

London Assembly Transport Committee – Tuesday 11 January 2022
Transcript of Agenda Item 6 – Vision Zero

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Our main item on the agenda today is a second hearing looking at the issue of Vision Zero. I would like to welcome the guests we have here today: Lilli Matson, Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer at Transport for London (TfL), Dr Will Norman, the Walking and Cycling Commissioner, Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens in the Metropolitan Police Service in charge of the Roads Policing Command, and Shravan Joshi [MBE], who is the Deputy Chairman of the Streets and Walkways Sub Committee at the City of London Corporation. Thank you so much for coming.

I should just say we were expecting today the Mayor [of Hackney] Philip Glanville, the Chair of London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee, and Councillor Clyde Loakes, [Deputy Leader] London Borough of Waltham Forest. Both unfortunately gave their apologies yesterday, which we were disappointed to receive, but we will be looking to try to have an informal meeting with them to make sure we get as wide an input from the London boroughs as possible. We will just note that and make sure that happens.

I am going to kick off the questions today and perhaps if I could start with you, Lilli. Could you outline for us how successful you think Vision Zero has been to date and are you going to be on track to meet your interim targets?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Good morning, everyone, and thank you very much for inviting me along.

Vision Zero is an absolute passion of mine and something I have championed within TfL, but it is true that there has been good progress on road safety in London for many years. It has been driven by the partnerships between TfL and its predecessors, but particularly the London boroughs and the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS). What was really different with Vision Zero coming in, in 2018, with the plan that we launched, is that it is based around the safe system approach. It allows us to forensically focus on the sources of danger, be that from vehicles or behaviour or the way streets are designed.

In that interim, since launching the Vision Zero plan, we have been able to drive forward on the Direct Vision Standard (DVS), and the Bus Safety Standard, and we are really reaping the benefits of that as a city. We have seen very good progress, and I will talk a little bit about the numbers of that, but it is worth noting that London's progress does outstrip other metropolitan cities in the United Kingdom (UK) such as Manchester and indeed in the other international cities like New York. You can really see the impact of having a clearly-focused approach on reducing risk.

In terms of the targets themselves, the pandemic has fundamentally changed how people travel. If we look back to 2019, which was the last normal year that we might refer to, there was a 39% reduction overall in the number of people killed or seriously injured. We compare that back to a baseline figure of 2005 to 2009 to allow us to track progress. During the pandemic there was a great retraction in vehicle travel in the early spring of that year and that did reduce risk. Overall we did see an even more impressive reduction of around 52% against that baseline.

If we look at 2021 where for the last 18 months traffic levels have been near normal or increasing, unfortunately, in certain places, we have continued to see progress. We saw the lowest level ever of fatalities on London's roads in 2021, around 73 fatalities, we are just waiting to finalise the figures. The overall target will be around 43%. Therefore, we are continuing to make progress. In some areas I would pinpoint the progress has been even faster. Probably most heartening with young people where we have already exceeded a 65% reduction in the number of young people being injured. There has been a 70% reduction in people being injured on or by a bus. That does show that when you really target your efforts you can make progress.

However, it is not far enough. Our 65% reduction target for the coming year is extremely stretching. Overall, we are doing really well in some areas and we will have to push hard if we are going to hit that overall. I am happy to delve into any detail.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Could you just clarify for us, the baseline you use is 2005 to 2009. What is the reason for that being the baseline?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Traditionally, the Department for Transport (DfT) did set national targets for road safety. They always set a particular baseline period to get targets against. The previous baseline period was 1994 to 1998. Then, with changes in Government, the national Government now does not set targets but DfT continues to track and bear that responsibility for gathering collision data nationally and to set baseline periods to allow regional governments to track their data.

Therefore, when we were setting the original targets back in 2017/18 as we ran into the Vision Zero action plan, that was the recommended baseline from DfT. They were very clear they would move to the 2010 to 2014 as a baseline moving forward. We will indeed do so when we reach the end of the current target we are tracking, which has an end date of 2022, and move to tracking against the 2030 target. That baseline then will become 2010 to 2014. It is in line with the approach advised by DfT.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Presumably it is so that you are able to compare more easily with like authorities. Perhaps I could ask Will next, and, Lilli, if you want to come in as well, what you think are the other main challenges to achieving these targets?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Good morning, everybody. Nice to see you. As Lilli said, we have made good progress but there is so much more to do. London has become a much safer place for people walking and cycling over the past 10 years. The risk of being killed or seriously injured per journey has fallen for people walking and cycling and across the board, but we have so much further to go. Those vulnerable road users, people walking, cycling, and motorbike users, account for about 80% of the people who are killed and seriously injured on our roads.

