zero, we reduce the danger and we increase active travel, and that helps with emissions, that helps with congestion, that helps with pollution and that helps with individual health.

Shaun Bailey AM: The Chair is getting antsy. Neil, would you like to add something?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): I made most of the points there, but I would like to reiterate that I am a pedal cyclist myself. We cycle as a family, we always have – five of us, me, my wife and three kids – and I am not blind to the dangers which cyclists face. We need to leave identity politics out of this. It is not car drivers versus bikers versus cyclists versus pedestrians. I am, variously, a pedestrian, a pedal cyclist, a motorcyclist and a car driver and my experience of each influences and informs my attitude to the way other road users behave. What I am saying is – it is very simple – if you want fewer cyclists to die, you need to get the messaging “Ride defensively”. It is that simple and that clear. We ride defensively as motorcyclists, it is how we stay alive, and you need to alter the messaging completely if you want fewer of your friends to die, Mr Bogdanowicz.

Shaun Bailey AM: Thank you, Neil. I am sure we will come back to that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We have got a lot of questions still to get through, Members. Guests, could you try to be a little bit shorter, but also you are here to talk about the users you are representing, rather than your views of the world and whatever. I am really conscious we have got an awful lot to get through to get the evidence we need on this.

We are going to look at progress on initiatives now. Assembly Member Berry?

Siân Berry AM: I want to ask one point of clarification from the last section, yes or no, if that is OK. Is it the case that Motorcycle Action Group (MAG) does not have a place on either the Vision Zero Reference Group or the Vision Zero Enforcement Reference Group?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): No, we do not have a place. No.

Siân Berry AM: That is really interesting and probably to be noted --

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): We would be very happy to take one up if you are offering one.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): I do not think we have that power.

Siân Berry AM: Yes, we can make recommendations and there will be no voting at the end of this meeting, so it is not a case of winning a debate today.

I want to talk to speed limits and I know that, Jeremy, you have brought this up a couple of times already. What evidence do you have and what information do you have about how the rollout of 20mph speed limits has affected safety on the roads when it has gone to new boroughs? I know that more boroughs have now adopted this, there are fewer gaps in central London and outer London still does not have a lot of 20mph default limits. Where it has been introduced, how has it affected road danger?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): There are a number of dimensions to this. There is how far London has got; for example, there is a really positive initiative in the progress report about TfL starting to want to work with Government around a 20mph default as a pilot project, which is really exciting. There is the work with the boroughs, there is the work on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and the red route network, and then there is general lobbying around 20 [miles an hour]. What is really exciting is the progress on 20mph in London. Even in the last year, the City of Westminster, [the Royal Borough of] Kensington and Chelsea and [the London Borough of] Merton have all gone 20 [miles an hour]. Really exciting is the fact that [the London Borough of] Wandsworth has recently made every borough-managed road, except for one, 20mph. The boroughs that have taken up 20mph are seeking to go further with it.

As you say, it is almost universally 20mph across inner London. When we move to the outer boroughs, there are lots of examples now of boroughs that have gone 20mph and there is really interesting work going on in [the Royal Borough of] Kingston [upon Thames] around two of the four neighbourhoods there having gone 20mph. If I give you examples, I will start to miss out boroughs, but there are examples such as [the London Boroughs of] Waltham Forest and Croydon have also gone 20, but there are a number of boroughs that have not gone 20 [miles an hour]. Some of them do not want to go 20mph, but there are a number of boroughs that do want to go 20mph and one of the opportunities - and TfL is very aware of it - is giving them support to make the leap.

Everybody is uncertain about London Transport [LT] funding and also there are priorities in LT funding. But if we are going to take advantage of the introduction of ISA in 2022 and 2024, it is really important that the boroughs that want to go 20mph are there so they can take advantage of it. Really exciting as well, which we talked about earlier, is mandatory ISA on almost half of buses by the end of next year. All the boroughs that want to go 20mph really should be encouraged to.

The 20mph programme on the TLRN has gone really well and it is beefed up in the progress report. What is going to be really, really interesting is where that goes in terms of being cost effective and also now, given there is not going to be a lot of funding, to make sure there is strong compliance with it. What are the tricks that can be used to make sure that where the TLRN goes 20mph that can be as close to a maximum as possible? There are examples in Camberwell and Tooley Street, of low-cost use of signs and lines, speed cameras, 24/7 bus lanes, a whole array of introducing protected cycle lanes, low-cost interventions. There is a task to be done of these large sections of the TLRN that are proposed to go 20mph. How do you make the compliance stronger? A lot of things can be done around that.

Siân Berry AM: You mentioned the TLRN a few times and that is effectively the strategic road network in London. I have got the most recent map of speed limits here and it seems like there is still an awful lot of the TLRN that is not at 20mph, even through central London. Would you support that becoming more of a default? I know the Assembly considered but did not vote for a motion to make it 20mph wherever there is a

pavement, for example, and ignoring some of the more strategic and motorway-style roads. Would you support that becoming a default? Are you saying that that is not feasible until you have done some physical measures?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): I am not sure it is about physical measures. There is some work to be done to improve compliance. To be fair, the programme to 2024 is virtually bringing in a default 20mph across inner London where all those roads are absolutely appropriate to 20mph and TfL is moving to that. It is funding-dependent, it is a two-year programme to 2023/24 and it is very much aiming for that. It is important to do other additional stuff that is compliance, but it is not going to be raised tables or thing like that. It is going to be mostly signs and lines and some elements of enforcement.

Siân Berry AM: You have talked a little bit about ISA. That is where the cars or vehicles are programmed to know the speed limit and stick to it. In terms of compliance, if you were to make it the default on even the more main road-seeming TLRN stretches, that would keep a lot of vehicles within that limit, would it not?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Yes, there are two elements to this. There is mandatory ISA, and that is what has been fitted on a number of the buses and is proposed to be rolled out quite significantly, retrofitted and on new buses, over the next couple of years. From the research that was done when TfL first looked at this, the compliance level with 20mph speed limits is 97% to 99%, and that is a game changer. That is why I was really excited about the idea of procurement practices. If, for example, TfL gets the boroughs to be mandating mandatory speed limits on new vehicles on their own fleets and on vehicles, say, where there are contractors for housing repairs, that again could be a game changer. Working vehicles could suddenly be much, much safer and pose less danger. There is the idea of mandatory ISA, which could be really powerful on working vehicles.

Then - this is where it gets confusing - there are the regulations that were inherited from the European Union and these are general safety regulations in that territory. Essentially, if the Government chooses to adopt that or a version of that, there will be ISA on all new models of vehicles from 2022 and all new cars from 2024. The problem is there has been a lot of watering down of the ISA that is proposed whereby it looks like now one of the systems that the manufacturers may be able to fit is simply an audible warning that then can be turned off, rather than the idea of you press the accelerator and there is a pushback against it. The danger is that even in Europe this will be watered down and one has not got a sense of what the Government will introduce here. Potentially, it is immensely powerful.

Siân Berry AM: The other thing to ask about is enforcement of the speed limits by the police. At the last London Assembly Plenary meeting, we asked the MPS to produce an enforcement dashboard because it does not currently have that. We have a dashboard, which we will talk about later, for collisions and injuries but not for the enforcement activity. There are no targets for that so that will come.

What more can be done to ensure that there is more enforcement of these speed limits and do the police play an important role, therefore, in achieving Vision Zero?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Absolutely. The hope is in the longer term we will move from enforcement to compliance. It is not enforced; people become compliant and then hopefully there is not the overriding of the systems that are fitted. However, now the police are immensely important, and they have played a very, very important role so far. One of the key planks of the original Vision Zero Action Plan was the three-tier enforcement programme and when Andy Cox [former

Detective Superintendent for Vision Zero, Metropolitan Police Service] was in charge of that, he was a real proponent of it and helped introduce it.

The progress report looks at, as I understand it, the back office improvements that were needed in Marlowe House to go from around 200 offences to be processed a year to a million offences a year. That system is now in place and there is a ramping up of the potential to enforce those systems. Officer enforcement has been really increased and that happened, especially when there were high levels of speeding early in the pandemic. The police have set up this Road Crimes Team as well. The police have played a significant part and there is a real worry that if the funding is reduced, they will not be able to do what is planned, such as installing new safety cameras for the next stage of the programme.