The partnership that we have is pretty unique and is being praised nationally. I know Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) has praised the partnership with the MPS and I am really pleased that [Chief Superintendent] Simon [Ovens] is here.

The boroughs are responsible for 95% of London's roads so it is absolutely critical that they are involved. Our healthy streets approach is essential and is central to everything that we are doing. Making the streets safer for people using the streets.

There are some areas that I am still really concerned about despite the progress that has been made. I continue to be concerned about cycling and around the vulnerable users and motorists. There are new technologies and risks emerging all the time, and the e-scooters are a challenge. We are seeing a change in the number of people and the focus on injuries and collisions with people driving to work, which is a challenge. The rising levels of traffic brings greater danger. Then there is of course the existential threat to the whole plan, which is the uncertainties around funding, both in terms of the quantum and the time periods of the funding arrangements that we have with Government.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That is really helpful. Lilli, did you have anything you wanted to add to that? Also, perhaps you could answer what more you think needs to happen with Government around any legislative changes?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes. Will did a great job summarising it. As the Committee will be aware, we have very recently published our refresh report and that was delving into some of the new risks that we are seeing emerging. The food delivery economy doubled in size between 2019 and 2020 and we are seeing a lot more people using particularly small motorbikes to do these valuable services and some of those are not having proper training and are putting themselves at risk. There is the whole issue around the gig economy.

The impact of - and Will touched on new technology - journey apps in particular have led to quite significant rises in traffic on minor roads. This is really pushing against our efforts to make these places where people can live and play. Really significant impacts of traffic on C-roads driven by journey planning apps, which has led to an increase in collisions as well.

The tragedy of collisions does impact communities differently in London. Children living in deprived areas are two to three times more likely to be injured in a collision. People with disabilities are around four times more injured. That is a national figure, but we think it holds true in London as well. Peoples of different ethnicities have different experiences. Therefore we are looking at how we can target our interventions moving forward and working critically with the boroughs, as Will said, because they hold so much of the road network in their hands, to really target those interventions to address those groups that are losing out most notably.

Moving forward, there are big issues that we need to continue to push forward with, eg freight safety. We have the next iteration of strengthening the DVS. Regarding the Bus Safety Standard, we must continue to roll it out because these vehicles are large and they are very present on our streets and we have made good progress, but we have a vision of zero injuries from buses. We are working currently and right now directly with the delivery industries themselves to try to drive safety there.

With central Government, we have been meeting very regularly to talk about what more we could do around 20mph. Around half of London's roads currently are 20mph. But we think there is merit in considering London for a standard, making 20 the default on the 30mph road space. It would be much easier for drivers, clearer and more simple. It would also easier to implement because you would not need as many changes between signs and lines. We most recently met with the DfT on 17 December [2021]. They are quite interested in some aspects of it but they are quite concerned about enforcement and other elements. Nevertheless, they are really willing to work with us on that.

Other areas that we want to see the DfT take more action on is around strengthening the compulsory basic training for motorcycle drivers. It is too easy to get on a motorbike with no training at all and just to keep repeating that. There is good evidence that we should strengthen that and we are waiting for further action to

decriminalise the enforcement of some moving traffic offences on cycle lanes and mandatory cycle lanes. There is a wide range of interventions and we do keep in touch weekly with the DfT on that. We would like to see some faster progress.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That is really helpful, thank you. We are going to go into some of that detail. Motorcyclists and food deliveries have become my latest obsession following e-scooters in terms of dangers on the highway and for those individuals.

Simon, do you think the Vision Zero targets for 2041 are achievable? Obviously funding is part of it, but are there other concerns you have?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): Good morning, everybody.

Is it achievable? It is an extraordinary aspiration to be able to think about achieving and an amazing target to get to. There are human beings involved in all of this though and, unless we entirely eradicate human beings from the process of driving and stepping out on pavements and things like that, it is difficult to see a total achievement. However, with all the work we are doing and the incredible reductions that we have seen, 73 people died on our roads last year, which are 73 absolute tragedies. Compared with the baseline of 211 you will see significant progress is being made. If we carried on at that rate and with all the things that colleagues have mentioned, we will see, I am sure, a further erosion of that figure.

We do get odd things where people will just unfortunately become a victim of some quite strange things, slow reversing and things like that, which are very difficult to totally eradicate, but this is an amazing aspiration. It reminds me a bit of the National Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) Full Stop campaign some time ago. A beautiful vision to think one day we will have no one killed on our roads in this capital city.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): OK, thank you for that. Shravan, what is your thought from a borough perspective, the City of London [Corporation], on this?

Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman, Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, City of London Corporation): Thank you, everyone, for inviting us to speak here today. Vision Zero is an absolute must for London and for the UK. As the Chief Superintendent has just pointed out, would it not be great to have that statistic of zero deaths and fatalities on the roads?

There are a number of challenges and difficult decisions and political decisions that need to be made to achieve reduction in traffic. We are going to have to reduce traffic and the speeds that people travel at. We are going to have to look at next-generation charging technologies. There are huge secondary benefits, which also align with the general direction of travel. Things around healthy lifestyles that could be promoted through active transport. Achieving lower air pollution is part of this mix. Also achieving net-zero targets and decarbonisation by having less vehicular traffic on the roads is part of that mix. There is a broader picture here.

We are very supportive of Vision Zero. We have put in place in the city several quite effective measures already and have seen the benefits of that in our nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), particulate, and air pollution figures.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Could I just come in briefly on the achievability of it? As Simon pointed out, every death and serious injury on the roads is a tragedy. It is

not just the deaths, it is the serious injuries, many of those are life-changing. Sometimes the difference between a death and a serious injury is centimetres or seconds in terms of the changes. Those are really important. They bring heartache and tragedy to everybody involved.

I cannot envisage what other goal we would have but bringing that to zero. We can all work, and there are changing patterns, there are changing technologies, things will move. This has to be a live document and a live policy. We do not know all the answers yet. This is why we have produced the progress report. It is why we are bringing in new actions. What other goal would we have? How many deaths are acceptable on our roads? How many serious injuries are acceptable? I would argue none. We need to work to that.

Other cities have managed it. Other capital cities have managed it such as Oslo and Helsinki. I am not saying that London is the same as those cities. London is bigger and more complex, with other issues and a different context. But other cities have managed it and I just cannot envisage, I would not want to sit here and say, "This number of heartaches, tragedies, people losing their parents, their kids, is acceptable on London's roads." The goal is right. The policy is right, it is working, but we do not know all the answers and we need to continue to learn as we deliver this.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Clearly, as we are hearing, emerging challenges such as the journey app and the impact that is having in areas and so on, as well as new technologies.

Assembly Member Clarke, you wanted to come in?

Anne Clarke AM: I want to follow up on some specific legislative changes for the Pedicabs (London) Bill. This is of particular interest to my constituents in Bloomsbury. The second reading of the Bill was on 19 November [2021], it was interrupted, and the second reading was due on 3 December [2021], but that did not take place. What is your understanding on when the Bill will return? Do you think the Government are giving this matter the priority it requires?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): The Pedicab issue has been a long-running bone of contention. We are not anti-Pedicabs. A green, clean way of getting around, they are fantastic, but the prices do need regulation. For example, my father-in-law got one, he is disabled, and was charged £40 going down the Strand the other evening because there were no taxis or other vehicles available for him and he is a blue badge holder. £40 to go down the Strand, it is astronomical. It does need that regulation. We are very supportive of that Bill.

Nickie Aiken MP [for Cities of London and Westminster] is the Member of Parliament (MP) who is bringing forward that and she has our support. I met Nickie just before Christmas to talk about the update on that. As you have said, the Bill was blocked as a Private Member's Bill, but we have been working with the MP who blocked that, Sir Christopher Chope OBE MP. We have a meeting coming up with him to try to address that. We understand that he is receptive to this but he has some legitimate concerns that he does not want legislation to ban things through the back door. We will continue to work with MPs to bring in that legislation and hopefully make sure that we get a green, clean option for those people who want it, but it is regulated so that it is safe, there are the checks available, and the fare structure is fair for everybody.

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

Elly Baker AM: I have a couple of questions also about the discussions with Government. I will wrap them up in one. Are you having discussions with the Government around their refresh of the 2011 National Road Safety

Framework, particularly around improving road safety education? Also, are there still discussions going on about restarting work on the graduated driving licence?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes, we are having ongoing discussions with them about the refresh of their Road Safety Framework. Education is clearly part of that. In particular we have been promoting Bike Safe and the wider rollout of road safety education. We are feeding in positively to that. Hopefully that is being listened to.