Siân Berry AM: Lorraine, how do you feel about speed limits on different roads and is ISA a useful thing?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): The problem that we have with speed limits as a bus driver is that we drive to a timetable, what is called a headway. Now that we are coming across roads that have the 20mph speed limit, our timetables have not been changed to take into consideration that we are going 10mph less, doing 20mph as opposed to 30mph. That is a problem that we are having. The buses are excellent where you have the speed limit and the bus will reduce its speed down to 20mph, but TfL has never ever taken into consideration the late running of buses if we get caught. Truthfully speaking, it is a good idea, even as a road user, driving a car. The speed limits are a good idea. However, as a bus driver who drives 7 days a week, 12 hours a day with a 40-minute break, I am on the road or my colleagues are on the road more than anybody else in this room and nobody takes any notice. We need more policing of the speed limits. We go slowly, we do 20mph and the car behind is not interested. He wants to overtake us; he will overtake us and he will cut in front of us. What do we have to do? We have to brake sharply, we then put our passengers at risk and we risk - if it is a wet road - hitting the offender, whatever you want to call him. That impacts on Vision Zero because then it is a statistic that is another accident on the bus or off the bus. We do think it is a good idea, we are happy to drive at 20mph and the more roads that are like that, the better. We just need them to recognise the fact that they need to alter our timetables and the duties to take it into consideration.

Siân Berry AM: That is really interesting. Thank you very much for that. We are bringing in TfL and the MPS for the next meeting and we have got some questions to follow up with them after that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We are getting a lot of good points to be picking up for our next meeting. Assembly Member Clarke?

Anne Clarke AM: I am going to carry on with you, Jeremy. Thank you so much for your comments on speeding. Just yesterday, I was out with residents in West Finchley, which is in [the London Borough of] Barnet, who are absolutely desperate to get their speed limit lowered to 20. It is very, very difficult in some boroughs particularly, boroughs like Barnet, to get them to reduce the speed limit where there is not the political will to do so. I am just very grateful for your comments.

Should the Government bring forward 20mph pilots, including in London, equivalent to the work being led by the Welsh and Scottish governments?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Yes, thank you for that. I am not going to go over the same territory again, but it is really exciting that TfL has moved this point from an appendix in the last report to something that is really upfront in this report. As you have just said, it looks like Wales and Scotland are going to go to 20mph within the next two or three years. There are now over 26 million people across the UK living in 20mph local authorities and it is moving to the default. The

United Nations has made it clear that it feels that globally the default speed limit in urban areas or in places where people and vehicles mix should be 20mph. TfL's intervention here is really valuable, bringing 8 million or so people in potentially to have a default 20mph.

This is probably too optimistic. It feels like it is only a matter of time now before the UK moves to a general 20mph default in urban areas, obviously with appropriate exceptions for more major arterial roads where people and vehicles do not mix. This is very, very useful and in some of the boroughs that do not want to move to 20mph in London there is a tremendous desire of residents to do that. It is a case of the leadership of the boroughs trying to listen to those residents, rather than feeling they do not want to take on what would be a really progressive move.

Anne Clarke AM: Thank you, Jeremy. How useful is the Vision Zero dashboard as a tool for your organisation in understanding the progress made on Vision Zero?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Yes, it is funny. I am finding it really valuable to help people find out what is happening in their area and there are a number of things you can do in it. You can narrow the dates down that you want to look at, you can look at people by age group and you can look on a borough basis. It is really, really helpful to be able to point people and have a really easy to use tool. The other thing that is really encouraging is that the data is far more up-to-date than we have seen typically in the past, and people are using much more current data. There are not a lot of faults with it. One thing that would be useful is if they did include elements such as the speed limit of the road involved to tie in a bit more with some of the wider dimensions of the STATS19 [road safety] data or the road classification or who the highways authorities are. But that is a bit nit-picking. It is a very useful tool and people find it relatively easy to use.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Assembly Member Prince?

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Jeremy, in relation to 20mph, what you are suggesting is that the 20mph speed limit should be regardless of the width of the road, the length, and whether it is a windy road or a straight road. If the 20mph speed limits are put into areas where they are more relevant, ie, outside schools, areas where there are narrow roads or lots of parked cars and so on, would that not be more effective than making drivers drive at 20mph for the entirety of their journey? For instance, as I have sometimes done, you go all the way to [the London Borough of] Croydon on a Sunday morning with not another single car on the road and I am forced to drive at 20, which I find a little frustrating. I do know as well that if another car does come on that road, he - or she, but usually a he, to be fair - will come up behind me, sit on my tail and then dangerously overtake me as soon as he possibly can. In my view, that is more likely to cause an accident than if we were able to drive at 30 in a sensible situation. I absolutely get that one needs to drive at 20mph in more hazardous environments. Sorry for the long question.

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): No, that is very clear, thank you. It needs to be made really clear that this is a default speed limit; it is not a blanket speed limit. [The London Borough of] Croydon is a really good example and [the London Borough of] Richmond [upon Thames] would be another example. Because of the characteristics of those boroughs, when they introduced a default speed limit they said, "Borough-managed roads will go to 20mph. However, there are roads which are not appropriate for that". They listened to the feedback from residents and accepted those roads. Typically, it is about the roads where people and vehicles mix, for a lot of London that is nearly all of those roads and the roads that we accept will be relatively few.

I hear your point about schools, and I have certainly heard that before. My concern about that is that, a bit like school streets in a way, they focus around the school itself and they do not think about the whole journey to school. The great concern is that we focus the safety just on the school gate, but we do not then make safe the whole journey to school. It is a broader conversation than trying to pick up individual locations and make them safe. I perfectly understand the point you made earlier, but drivers do ask for consistency and it is a lot easier when there is a consistency to the speed limit. As I said, if there is an arterial road that is not appropriate, then that will of course remain at 30mph or above.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Yes, I do concede that it is a nightmare driving down to [the London Borough of] Croydon because one minute it is 30mph, the next minute it is 20mph, then it is 30mph and 20mph. In the end, if it was not for the fact that I have got a little thing on my car that tells me what the speed limit is, I would not have a clue, to be perfectly blunt. I want to develop that a little bit more. Can you give me any examples or are there any figures – real life examples, not laboratory testing – that show which boroughs have seen any reduction in killed and seriously injured (KSI) or deaths by reducing the speed limit to 20mph, taking in mind we cannot use the COVID period because that is an anomaly?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): That is a really good question. I will be honest. We have seen a lot of research around the impact on vehicle speeds in London where the boroughs have gone to 20mph and we have not seen data in particular about the impact on casualties. However, there is a lot of work on this across the UK and I am happy to supply it to the Committee afterwards. One example is the research TRL [Limited] did a couple of decades ago, which was for every one mile an hour reduction in average speed there is a 6% reduction in casualties in an urban setting. That research is there. I will be honest. I have seen speed limit impacts from the boroughs and how average speeds have declined with the introduction of 20mph, but I have not seen casualty data. That is probably because in London there are so many other variables that probably make that a bit difficult to isolate.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): It is a difficulty because I always quote, I think it is, Portsmouth and Bath where they put 20mph blanket speeds in and after a period of time both said they regretted it. It had no effect on reducing casualties and if they had the money they would reverse it. As I move on --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Perhaps, Jeremy, if you want to send us any information you have got on that, thank you. Right, do you want to move on to your next bit?