The second part was about the graduated driving licence. We are very strongly in favour of this. Our understanding is that it is not necessarily being progressed by Government, which we think is a shame and does not reflect the evidence and the consultation responses that were received on that. We do feel that there would be really significant safety benefits. Therefore, we will continue to make those points to Government. It is very important.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Do you want to just explain what that graduated driving licence is?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): In very general terms, people can get their provisional licence and then pass and then they are allowed to have full access to all aspects of the road network and all speeds up to the speed limit. The graduated approach limits the size of vehicles, speeds or the range at which people can have access for a period of time until they become more experienced. It is to allow a more gradual experience of gaining that road-user experience. It has been tried in different areas and I cannot quite remember where, but we can certainly provide more input on that if you want. There has been quite an extensive consultation, which I referred to. It was a fair while ago. There just has not been any progress from central Government in terms of taking it forward.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): It is always very unusual that people could go on to a motorway as soon as they pass their test yet have never had a lesson or anything on the motorway. It always struck me as bizarre. Assembly Member Garratt.

Neil Garratt AM: Perhaps I should declare an interest. I set off to come here this morning on my bike and my wife and my 11-year-old son also left the house this morning to go to work and school on their bikes and it is my sincere hope that we all get home safely again this evening. Therefore my commitment to this is quite high.

I have a couple of areas I would like to ask questions about, if I may. Firstly it is about the baseline, which I have real problems with. I accept the explanation that you gave earlier, Lilli, about aligning with national data collection periods, but a normal person looking at the baseline that you have used, it is so odd as to look dishonest. That is the way that it seems to me. I am looking here at a graph showing the killed and seriously injured (KSI) stats for the baseline period and then all of the improvements in safety that happened since then, effectively during the decade before Vision Zero started, and then you sit here this morning and you quote a lot of statistics about achievements of Vision Zero. Am I right in saying that the lion's share, possibly even nearly all of those improvements, except possibly in the very last year, before the COVID year, were achieved before Vision Zero even started and before the current Mayor was in office?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Great question. Let me just roll back even further. What we have fortunately seen as a city, and I mentioned it in my introduction, is a steady decline in the number of people being injured. That has continued, exactly as you indicated, for many, many years. To be really clear on that, a lot of those improvements are nothing to do with

TfL, they happened before TfL happened, or to do with the boroughs. They are to do with vehicle safety improvements. That has had a major impact in terms of making vehicles safer.

When we track safety improvements more recently, we can indeed see year-on-year improvements. The reduction between 2019 and 2020 was 20%. There is a further year-on-year reduction this year. We are really happy to provide – and we do indeed provide – all data very openly. You can track it. What I just want to say is that you are right that there were reductions from 2005 to 2009 up to the period 2018 because a lot of really good work was going on, but where we have seen a real acceleration of impact is in areas such as the bus safety. That does reflect the work that has been really focused in that area.

Neil Garratt AM: I have some questions about bus safety, which we will come on to in a later section. The picture that you just gave earlier, you quoted a lot of safety improvements, and you did not quite answer my question. All or nearly all or a significant percentage of that safety improvement that you are claiming credit for at the beginning of this meeting happened, not just before Vision Zero, but before this Mayor even took office. Is that correct?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I am speaking on behalf of TfL. TfL has been --

Neil Garratt AM: You were claiming that as part of Vision Zero though. When did Vision Zero start?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): The Vision Zero Action Plan was published in 2018. It builds on the Road Safety Action Plan, which we published in 2014. There were always safety schemes being delivered in London during that period. There were also efforts to control speed. What is really different about the Vision Zero Action Plan is the statement that no death is acceptable and the real focus on reducing risk. What that has allowed us to drive forward at a much more accelerated rate is efforts such as protected cycling schemes --

Neil Garratt AM: Sorry, I apologise for keeping interrupting. It is not that I want to talk about the specific schemes. We will probably have a lot of time today to talk about that. What I want to talk about is the baseline. I heard what you said earlier about the national periods of safety monitoring, but if we are claiming impact of Vision Zero, why are we taking a baseline that starts ten years before Vision Zero? Why not take a baseline that starts either during the period around when it started, let us say 2016, 2017, 2018, or maybe a five-year period leading up to 2018? Would that not be a more honest baseline of where things were when Vision Zero started so that you can then compare the impact of what is happening under Vision Zero?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I can accept your challenge, but the point is, as a technical officer, we have been tracking targets within London since we were set up. Indeed, the London Road Safety Unit existed before TfL existed. Therefore there is a continuation of targets and tracking and it would not have been appropriate to break that continuation. We had a previous target, which followed the previous Government baseline, which was 1994 to 1998. When that one was concluded we moved to the new baseline. It feels to me that this should not be a politicised issue. It is too important for that. We are tracking the progress. I will come to the fact you want to know what the progress is, but in terms of the technical tracking of the collisions, of people being killed or seriously injured, we feel it is very important in terms of having a clear public trajectory that shows how we move from one baseline to the other.

In terms of being able to demonstrate whether the Vision Zero Action Plan been successful, it is quite clear, if you look at the refresh report, it tracks what actions have been completed and what have not. It also looks at specific impacts of schemes such as quoting the evidence, not just from TfL, but others, in terms of the impacts of low-traffic neighbourhoods. We can always provide more of a bespoke analysis, period by period, which will show you exactly what the progress has been from any one period in time. As a city, we are incredibly lucky to have very detailed and rich collision data, which we take very seriously.

To be very clear and on the record, there is absolutely no dishonesty in this. We track this because this is completely aligned with the Government's approach to monitoring road safety.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): I was just going to come in and say there has been progress during this mayoralty. If you take 2015, there were 136 people who were killed on the roads. I do not want to make this political because good progress was made under the previous Mayor with the introduction of the cycle lanes and the changes. In 2016, there were 116 people [killed]; 112 in 2018; 125 in 2019; and 96 in 2020. What is interesting is the spread of the causes of those collisions. In 2015, 66 pedestrians were, sadly, killed. In 2020 that was 45. It has gone down on every scheme.

As I said before, this is not political. There has been a heartfelt cross-party agreement that we should not have people being killed on our roads previous to this Mayor but progress has been made by this Mayor. The Vision Zero umbrella and the Safe System approach is a new way of modernising the good work that has been going on and has brought that along. It is wrong to say that there has not been progress made under this administration because the evidence shows that there has been, but we do have an awfully long way to go.

Neil Garratt AM: OK. I feel perhaps we have explored that as much as we can. Thank you for your answers.

I had a quick second question, actually, which is about a piece I saw in the press this week about an online video advert called "See their side". I had two questions about that, which I will do together.

The first one is: how on earth did we end up with an advert that was supposed to be about the laudable aim of drivers and cyclists seeing each other's sides, in which the driver was clearly at fault, and somehow we ended up with this message that we should all be getting along together without reinforcing the fact that in the image shown it was not the cyclist but the driver clearly at fault?

Secondly, did either or both of you sign off on that advert before it went out?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Thanks for that question. In the Vision Zero refresh report, one of the more sobering statistics is from some of the work we have done looking at attitudes to safety in London, which does just show the magnitude of the issue. Some 87% of Londoners still consider that collisions are inevitable and are something you accept. There is a large body and need for work to bring people along to taking more care on the road network, considering that safety is the be all and end all of making a journey. We have talked - and we talk in the report - about the real need to try to influence cultures and behaviours on the road network. This piece of work drew exactly on that research and was quite carefully researched beforehand.

The whole point of the advert is it is not clear if anyone is at fault. The driver neither swerves nor does anything. All you see is an altercation and it is a nasty altercation. The whole point is that it has both participants reflecting on it.

I did see the advert and I did comment on it and we did make some changes to it and so I did absolutely see it before it went out. What we really wanted and what was very interesting because we did some follow-up research with focus groups is a lot of different groups did actually have the sort of lightbulb moment that the advert was looking to generate, which was that moment of empathy and recognition that the other road users also are there as human beings and are perhaps scared by what is going on. It did not have the stakeholder reaction that we wanted and, therefore, it was muddying the very issue that we were trying to do.

To try to intervene in something as complex as road safety culture is a very difficult thing. It was quite a brave attempt to try to do this. We do not think the advert was effective, ultimately, and we have stopped it, but it was trying to do something new and trying to generate that kind of awareness and empathy. We need to look at it and to learn from it and see what else we can do to try to progress what is, at heart, absolutely essential: that we try to generate a wider sense of awareness about the huge responsibility we all have as road users and the danger that we all pose to each other, which outwith we will not actually achieve Vision Zero.

Neil Garratt AM: Sorry. My question was: you signed off on that advert. I accept that you said that you --

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I definitely saw it as part of the process of approving it within TfL and, yes, if you like, I signed off on it. Just in terms of the Byzantine governance of TfL, it was not actually my final say but, yes, I am happy to take accountability, if that is helpful.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Just to confirm, we have to tackle the culture on London's roads. We have done an awful lot of marketing around the behaviour on London's roads in terms of the speeding, the drink driving, all of those things, and they are effective, but all the research shows that 90% of people still consider it inevitable that people will get killed and seriously injured on our roads. There is a deep-rooted culture. All the research shows that there is a culture of everyone in it for themselves on London's roads. That is what the semiotic research shows. As I said, it is tackling culture and change. I say this as an anthropologist. It is a huge challenge and we have to be able to think innovatively and differently about this.