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Lorraine, what more can be done to support safe behaviour for different types of road users, do you think?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): We have to concentrate on the bus drivers themselves and we have to think about the fatigue. Like I said, we do 10 to 12 hours, 7 days a week with a 40-minute break. If we are going to be driving at 20mph, which is all well and good – it will reduce the accidents, not that we have a lot to be quite honest on average with other road users – TfL has to focus more on the bus drivers, the bus driver industry, in order to take into consideration the 20mph roads. Like you said, driving down to [the London Borough of] Croydon, Streatham High Road is an absolute nightmare. Cars whizz past, lorries whizz past us and we will never have an opportunity to get Vision Zero where accidents or incidents are concerned unless other factors are brought into consideration. The MPS just see speeding cars in a 20mph zone, they do not do anything about it and we look at them as if to say, “Well, aren’t you going to stop him?” That behaviour in a 20mph zone is putting other people at risk. What I have noticed is that where roads are 20mph, pedestrians are more likely to cross the road anywhere, as opposed to crossing at a zebra crossing or the pedestrian crossing. That has to be taken into consideration with drivers that are not taking into consideration the 20mph.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): If TfL and the bus driving companies were more focused on safety, rather than achieving the time goals, do you think that would help?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): They need to be more focused on safety.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Do you have any evidence of them focusing on safety over delivering targets?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): Do you know what? Truthfully speaking, the bus industry is all over the place. At the moment, we are fighting fatigue. With the safety aspect of TfL with the bus industry and bus drivers, 100%, we have to be absolutely perfect, but, like I said, we are human beings, we can make a mistake, we often do make a mistake and we do not get up in the morning and say, "This is what we're going to do", but it happens. The pressure that TfL puts the companies under drops down onto the bus drivers and we are under pressure to keep to the timetable, to keep to our duty, to make sure we come in on time. For us bus drivers, we have to balance out safety as well as keeping to the speed limits.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Yes, that is very useful evidence, thank you.

John Murphy (Regional Officer, Unite): Going back to the original point and just so that you are aware, I have not always been a Regional Officer of Unite union. I spent 24 years being a bus driver and I happen to agree with everything Lorraine has said up to this point, by and large. With safety, when we talk about the 20mph, bus drivers will drive at whatever speed you require for drivers as long as they have got the tools to do it. The speed limit of 20mph, 30 miles an hour, 40 miles an hour does not substantially make a great deal of difference to the bus driver. Where it does impact is in the monitoring of this and the enforcement of this and it is a point Lorraine made earlier. We need to ensure there is enforcement because several people so far have made the point that if the bus drives at 20mph, someone is going to overtake them and that puts them on the other side of the road and in conflict with another vehicle. Enforcement is fundamental to all of this.

The problem with having some roads at 20mph and some roads not at 20mph is it creates rat runs. If there are roadworks somewhere everyone diverts off down the other streets. This increases the traffic down there where people are not necessarily used to it and, as a consequence, there is a risk of it increasing the risk of accident.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Tom, for a while, I was living in [the London Borough of] Lewisham and the main roads, if you can call them that, were 30 miles an hour, the side roads were 20 and it was not that advantageous to take the side roads. When everything is 20mph, would that not mean that you are then once again encouraged to use the side roads rather than the main roads?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): What Jeremy [Leach] said is correct. We are talking about a default speed limit of 20mph on residential streets and, where a borough or traffic highway authority feels there is a need for a speed of 30, 40, 50 miles an hour, then that would apply. That is roughly what they do in some European countries. In Holland, they have home zones where you might even have to travel more slowly than 20mph, in some cases restricted to 10 miles an hour. You would not think of driving through a housing estate at 20mph because it would be too fast and you do not drive at 20mph through a car park. There are speeds that are appropriate on residential streets. I recently cycled in [the London Borough of] Barnet and there was a very big sign on a narrow residential street, saying "Please stick to 30 miles an hour". I thought it was unfortunate that the residents of that street had to experience, presumably, vehicles travelling at significantly above 30 miles an hour because that is why they had the sign.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Do you think that the targets for Vision Zero are the right ones?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Yes, the main target is an appropriate one. To look at fatalities and serious injuries, that is an appropriate target. We have suggested broadening this. Perhaps to pick up with Tom's [Bogdanowicz] point earlier about this wider agenda and also to tie in closely with the work around Healthy Streets, we suggested including – perhaps not as a target but as a part of the information that is provided as this work goes on – perceptions of safety on the roads, especially while walking and cycling. That is an integral part of the Healthy Streets Scorecard. Then we suggested indicators that track progress on reductions in average speeds, volumes and perceptions of intimidation by motor vehicles.

I do not know whether you know about the Healthy Streets Scorecard, which is a monitoring device that is published every year, based on publicly available data. There are a number of those indicators that might be quite useful to TfL and as part of this work or even for the Committee around potentially sustainable mode share. That is the proportion of journeys that are made by public transport, walking and cycling, levels of active travel, the prevalence of low traffic neighbourhoods, 20mph speed limits and also the amount of physically protected cycle track on main roads. It could be broadened, the focus is the right one, but there is a chance to make it a bit richer by looking at some other indicators as well.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Do you think enough is being done to improve road safety for pedestrians post-pandemic?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): As [London] Living Streets, it is something that really concerns us. I am just trying to simplify this a bit. There are two dimensions to this and whether it is post-pandemic or not, this is work in progress. In a London context, the key location where there is danger for pedestrians is on main roads, especially high streets and town centres. There are funding issues involved, but what we would say is that all of the focus needs to be on things like missing pedestrian crossings. We need to tackle those locations where there are crossings, where there is no green man crossing at all or where there are arms that are missing and there are examples around here where that is the case. Signal timings: again, there is a potential trade-off with bus times and general traffic times, but pedestrian wait times and crossing times can be an issue. There is the potential, as is being trialled in Manchester, of side road zebra crossings, the Beeline crossings and if they become allowed, there is a fantastic opportunity to give pedestrians priority there. There is 20mph speed obviously. Another area that is unexplored in London is traffic-free areas. You have got to be careful to make sure these are economically successful and make sure time deliveries can occur, but there is a chance to make more traffic-free areas. That is what the spirit was behind the Oxford Street approach, which added a lot of economic vibrancy because of the spend of pedestrians.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): If you say traffic-free areas, does that include pushbikes as well?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): It is areas where those non-mechanical transport modes work well together and it is certainly possible to devise shared spaces where both of those can work. The work around The Strand is going to be really interesting; it is a pedestrian area but people cycling through there either dismount or go at very careful speeds and I am sure that can be designed.

Finally, there is a really important piece about pavements. They need to be wide, accessible and clutter-free. In the town centres and neighbourhood streets we are finding tremendous potential in removing through-traffic from neighbourhood streets. The potential for pedestrians is very exciting.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): That is very kind of you, thank you very much. Neil, I have got some questions for you. Do you think enough is being done by the Mayor and TfL to persuade all London boroughs to allow motorcycles to use their bus lanes?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): No, I do not. I know that the Mayor says that he does support bikes in bus lanes, but this is an agenda that needs to be propagated much more aggressively than it is being done. It has been proved over a very long period now, ever since we got bikes into bus lanes in Bristol the best part of 30 years ago, that bikes do not cause buses any problems. They do not cause other bus lane users any problems, but they do make motorcycling much safer and reduce motorcycle casualties.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): All right, thank you. What else would you suggest could be done to reduce motorcycle deaths?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): I understand that you had, I think it was, an average of 30 deaths a year up until very recently and deaths have dropped to, I think it was, 4 or 6 in the last year.

To answer that question really intelligently, somebody needs to go back through all the statistics and try to find out why each of these accidents happened. I analysed 20-odd years' worth of statistics of accidents on the M62 motorway more than 20 years ago and that was very informative, and that was in connection with the wire rope crash barriers project. If you go back to the data and find out why the accidents are happening, then you can look at addressing the reasons, but one thing everybody should understand is this. If you ride a motorcycle, you do not want to hit anything at all.

A dog will bring you off your bike. At the best, it is a load of expensive repairs; at the worst, it is death. I understand that the gentleman who runs the Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS) has produced a report about who kills whom, and it says that motorcyclists kill a disproportionate number of pedestrians. If that is happening, then I guarantee that is happening because people are walking out into the path of motorcycles or, as I have experienced, into the side of a passing motorcycle, simply because they are not looking where they are going. Such accidents are as likely, and sometimes more likely, to result in a KSI to the motorcyclist than to the pedestrian that walks out in front or into the side of them. You do not want to hit anything if you are on a bike because even a dog or a cat will bring you off. I had a badger come out into the front of my old Rover 75 and it did 1,200 quid's worth of damage. If it had come out into the front of my bike that would have probably killed me.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): What impact do you think the removal of road space and narrowing of lanes has had on motorcycle safety?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): Disastrous and deadly. The more you compress motorcycles into a limited amount of road space with well-protected people in cars, the more motorcyclists are going to be KSI. It is as simple as that.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Then what is MAG's view on the best way to include motorcycling in the modal mix on roads?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): We would like to be in all the consultations and, as I have said, if there is a place on your Vision Zero Committee, we would certainly take that up. We, as an organisation, have a stated *What is MAG?* statement, I have got a copy with me and you can have it if you want. Part of that is that we all accept personal responsibility for what we do. I do not think there is any place in all of this for dogma and identity politics. If you are going to get one thing across that is going to make everybody safer, it is that everybody needs to look out for everybody else, but everybody also does need to look out for themselves.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): OK, all right. If you could share those statements with the Committee as additional evidence, just email it to us and it would be really helpful. Yes, thanks.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): How useful do you think the training is that is offered by TfL for motorcycle users and do we need more training for motorcyclists?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): Motorcyclists today are better trained than they ever have been. It is certainly not the scenario when I started motorcycling on the road in 1981 when I literally bought a bike, was shown where the controls were and wobbled off into the traffic.