It is not easy. Clearly, the reaction to this advert is not what anybody would have wanted and it has been stopped, but I still believe - and actually from talking to a lot of the stakeholders and I am sure everyone here would agree - that we do need to do work on pushing how we change the culture on London's roads. It is a challenge. We do need to think innovatively and I would not want the issues that happened with that advert to affect the team to be able to think differently and actually address what is a really challenging problem.

Neil Garratt AM: What I heard in your answer was that it was the reaction to the advert that was the problem. Do I infer from that that you did not think the advert itself was a problem but you accept that the reaction was not what you expected?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): No, I did not see the advert before it went out and I was not a fan of it when I did.

We have actually worked through the issues on that process so that there is now a new system in place whereby marketing and content and working with colleagues in the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and the MPS and others coming together to do this jointly. As I said, this is stuff we are learning to do all the time. There is a new process and a new system in place so that, as we move forward, things can continue to do well.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Great, thank you. That is very helpful. I am just conscious, Members, we are still at the end of question 1. We have a lot to get through and so maybe pick up a little pace already. Otherwise, we are going to be here into the afternoon. I have Assembly Member Prince on this question and then I am bringing in Assembly Member Desai.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Because of COVID, there must be a question over how we can rely on the data during the period of COVID because of the different traffic levels.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes, I absolutely concur with that. COVID had a very significant impact on how people travelled. Obviously, we are tracking casualties and they are impacted by the number of journeys that are made and the types of journeys.

Just to highlight a couple of elements within that that will be particularly of interest to you, in 2020, when there was a real retraction, as we all remember, between March and May when the roads were empty, we saw a very welcome general reduction in collisions. However, there was an increase in speed-related collisions because people used the empty roads to illegally speed and cause enormous road danger.

Also, of course - and this is consistent with 2021 as well - because of the largely working-at-home arrangements, a lot of central London is much emptier than it would be and so we have seen a really significant fall, a very great fall and a welcome fall in pedestrian collisions, but that is not necessarily the true picture of what London will hopefully look like when it gets up and running again and we have more pedestrians again. We are very conscious that those are very unusual behaviours or patterns of travel.

A further one that is quite significant is, in 2021, thank goodness, we saw a real reduction in the number of people being killed on motorcycles. Tragically, 10 people were killed, but that is quite a reduction on previous years. It seems that that relates in particular to a reduction in people being involved in collisions on large motorbikes, who would traditionally commute longer distances from the southeast. That, again, reflects the working-from-home period.

All of this is to say that you really need to delve into the top-level figures. This is a really dynamic and live picture and we need to be really fleet-of-foot to respond to the risks as they arise. We do not ultimately know what travel patterns will settle back into post-pandemic. Working from home two or three days a week will potentially have impacts on the safety patterns that we see because people might be making more local journeys and they will not be making such long journeys. That all has to be taken into account in terms of the actions we put in place and it does - you are absolutely right - mean that there needs to be really careful interpretation of top-line figures.

Unmesh Desai AM: My lead-off question has to some extent already been answered by TfL, but I will still put the question to you. It would also have been for the MPS as well for a perspective on how far the pandemic has affected progress towards Vision Zero. Perhaps when the [Chief] Superintendent comes back, I can put that question to him.

I know in terms of TfL and the effect of the pandemic on progress towards Vision Zero, you already partially answered that question in your response to the main question from the Chair, but can you just give us a vision of where you are at, where you are going and what the current situation is?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes, that is absolutely fine. I am just noting a couple of points. Where to start?

One of the reactions in terms of travel behaviour from the pandemic has been to increase car traffic because people are using cars more. That directly followed the Government's advice at the beginning to avoid using public transport. Thankfully, that is not now part of the advice on travelling safely because we know that the public transport network is safe. Traffic in outer London, for example, has increased. That is making the challenge of achieving Vision Zero harder. It is something that we will have to continue to try to overcome by making the roads safer and more attractive to people, in particular those walking and cycling journeys and travelling by bus.