I do not think a lack of training is an issue at all these days and where there is a perception of motorcyclists riding very badly – and I see it myself – 99 times out of a 100 it is people who are riding illegally. I see it where I live, and I am sure you will see it in London as well. I see some appalling riding, but it is by people who I know are not riding legal motorcycles. They probably do not have a licence and they certainly do not have insurance.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Do you think that the delivery companies and the fast food companies do enough to train the people they put on their bikes before they let them on the road though?

Neil Liversidge (Chair, Motorcycle Action Group): In my experience, most of them do next to nothing and they have a very cavalier attitude to the safety of their workers.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Assembly Member Baker.

Elly Baker AM: The first question is for Tom at the LCC and it is a similar question around training. Is there enough that could be done to support cyclists through training to help them manage risk and is there sufficient money to support this?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): Yes, well, training is a useful adjunct to the introduction of decent infrastructure and anybody can benefit from it, particularly children. There was a programme, which was developed in quite a number of schools. Neil [Liversidge] was talking about defensive riding and that is what it teaches, both adults and children. That programme was being progressed in several hundred schools successfully, but funding has recently been cut back. That is a big blow and it is a big blow not only for the children who will miss out on that training but it is also a blow from the perspective of the instructors and the people who have invested the time in getting the expertise to be instructors. We will come out of the pandemic with a situation where children have not been trained and there are insufficient qualified instructors to assist them.

There is also the issue of driver training and one of the problems is that a lot of drivers may not be particularly those who ride bicycles themselves. In Holland, it is a different situation and pretty much everybody drives and rides, and everybody is familiar with the behaviours of both types of vehicle. The Dutch do have a training

programme for all their schools and all children are given cycle training. Here, we embarked on a programme of Safer Urban Driving, which is a module developed for lorry drivers, and we think it has been successful. Most of the drivers who do the module say that it has been positive for them and it helps them understand how cyclists move on the road. Neil was talking about defensive riding; it may be understood from the perspective if someone is on a motorbike, but it is not necessarily understood that someone on a cycle might take a similar approach. Approaching a junction, a cyclist might be in the centre of the lane so that a vehicle does not cut across him. I was riding in today; I was in the cycle lane and a vehicle stopped. I was riding, it was driving alongside and it stopped for me to pass. I was impressed, it is great if people do that and we need to get to that stage.

Safer Urban Driving for lorry drivers is positive and I would like to see it become a standard module for the lorry drivers to do, rather than just one of several so that they could do First Aid three times, instead of doing Safer Urban Driving and First Aid and something else. We would like to see that happen at the governmental level to introduce that kind of programme for lorry drivers as a standard part of their training. Yes, both cycle training for kids is important and cycle training for drivers and also for the adults who are taking up cycling. There are so many new riders out there and we have been offering a Bike Buddy Programme. I have been out with parents and kids and showing them some of the new cycle routes because we have had these 100 kilometres of routes proposed or completed and others proposed, but not everybody knows about them. Assembly Member Bailey was asking about what more TfL could be doing, and it could be publicising that sort of facility. Yes, I know how to get from here to north London and from here to Kensington Palace without encountering a car, but not all of you would be able to answer that. I am in the business, you are not, and you cannot be expected to know that.

Elly Baker AM: Thank you. Lorraine, do you feel that there has been sufficient training offered to bus drivers on all the safety issues that we have been discussing?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): Yes, I do. We are highly trained, especially for cyclists and motorbikes, and we are always having it drummed into us that they are the most vulnerable and they have no protection. We are not really allowed to overtake a cyclist or a motorbike unless there is sufficient room to do so and looking further ahead to make sure that we have got enough space to pull in, without causing the cyclist or the motorbike to have to brake or slow down.

I think - maybe because I am one - we are well trained and I will never turn around and say that "No, we are not trained sufficiently". That is one thing that I will say, we are. We do - we have to - take into consideration motorcyclists, bicycles, pedestrians, everybody.

Elly Baker AM: Thank you. You made some comments earlier on around not being aware of Vision Zero. One of the things that is so important to drive up safety standards is to have an open safety culture where it is discussed all the time. What do you think the barriers are to that and why is that not being discussed? You have said in training it is, but day-to-day why do you think safety is maybe not discussed and high up the agenda?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): It is because we are trained and because of the level that we are trained to, once we are out on the road it is nobody's concern but the bus driver. We get blamed for absolutely everything. Not only from our training, but we are extra cautious of what we do. We are trained to look at the mirrors three times when we pull out from a stop. We are trained to check inside them going around a corner.

Where Vision Zero is concerned, the higher above feel they do not need to worry about us because we are trained to do it properly and we do take safety into consideration. At the end of the day, it is our job. We do not want to have an accident inside the bus or outside the bus. The 12 years I have been a bus driver, truthfully speaking, if I had ever had an accident, I do not think I would ever drive again, a bus or a car. A lot of my colleagues feel the same. It is our responsibility as well as the training we have been given in order to do our job properly.

I cannot see Vision Zero reducing down where the bus industry is concerned. We do not have a lot of accidents. If there are, most of them are not ours. Because of the pressure we are under, somebody has to look at the industry and say, "Enough is enough. We need to take into consideration the bus drivers". Like I said, 12 hours a day, seven days a week with a 40-minute break, we are tired. We do get tired and when you are tired, we are human, we do make mistakes. That is nothing to do with the safety issue or our training. That is to do with fatigue. We ask for help but we are disregarded by everybody. People who are not bus drivers make decisions on our behalf which are wrong. It is nice to be here today and to get the bus drivers' point of view across because there are things I could tell you that would make you think, "God, I never knew that". Apart from John [Murphy], who was a bus driver back in the day, people need to understand where we, the bus drivers, are coming from. We do not want to have an accident. We pride ourselves.

The number of accidents we have to avoid on a daily basis because somebody has walked out in front of the bus, somebody has pulled out of a side turning, somebody is going too fast, and they want to get past us. There has been a lot of accidents where a passenger has left the bus and gone to the front or the back of the bus and gone to cross the road and a car has come speeding by because they have underestimated the speed. We get blamed for that. It is ridiculous that we should have to take responsibility for what people do. In order to get Vision Zero where the bus industry is concerned, TfL need to look at us and look at how we work and the way we work and reduce it down.

Elly Baker AM: That is helpful, thank you. John Murphy, I do not know if you have any views about the safety culture. Lorraine has spoken very interestingly about that. In terms of the actions in Vision Zero that relate to buses, there is stuff around fatigue management, around bus safety and about the health and wellbeing of bus drivers. What is your experience of these programmes that are designed to prevent fatigue mostly and are they working and should anything else be done?

John Murphy (Regional Officer, Unite): For me, I am reluctant to say the work done so far by TfL around fatigue management has gone very much further forward than when we first started. There is an overall failure to recognise that you cannot solve everything by putting a machine into a bus. If somebody measures TfL of taking in-between the Lufbery Report, up to this point, include things like seeing eye machines where you can see if a driver is fatigued. The problem with that is it is reactive. We need to get to a stage where we are being proactive.

There is a flaw with the TfL thinking, certainly from the perspective of the Union, and I am sure I speak quite accurately, and drivers will reflect this as well, the people we are representing. TfL ran a course for all of London where people were given virtual reality headsets to put on. The solution to fatigue from the TfL perspective, according to this training, is do not have an argument with your family at night and make sure you go to bed early. It completely ignores the fact that we make drivers work longer or that TfL has a plan to roll out remote sign-on which is going to make drivers more fatigued. If you go through remote sign-on, the measures that have been put in place up to now, training managers to recognise people who are fatigued, how does that work when someone is signing on five miles away from the manager? I do not see that working unless they have bionic eyesight.

I know a lot of people will think it is that leftie thing again, funding is an issue because, right now, as we reduce funding as we go forward, this has to have an impact. If you go to the shop with less money, you buy less. Everyone can accept that. In this instance, if we want to talk about a decent standard of training going forward rather than something that is drawn on the back of a cigarette packet, we have to pay for that, and we have to invest in it. If we want to talk about putting all these measures in going forward, we have to pay for that. The funding is very important.

The training itself, how do you train someone not to be tired? This is the failing in the approach. You have to put measures in place to stop people being tired. If we talk about the training and the standard of bus drivers, let me tell you this: in 24 years of bus driving, the vast majority of the people I have worked with, I have met, have been of the highest standard who take the job very seriously. That was never better demonstrated than during the pandemic and the first lockdown. While everyone, who could, took shelter, bus drivers had to come to work every day and play Russian roulette. Let that be a symbol of the dedication of the professionalism of these people.

As Lorraine [Robertson] said, they are trained to a high standard. By and large, when you think of the miles they do, the number of incidents they are involved with are quite small in proportion to other road users out there. It is not necessarily about the training. They can do the job but sometimes there will be mistakes. These mistakes are increased when you include things like fatigue and impacts of the measures that increase fatigue such as remote sign-on, longer duties, lower pay etc.

It is a broader picture than just training. If you are asking me, "Is the training around Vision Zero up to scratch?" Absolutely not. The responsibility ultimately for this is the bus operators, the people who operate the contracts from TfL to run the buses in London. The reason this is not as high on their agenda is because it is not seen as something that is high on the agenda because there are other things that take priority. For example, banging out miles, chasing miles, making sure they maximise the margins that are available to them, therefore, it falls lower down the scale. Money always rules, does it not?

Elly Baker AM: That is very helpful, thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That was lovely. Thank you, John [Murphy].
Assembly Member Rogers, and then we are going to move on to looking at e-scooters with
Assembly Member Garratt.

Nicolas Rogers AM: I had a number of follow-up questions around driver fatigue for Lorraine [Robertson] and John [Murphy].

Lorraine, you mentioned fatigue a number of times. How many times would you say, when there is an incident involved a bus driver, is fatigue a contributing factor to that incident?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): We do not have any stats on that because fatigue is not recognised.

Nicolas Rogers AM: When you say it is not recognised, what do you mean?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): Like John said, you cannot train a driver not to be tired. However, when you have finished your duty and you go home, you have a family you are involved with. If you are a single parent, you have the children to get sorted out, you have shopping to do, you have cooking to do. You end up with five hours sleep. None of that is taken into consideration. All we get told is, "Get plenty of

sleep". How can you get plenty of sleep when there are other things you need to do? We need to reduce down the working hours but give us a decent pay to cover the reduced hours that we are doing.

They are saying that remote sign-on can reduce fatigue. How does that work out? I take the first bus out of the garage in the morning at 4.00 am. I have to drive my car to the depot. When I finish driving I have to then make my way back to the garage because that is where my car is, we are not going to get paid for this remote sign-on. That is a 7% deduction in our wages per year, but we are still basically working for the company because we still have to make our way back to the garage. We are fighting that.

Nobody seems to be able to understand that fatigue is a big part of our life. We do get very, very tired. What I try to explain to people because I am quite a Union activist, is that fatigue is different from being tired. When you are tired, you can get a little nap but when you are fatigued, it goes on and on and it builds itself up to you getting things like headaches, double vision, backache. I have been so tired that I have approached a bus stop thinking that people were at the bus stop where there was not; it was a poster with people on the poster.

Nicolas Rogers AM: Can you give examples of what systems or processes are in place to manage the kind of fatigue you are talking about? For example, you must have minimum rest periods between shifts and things like that. Are those rest period adequate?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): We have 40 minutes. If you are driving for 10.5 hours, in-between, at some point in that, you cannot drive for more than 5.5 hours. That is the European directive. When you get 40 minutes and in that 40 minutes you have to make your way from getting off that bus to a restroom, wash your hands, go to the toilet, go and get something to eat or eat what you have brought with you, as you turn around, your 40 minutes is done and you have to get back. You have to go to the toilet before your get back on the bus because if you are going to be driving for another 5.5 hours, there are no facilities unless there is a garage on your route and you can stop and explain to your passengers that you need to run in and use the facilities. All of those things contribute to the fatigue. The way I and my colleagues feel is that there should be a reduction in hours, but we cannot take less hours and a lot of my colleagues work rest days.

When you work seven days straight, and you have two rest days, you do not. Our colleagues will work that one day, therefore, they do eight days straight and one day off. The shift pattern then changes from working late at night to working first thing in the morning. The whole contribution needs to be looked at.

Nicolas Rogers AM: Is there a maximum distance you are permitted to live from your depot?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): No.

Nicolas Rogers AM: You could do, say, a 12-hour shift, and have 1.5-hour commute back home and then fit in your life, sleep and then another 1.5-hour commute back the following day.

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): Yes.

Nicolas Rogers AM: When you have finished your shift, is there a minimum period of time that you have to have off before you sign on for duty again?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): 10.5 hours.

Nicolas Rogers AM: 10.5 hours, OK.

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): That is 10.5 hours from when you sign off. If you spend 1.5 hours getting into work, 1.5 hours getting home, then that is three hours out of the 10 hours which makes it seven hours. In those seven hours, you have things to do. We are meant to sleep for seven hours. They say to get enough sleep.

Nicolas Rogers AM: I am conscious of time. My final question on this. If you were to wake up and due to go in for a shift but you felt so fatigued, you thought you were unable to do that, would that be accepted if you rang up and said to your manager, "I am too fatigued. I cannot come in"?

Lorraine Robertson (former bus driver): They cannot turn around and say, "Well, you have to come in" but if you do it more than ex number of times, you will be disciplined and you will have no support. It will be used against you. We struggle not to come in because we do not want it on our record, we do not want to lose our job and we do not want to be disciplined. That is it.

Nicolas Rogers AM: Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Very useful. We will be picking that up in the New Year. Let us look at e-scooters. We are going to have to pick up the pace on the last few sections.

Neil Garratt AM: The big question is not just about Lime but generally the three companies doing these trials across London. What is your general assessment of how those trials are going overall? In June [2022] they are due to expire, are they not?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Yes, from my perspective. I can speak on behalf of Lime. It is hard for me to speak on behalf of the other companies or TfL.

From our perspective and from the perspective of the latest published stats from the trial, it is going very well. It has been very successful. We now have 10 boroughs involved across London and the last published figures, which were for last month, cumulatively just under 500,000 trips, which is a good take-up. In terms of looking towards Vision Zero and in terms of the safety impact of those journeys, we have seen a very low level of safety incidents. Across those just under 500,000 trips --

Neil Garratt AM: Sorry, was that 500,000 Lime trips or 500,000 for the whole lot, all three?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Sorry, 500,000 across the whole trial; Lime's would have been something around about 180,000 of those. Those figures are about a month out of date and so there is a slight lag. Across the 180,000 journeys that we have provided on e-scooters we have had one serious incident that has resulted in hospitalisation and follow-up after that. Aside from that, the number of injuries, the number of incidents and the number of interactions with other road users or with pedestrians have been very low. From that perspective, we are pleased with how it has gone, particularly as this is a brand-new transport mode being introduced into London.

Actually, one of the things we are pleased with the evidence that is being shown is the difference between the type of scheme we are providing and the type of scheme the other operators are providing with legalised, regulated e-scooters and the much less safe illegal e-scooters that we see lots of around London. That distinction is becoming ever more clear as the trial goes on.

Neil Garratt AM: In terms of the distinction between the trials and the private e-scooters, I am conscious you have a business interest in saying legalise your lot and ban the other lot but, notwithstanding that obvious slight bias that you have, let us say we get to June [2022] and the Government is thinking about what to do next. It has options to just keep them all banned, legalise the schemes in a similar format to now or just legalise all of them including private. How would you evaluate those alternatives?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): It is irrelevant of the business position from our interest in it. We are actually in favour across the board of legalising e-scooters in the UK. The UK remains one of the outlier countries across the world where e-scooters remain entirely illegal outside of the legalised trials.