The pandemic has also had some opportunities in terms of pushing forward in terms of Vision Zero initiatives. There was a massive increase in people cycling, for example. We know when we look at the rates of people being injured cycling that the risk - the rate of injury per journey - has reduced by about a third. We were able, working very closely with the boroughs and with the boroughs often in the lead, to introduce an enormous number of temporary walking and cycling measures, which Will knows about in detail, and many Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTN). The evidence from researchers has shown that those had a really significant impact on reducing risk and making the roads safer. On one level, it has made our job harder and, on others, we were able to move forward at pace with some schemes, which have really helped to improve London's road network. Hopefully, that is helpful.

The final thing I would say - and we can come on to the detail when you want to talk about it - is really the impact on TfL's funding. We set out a really ambitious plan to continue to move forward on this agenda in the recent progress report, but it is no secret that that progress is absolutely dependent on securing a longer-term funding deal with the Government that will allow us to work with the boroughs to progress this agenda.

Unmesh Desai AM: Chair, I have another question on funding but, Will, do you have anything to add to what your colleague has said?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Very briefly, I am not going to add to what Lilli said because it was comprehensive. COVID has brought challenges and opportunities in this area.

I will just give you an example of one of my concerns moving forward as we come out of COVID. What have we learned during this period? If I look at my portfolio of making the roads safer, we did an awful lot. We delivered over 120kms of cycle routes in a little less than 18 months - that has made a massive difference - and over 100 low traffic neighbourhoods. That was done quickly and cheaply.

We cannot do everything in quick and cheap measures. There are some dangerous junctions in London whereby you cannot do something with some wands, some plastic and some lines. It does require new signals and a new junction layout.

However, there is an awful lot of stuff we can do. Take, for example, Holborn gyratory, which is an area where there have been eight fatalities since 2005. It is well known as a dangerous junction. There was funding in place for Camden to be able to make permanent changes to that gyratory and make it safer for all road users. We could not commit to that money because of the timescales and the funding packages and the emergency situation that Lilli outlined due to TfL funding but, as an interim measure, we did take some of the learnings

from the boroughs and some of the skilled officers in the boroughs and TfL to bring in what we could do as interim steps.

TfL has a great system of “go, look, see”. Where there has been a serious injury or a fatality, go and look at the junction and see what happened. I am very keen on “go, look, see, do”. What can be done immediately? There is an example in Holborn where there are some changes that have been happening. Some of that comes from the learning that we had during COVID. It is the same in Wood Lane, where there was a fatality recently. “Go, look, see, do.” What could be changed in the short term in those places, learning off what we have done during the COVID period?

There are opportunities but there are also challenges with COVID on this agenda. Our responsibility is to take what worked, apply it to the scheme and evolve our ways of doing things as we move forward.

Unmesh Desai AM: Thank you. What consultation has taken place between you and stakeholder groups during the pandemic about how to protect Londoners and the users they represent, groups such as London Living Streets and the London Cycling Campaign (LCC)?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I will kick off and then hand to Will.

At the London-wide level, one of the stakeholder forums we introduced with the original Vision Zero Action Plan was the Vision Zero Reference Group. This is a group of stakeholders including groups such as the LCC, as well as safety groups, which we meet with regularly and discuss policy challenges and share data. We shared with them, for example, that advert that you mentioned earlier and shared the early workings on that and get their input on it as part of the development. That has been ongoing.

At the local level, as I was saying, there have also been extensive stakeholder relations. Will, did you want to talk a bit about those?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London’s Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Yes, thanks. Building on that, at a city-wide level on that Vision Zero piece, there is that group that Lilli talked through.

Also, more on the changes to the streets, I know during the pandemic and the rapid rollout under the emergency legislation that the Government provided, we did not provide that consultation that we know is so important to bring communities along with us. As a reaction to that, given the legislation and the guidance that was issued by the Government, we did establish a Street Space Advisory Group, which brought together organisations like the LCC, the Business Improvement Districts, London Councils, London TravelWatch, the Royal Automobile Club (RAC), the Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB) and a whole raft of people who are interested in this to shape that programme. That helped to change things. It helped to move things on. That is where we discuss things like the inclusive streets and 24/7 bus lanes.

Now that we have moved beyond that and the legislation has changed, we have gone back to a wider level of consultation and all of those temporary schemes that were put in are currently being looked at as to whether they should be removed or whether they should stay. That is going through the usual process of consultation. I would advise anyone listening or watching to go to the TfL “have your say” page and the boroughs’ as well because there is an awful lot of live consultation going on not just to look at that but also to see what could be improved in those measures if they go into more experimental measures as the traffic flows continue to change, if they go into permanent measures or if they are they removed.