What we do want to see is the same standards implemented for privately owned e-scooters as we currently have in place on the e-scooter trials. Mainly that is around vehicle construction and mainly it is around the safety features the vehicles have to have. For example, our vehicles in London have a capped top speed of 12.5 miles per hour. There was some of the conversation earlier about automatic speed limits across London but also in specific areas. They are already implemented on e-scooters. E-scooters are the only form of transport at the moment where they are widely implemented as a matter of course. We would like to see new privately owned e-scooters to have similar capped top speeds.

In addition to that, the e-scooters in the trial at the moment have safety features like two independent brakes and they are stability tested. Our e-scooters from the top speed, in London, to stopping have a stopping distance of around 3 metres. That is tested and the evidence is examined by the Department for Transport (DfT) before we are approved to put that e-scooter onto the road. We want to see those standards met by anyone who sells a private e-scooter or anyone who owns a private e-scooter.

More broadly, we think in general more people using e-scooters - we also offer e-bikes in London - and more people using e-bikes, cycling and walking will help London meet its climate goals, improve air quality and improve safety, because we know that motor vehicles remain the biggest danger on the road. In addition to that, there is also a benefit in that the more people we get using e-scooters, e-bikes and cycles in cycle lanes on the roads, if those people then go off and drive as well, which many people do - I do that and lots of people do it - the greater their understanding is going to be of what it is like to be a vulnerable user of the road, even of a cyclist or an e-scooter user. There is a real benefit in that in terms of moving towards Vision Zero.

Neil Garratt AM: You mentioned people using e-scooters. That was something else I was interested in in terms of the kinds of people who are renting them, because there is a demographic profile of people who tend to cycle, for example, which is not quite the same as the demographic profile of the whole of London. Since you are running bikes and e-scooters, do you see a difference between the kinds of people who are renting e-scooters versus bikes?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): There is a slight difference. Globally we do see a difference and in Europe we see a marked difference. Generally speaking, there are lots of people who can ride an e-scooter who would never get on a bike. We have worked quite closely with the LCC and other cycling organisations around the world. One of the reasons they are quite often quite open to working with e-scooter companies together on things like segregated infrastructure is because they recognise there are lots of people who just will not get on a bike or an e-bike. Getting that person out of a car and onto an e-scooter or at least giving that person the chance to experience what it is like to travel around a city not in a car or on public transport is really beneficial to improving people's experiences of it.

In the UK, the reason why the data is slightly skewed on this is because you need a provisional or full driving licence to ride an e-scooter in one of the trials. At the moment, in some parts of London that requirement is quite exclusionary. We know that there are certain groups from certain parts of the community who are much less likely to have a provisional driving licence. For one thing, it is expensive to get a provisional driving licence if you do not have one already. In addition to that, we know that lots of younger people simply do not have original driving licences because they have no intention of driving. That is one thing that we would like to see looked at in the future in order to work out how we can access a wider portion of the community and give more people the opportunity.

Neil Garratt AM: When you say, “look at”, do you mean abolish that requirement? Is that what that is code for?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): In the Government’s phrase, it is currently looking at this. When the Government looks at what it might do in the future, when it chooses what future legislation might include or indeed if it choose not to make e-scooters illegal at all, we would like to see the requirement for a driving licence to be removed because we think that it brings a limited safety benefit for a vehicle like an e-scooter but the equality impact and the impact in terms of excluding large parts of society from using these e-scooters is very large. It is something that we certainly want to see changed.

Neil Garratt AM: In general, it is broader groups of people who are using e-scooters who are not using bikes?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Yes, certainly. There is good evidence from certain different places around Europe - notably some of the Nordic countries but also places like Germany - that actually things like the gender balance of e-scooter riders is slightly more equal than, for example, it might be on bikes or e-bikes.

Neil Garratt AM: I wonder whether you could just send that in if you have evidence on that. That would be useful.

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Certainly, yes, we can share some stuff on it.

Neil Garratt AM: The other question I had in terms of how the e-scooters are used is the distance that people are traveling and whether you have any information about that. I realise it is quite hard to know but what were the modes of transports that those people might otherwise have been using, either just your intuition or -- I do not know whether it is very easy to actually gather that information.

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): It is one of the things that the trial is looking at at the moment and TfL is doing some research into this. We are working with some research partners. We have a trial up in Greater Manchester where we are working with the University of Salford to look at this. Actually, the DfT is due to publish some evidence on that pretty soon. That will be the best evidence because that will give you a national picture of it.

In London, the average journey time for someone using an e-scooter across the trial is around 20 to 21 minutes and so that implies, roughly speaking, a journey length of perhaps 1.5 to 2 miles. Something like that would be about right. Incidentally, that actually tallies pretty closely with the data from our e-bikes in London. Journey lengths are not massively different, although e-bikes tend to sometimes make much longer journeys. You very rarely see someone on an e-scooter take it for 40 or 50 minutes, whereas you quite often see that on an e-bike and so it depends slightly how you take the data.

In terms of where the trips are coming from, it will certainly be a mix. It will be a mix of different modes. We have parking bays for e-scooters and the parking bays that get busy quickest are always the ones that are closest to public transport, normally closest to a Tube station. That implies to us certainly that actually there is a high turnover of people who are using e-scooters to connect into particularly the Tube. Where I live in southeast London, there is no Underground.

Neil Garratt AM: I have that problem, yes.

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): It is quite a walk to the train station, as I am sure people will be aware. For me, there is not an e-scooter bay close enough to me currently to ride an easy e-scooter to the station - I often use an e-bike for that - but, if there was, certainly an e-scooter would be perfect. I have a journey of a mile, I can leave the e-scooter there, I know it will be there when I come back and I can link my journey into public transport in that way.

Neil Garratt AM: Yes, that makes a lot of sense. Are you also seeing journeys between places that are not so -- for example, someone here thinks, "I might go to Leicester Square", those kinds of journeys of a couple of miles across London as well or is it really heavily dominated by public transport hubs?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): No. It certainly is a mix and we are seeing the types of journeys you are talking about. The key thing - and it is something that we want to try to do more of in future - about the e-scooters is they often fill a role for people who want to make a quick journey of not that far, but who perhaps had not planned before they were going to make that journey or certainly had not planned how they were going to make that journey.

A good example is - less so now that we are working from home again - someone leaving the office to go to a meeting a couple of miles away, a student going to meet someone from a university or going to a university for a class, making that journey of 1.5 miles and leaving their departure place and thinking, "How am I going to do this? I do not have a car with me, am I going to use a taxi or a private hire vehicle? Am I am going to wait for the bus? Am I going to walk it?" Actually, that is where something like an e-scooter or an e-bike can really come into the mix because it is an easy way to make that short journey. From a city perspective, that is a beneficial thing somebody is making because it means they are going to make that journey in a lower-emission or zero-emission way. They are the types of journeys we want to see more of.

That relies, though, on there being lots areas for people to park these e-scooters in afterwards. That is one of the things we are working very closely on with TfL and the boroughs for next year.

Neil Garratt AM: I know there is the geofencing and you have to leave them in a certain area. Is that working in practice as well as it is meant to in theory?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): It is working in practice and certainly London is one of the best examples internationally of a parking system for e-scooters and e-scooter rental schemes. That is working really well. The parking compliance is well in excess of 95% for lime and I believe that across all operators. Again, I cannot speak on their behalf but that is the case from what I see.

The downside of it or the challenge for the operators of the e-scooter trial is that by having parking zones that are defined, and where you have to leave an e-scooter and pick one up from, you do reduce the usability of the scheme. It is impossible not to, unless you are able to do what some cities like Paris have done, which is to literally implement thousands of parking areas for bikes, e-bikes and e-scooters. In that way, you make it

really convenient for people to use an e-scooter and make it really viable. There are parts of London at the moment where even if you are in a borough that is part of the trial and you want to use any e-scooter, you would open one of the three companies' apps performing it and you would still have to walk nearly a mile to a parking area. That is not really a viable option at that point. At that point you would just discount e-scooters from your travel options. That is one of the things we do want to work on.

Neil Garratt AM: Presumably it is the boroughs that are allocating those spaces by and large, is it?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Absolutely, and we are completely aware of the competing priorities for space. It is a really big challenge for the boroughs. It is a big challenge for TfL. We also work with private landowners and it is a challenge for them. This is right across the board. In terms of getting high take-up of these types of transport modes, it is something that we really do need to get right and want to increase and so it is something that we are putting a lot of time and effort into.

Neil Garratt AM: Yes, reducing that dead time in the journey where you are walking to start it. In terms of safety, this is the big counterpoint that always comes up with e-scooters. I know the question I have is: what safety measures do you think are needed to roll out e-scooters London-wide? For me, there is a particular emphasis on pavement use. I appreciate that the RNIB person is not here but, if she were here, I am certain that she would be saying that blind people find them terrifying on pavements and they just need to not be there. Particularly the focus on that but broadly as well, what do you think is needed to implement them in a safe way?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Firstly, on people riding e-scooters on pavements, it is something that as a rental operator, when you sign up to our service, you undergo training on the app and also, because you have to use our app to rent the e-scooter, we are also able to push messages to people saying, "Do not ride on the pavements. It is illegal to ride on the pavements". We have that on the e-scooter as well. We also have some technology that we are developing at the moment and lots of other operators are developing other forms of technology to try to deal with that problem as a whole.

We have a Disability Advisory Board in the UK that we work with, which the RNIB is part of. One of the things that we have worked with quite a lot on is the idea of having clear identification numbers on the e-scooters. That means that if a member of the public, a TfL enforcement officer, a member of the police or in some cases people working with our partner boroughs see people riding on the pavement, it is very easy to report to us the e-scooter and the location and, using the global positioning system (GPS) and tracking the e-scooter, we can ban that user. At the moment, we are banning around 100 users a month in London for either pavement riding or deliberately mis-parking. We are taking enforcement action on that.

It remains a significant problem on the private e-scooter side. The issue around the private e-scooters is that there is literally no enforcement and no law about it whatsoever because it is already illegal to be using an illegal e-scooter by definition. That is a big problem because, at the moment, we have around 3,500 rental e-scooters in London through our schemes and nationally the estimates are that there could be as many as 500,000 private e-scooters. You would imagine certainly a couple of hundred thousand of those are likely to be in London. That is a huge problem and that is only going to get worse as the months go on, as more people buy these and as retailers continue to sell them.

What we would like to see is the Government taking action to put stringent standards in, such as every e-scooter has to have a bell, and it should include making really clear to people that it is illegal to ride them on the pavements. At the moment the illegal e-scooter use is such an unregulated space that things like pavement riding become just another way in which people are breaking the law and we do need to take care of

that. The way we would like to do that, as I said before, is really about minimum standards for the vehicles themselves - things like brakes, lights, testing and maintenance - and then asking people to enforce that.

However, it is also important to say that you can never fully eliminate personal responsibility on this. We can tell people and ban people if they use the e-scooters incorrectly, we can put stickers on the e-scooters, the police can enforce it, but if people still do not understand or do not want to understand, that is still going to be a problem. I would say that is something that goes right across transport modes. It is the same reason why people still drink-drive occasionally in the UK. It is personal responsibility and it is unacceptable and that is what we need to communicate.

Neil Garratt AM: On the private e-scooters, effectively a legalise and regulate approach is what I am hearing from you?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Yes, absolutely. I will not go into more detail, but certainly legalise, regulate and make the rules very clear. It would be welcomed to regulate at the point of sale. That makes a huge amount of sense. We have not done that thus far and that is a significant problem.

Neil Garratt AM: OK. If I can pass just quickly over to Jeremy [Leach] and Tom [Bogdanowicz] and I saw Neil [Liversidge] indicating as well and perhaps --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We are very short on time and so just perhaps go to one of the other guests, please. I have Members queuing to come in on this and we have more to come.

Neil Garratt AM: OK. Perhaps to Tom, then, as a cycling group, what is the perception of e-scooter users? Is it friends and allies or rivals and challengers? How do you make sure that cycling and e-scooter, which are fundamentally quite similar, are working well?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): We were aware of the advent of e-scooters and we conducted some research, in fact, a couple of years ago, which was pretty thorough and looked at what happened elsewhere. We concluded that they are not active travel but, on the other hand, they can be part of the tools that we use in order to reduce congestion, pollution and emissions in our cities. Therefore, we thought that in a regulated and legalised way, they could be a useful part of the programme.

If we have more people on e-scooters and they are not to use pavements, which makes sense, they will wish to use cycle tracks and therefore we have to account for the volumes. As we go forward and design for further cycle tracks, we need to consider that the volumes may be higher and we need to allow for them.

Yes, on speeds, I absolutely agree. To have e-scooters doing far higher speeds than regular bicycles would be inappropriate in those cycle lanes. If they want to do, they can do that on the roads with motorcars.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much. I have Assembly Member Baker and Assembly Member Berry indicating and wanting to come in on this. Then I have three more sections. If people could condense their questions down, that would be great. Unmesh [Desai AM], you need to decide. Do you want to do your one at all or do we need it at the end? I am going to let you think about that. Assembly Member Baker?

Elly Baker AM: I have so many questions I want to ask here but I am going to try to condense.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We can follow up in writing.

Elly Baker AM: We may have to. Something I am really interested in asking – and it would be opening it up to everyone and so it would be an absolute disaster right now – is what the impact would be for other road users, pedestrians and cyclists of legalising and regulating. If I open that up, it is going to be absolute carnage and so maybe we can follow it up in writing.

What I am interested in asking Alan particularly is about the information you seem to be giving us that it is short journeys, it is not necessarily people replacing car journeys. They are sometimes replacing journeys that they would walk. In terms of impact on sort of active travel, in terms of impact on the aspects of Vision Zero that are around modal shift, what role are e-scooters really going to play in that? I am not really hearing that. I am hearing about the safety of the individual trials and not how e-scooters might contribute to a safer city overall.

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): The average journey length at the moment from the London trials is around 21 minutes. Like I say, that implies upwards of a 1.5 to 2-mile journey as an average. There is a significant number of journeys that are happening that are longer than those. Anything really in excess of a mile in most cases is something that most people are not going to be walking at the moment, although we do need to look into more detail at whether or not the journeys are switching across from cycling or e-cycling. That is something we need to look at the evidence on.

Certainly at the moment, as a company that offers e-bikes in London and e-scooters, when they are both available on one app next to each other and you can choose which one you take, we see no dent at all in our usership numbers on the e-bikes by the introduction of e-scooters. That is not a concern.

In terms of the wider point, the benefits are that you are giving people a convenient and easy way to make a zero-emission journey and, in some instances, that zero-emission journey – if it is a very short journey – could be replacing a walking trip, but in lots of instances it is going to be replacing something else that is less desirable.

Certainly the longer journey lengths and the linking into public transport, in the example I gave before, from where I am, just over a mile into a train station. That is the way I would prefer to get around London. I would prefer to get to a train station and take public transport. In most instances that is not open to me and so my option is to get a mini cab. It is to get a black taxi. It is to walk down the road about 10 minutes to the bus stop and then wait for the bus there. There is a role here that e-scooters can play.

One of the things that is good about the model in London with the parking zones in particular is that we can site these parking zones in areas where we encourage certain types of journeys and perhaps discourage other ones. It is early days in the trial and we want to see more evidence from London specifically about the modal shift, but those are just some of the ways in which we would certainly see the benefits.

Elly Baker AM: You are keen to expand to people who do not have driving licences, which would indicate that you think the growth area is people who do not have cars?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): At the moment the concern about driving licences is one of wanting to be able to serve the largest number of people. It is also one of equality. There are people who cannot get driving licences for a variety of reasons and who might be able to use an e-scooter, and that is either their own e-scooter privately perhaps in the future if that becomes legalised or shared.

In addition to that, from our perspective, we think it is wrong to assume that the only people who are using cars in London are those who own them. Particularly in central London, particularly in zones one and two, there is a high number of people still travelling in other forms of motor vehicles. I mentioned mini cabs, black cabs, etc, before, personalised forms of motor travel. Those are journeys that we would like to try to actively target people to replace using an e-scooter. That is one of the reasons why we want to see that driving licence requirement ultimately removed eventually.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Assembly Member Berry?

Siân Berry AM: There is a lot of focus on taking very big, motorised vehicles that by and large carry one person around and adding electric motors to those when potentially extending the range of very light and small modes by adding tiny electric motors is an aspect we do not look at often enough.

Siân Berry AM: Sorry, I am aware I have had very little time in this meeting, whereas the Conservative Group has had a very long amount of time.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): I am not getting into party politics on this. I just want your question.

Siân Berry AM: I just wanted to make sure that the investigation heard that point.

My question is just about statistics, basically. At the moment, the dashboard that we talked about earlier on and the report on Vision Zero does not report on the safety of e-scooters at all in individual ways. They are under 'other vehicles' but it is not clear how many of them there are. It is the DfT that sets these categories and also largely the DfT that does the surveys that determine distance travelled by each mode as well. What are you doing to argue for a separate category? Do you have any idea about the timing of that if you work on lobbying at a national level?

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): I do not have any more information at the moment on the timing. Certainly, we would like to see the Government act with haste on this because the problem of illegal e-scooters is growing and the longer we leave it the worse that will get.

In terms of a separate vehicle category, certainly we think e-scooters should be regulated as a separate vehicle category. At the moment they are regulated as a motor vehicle. It is the same as a car, effectively --

Siân Berry AM: In the safety statistics they are not reported alongside cars. They go in 'other vehicles'.

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): That is probably because the safety statistics have not been updated to look at e-scooters under the legalised trial. There are some bits of research out there that do look at e-scooters specifically. There was a PACTS report that recently looked at e-scooters specifically. There is a problem across lots of different organisations - the DfT, the police, the National Health Service (NHS) - that actually e-scooter incidents often are not recorded because it is still a form of transport that in most areas is still illegal. The trials are run in about 20 or 25 UK cities. Everywhere else e-scooters are illegal and so it is hard in terms of recording those for places to do those.

We would certainly welcome those incidents being recorded and in particular at the moment a distinction between illegal e-scooters and rental e-scooters. One of the issues that the PACTS report I just mentioned - we can put you in touch with it - looked at was they asked people, "Were you on a rental e-scooter or a private e-scooter?" It is interesting the data from that. Of course one of the things they also identified is, because

private e-scooters are illegal, lots of people might be saying, "I was on a rental e-scooter", when perhaps that was not quite the case. Yes, certainly we would welcome better information and better data.

Siân Berry AM: Yes, it is more about the statistics, though. You will not get a statistic that distinguishes between legal and illegal – that is for separate research – but you cannot tell me about when it might appear in the statistics? We can ask the MPS and TfL about that.

Alan Clarke (Director of Policy, Northern Europe, Lime): Yes. Certainly I do not have the answer.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): It is an important point. We need to pick that up and so we are making a note of that. Assembly Member McCartney, looking at international comparisons?

Joanne McCartney AM: Perhaps if I could start with Tom, if I may, looking at international comparisons, we have talked about Sweden in particular before and I am aware of Oslo and Helsinki. They have introduced initiatives along the lines of Vision Zero.

I am just wondering what aspects of them you think have worked and what London can learn from them. Then, following that up, what would London need to do to actually put in practice some of what they have done?

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): They have introduced some of the things that we have already talked about. They have made the effort to reduce motor traffic in general. They have produced infrastructure that is suitable for cycling and walking. They have introduced speed humps. They have increased speed enforcement. They have introduced home zones. All of those things that we have in their nascent form are there in a much more developed form.

Yes, these are smaller cities, but we have seen that Oslo did achieve Vision Zero – meaning zero fatalities – in 2019. It went up to four the year after but that is the trend. They used to have fatalities at a rate of about 45, if I remember rightly, which is half of what we have here, and it is a much smaller city of about 650,000. That is exactly what we need to be doing.

It is also worth looking at what happens in Holland, which has a fatality rate for cyclists that is half that of what we have in the UK. They have very many more cyclists but, per mile, the rate is much lower, and they do have a whole programme of infrastructure, good training and all of the things that we have discussed previously.

One of the other things that they are struggling with, and that we will be struggling with, is parking and leaving things. As with e-scooters, we need places to put these vehicles and we need them not to obstruct others. We concluded from our Climate Safe Streets report that we needed something shared every 300 metres or so. I was talking about one mile for an e-scooter and that is too long. Whether it is a pedal cycle that you are hiring or a car or an e-scooter or any other mode of shared transport, these need to be frequent because the whole idea is to try to reduce the need for cars. We need to make the other options attractive and easily available.

Joanne McCartney AM: Thank you. Can I ask the same questions to Jeremy, please?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Tom has covered a lot of the points. It was a really good point he made. A lot of it has been that they were prepared to grasp some politically difficult issues and they are completely different in size compared with London, but the two

key elements would be this issue of traffic volumes and reducing traffic going into and through the centres and also being prepared to address parking levels. That is really important and those are knotty things to grasp.

The other relevant thing for London in our situation is just the role of the boroughs. Boroughs have led on a lot of things like 20mph, but also it is really important as an analogy that the boroughs take part in the rest of the schemes and all of these things to make Vision Zero work and that they are able to be funded to do that.

Joanne McCartney AM: It seems to me, just looking at the Sweden example, for example, it was not just the transport authority doing this. It was through all levels of government and there was real will to actually do it. It became, if you like, society's issue as well. It was not just an institutional issue.

What does London need to do to get to that stage where it is acceptable, and we do not really have the arguments between different road users? Is it possible to get there?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): That is a really good point and there was a real analogy to what happened in New York as well. In New York they embedded Vision Zero in the Mayor's team and so it was absolutely embedded in the culture at a high level. That idea of bringing things together is a terribly good one. There are opportunities to go further there and tie into those other agendas we touched on earlier, healthy streets, air quality, the climate emergency and cutting emissions.

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): I would note that the Mayor's Transport Strategy talks about how 70% of us should have access to the strategic cycle network within 400 metres. If we manage to achieve that, then all those people who wish to cycle will be able to take the opportunity to do so and those who are driving will have less congestion.

Someone recently put together a video, which I will be happy to share, from Holland where they said that Holland is the best place to drive. The video was all about how Holland is ideal for driving because there are so many people cycling and because there are facilities for cycling and walking. There is a benefit that goes across society as a whole.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much. Assembly Member Rogers is going to ask a couple of questions and then we will draw it to a close.

Nicholas Rogers AM: I have been able to boil this down to two questions. I will address them both to Jeremy, if that is OK. Firstly, do you think behaviours on the road have to change across the entire country in order for our city to be successful in achieving these goals?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Yes, London has almost had to lead the way in the last decade or so and that and a number of cities have been filling a void where there has not been an adequate focus on reducing casualties. In fact, that has not happened across the UK.

What is exciting potentially post pandemic is the way this is now working on a whole UK-wide basis and that things are starting to change, which could benefit London as well. The two examples I would give are the new elements in the Highway Code that emphasise the road user hierarchy, and put reducing harm to the most vulnerable at the top. That is really exciting if that gets promoted and publicised properly. We have touched on in some detail the potential for intelligent speed adaptation, again, to reduce danger. The building back better agenda is to be seen how that happens, but around that context there is a lot happening whereby the Government is starting to get its hands dirty in this area again.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Are there other specific local initiatives elsewhere in the UK that we could learn from and, more generally, should TfL and the Mayor be collaborating more across the UK?

Jeremy Leach (Chair, London Living Streets, and Co-founder, Action Vision Zero): Yes. I promise I will not go into detail, but we have a list of examples from the UK. They are not huge ones, they are more elements such as the Warwickshire Road Safety Strategy, which has improved perception of safety as a key performance indicator. If we may, we will do a written submission back. Yes, there are some examples, but I would say overall that no one has a strategy that is this holistic and with the potential and the chance to bring these things together. That needs to be done at the highest level but there are all the ingredients to do that here.

Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer, London Cycling Campaign): Just to add, the West Midlands programme of trying to discourage close passing through enforcement programmes has been quite successful and replicated in some parts of London. That has been very welcome.

The other interesting aspect of behaviour in the UK is zebra crossings where we all stop and respect the pedestrians right across. It would be excellent if that sort of behaviour was wide across the whole aspect of road use.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you very much for brevity there. I realise there is lots that we have not covered today. We will invite you to send in any evidence that you have not had the opportunity to give us today and we will also follow up with questions.