Unmesh Desai AM: On the all-important issue of funding and money - and to some extent, again, you have already touched upon the issue of funding and the funding settlement - overall, what impact will your financial situation have on your ability to reach Vision Zero targets? Very specifically, the TfL submission to the GLA budget outlines what projects will be removed, reduced or deferred unless Government funding is provided in the streets, buses and other surface operations areas. Capital enhancements have dropped from £371 million to £214 million and capital renewals have dropped from £260 million to £128 million. Can you give us some context on what programmes will no longer be supported?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I would caveat or introduce all that I say with the fact that we are very much working with the Government now to try to seek that longer-term funding deal so that the ultimate, very uncomfortable outcome of a managed decline scenario, which has been much talked about before Christmas, could hopefully be averted. Without significant funding at a high level - it is worth the Assembly knowing that we have done some assessment - we know, for example, that if we had the funding required to deliver the Vision Zero Action Plan, by 2030 we could avert around 3,500 serious injuries and around 117 deaths. If we do not have the funding, those collisions and injuries are very likely to result because we will know that the performance will not improve.

The kinds of things that are at risk are the kinds of projects that we have so benefited from in the past. The ability to complete the Safer Junctions work, for example, would need to pause. The ability to accelerate the transition to 20-mile-an-hour sections of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), which we have highlighted as being our ambition within the Vision Zero Action Plan would need to pause. There would be a slowing of the ability to roll out intelligent speed adaptation for the buses. We would still be doing some but it would not be at the pace we wanted.

Almost all of the measures that we highlight within the Action Plan will be impacted by a lack of funding and that will result in people continuing to be injured on our road network, which we feel is avertable. We have shown through the progress that we have been able to deliver that when you put the measures in place that have the evidence to support them, you will drive down that risk and you will drive down death and injury.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Can I just add to that? There are some things that keep me up at night. This is at the very top of that list. Without a long-term funding deal, we are not going to be able to continue to build safe cycle networks. We are not going to be able to do those safer junctions. We are not going to be able to improve those boroughs. This is an existential threat to the progress on Vision Zero.

What I am pleased about is that I know there are people in the Government who really share our goals and ambitions here. Again, let us not make this party political in any way. There is shared agreement and the previous Mayor did do an awful lot in this space as well and so I am hopeful that that will bring an outcome.

However, it is not just an impact on TfL here. As we have said all the way through this, Vision Zero is a partnership. It is a partnership between the MPS, the Mayor, TfL and the boroughs. The impact on funding goes way beyond just the TfL bottom line and the schemes that TfL is doing. Some 95% of the roads are the authority of the boroughs. TfL provides most of the funding for improvements in the boroughs through the Local Implementation Plans. In the managed decline scenario, there will not be the funding for the boroughs to be able to make those changes. We also provide £91 million towards the funding of the Roads Traffic Police Command, which has over 2,000 uniformed officers in there. That is an absolutely core priority to the enforcement on our streets. Vision Zero is a partnership.

We do need a long-term funding deal to be able to plan. It is not just the quantum of the money. It is the time that there is because, obviously, changing some of the junctions or planning some of this stuff goes beyond the period of months and weeks.

The impact is already happening, though. Let us be clear. This is not a future impact. It is already happening. Holborn gyratory, as I alluded to, was it was a scheme that had almost £10 million worth of funding set aside. That has had to be put on pause. At Wood Lane, there is a cycle route there where there was a fatality. The cycle training, which is an important part of the education piece, has had significant cuts to the amount of money being funded through the boroughs here. The reality is this is happening now. This is not some sort of a worst-case scenario moving into the future.

That is why it is so urgent. It goes way beyond my lack of sleep that this is important. We come back to those horrible figures of over 3,000 people being killed and seriously injured on our roads.

Unmesh Desai AM: Thank you. On the existential threat and the need for a long-term funding deal, I could not agree more.

If I can turn to you, Shravan, as the only representative of local government with us today, we talked about a partnership between TfL, the police and the boroughs and you already talked about to some extent the role of the City [of London] and you referenced air quality. Can I just put it to you generally about the role of the boroughs overall in the Vision Zero work of TfL and particularly the impact of COVID in this work? You may wish to give examples from the Corporation and the City of London, which I am proud to represent in this building.

Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman, Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, City of London Corporation): Thank you for that. I would reiterate exactly what Will has just said about some of those issues and concerns. We share those.

If I can bring that local perspective in, firstly on TfL and funding, certainly we think that with 95% of the road network under borough control that certainly there needs to be more equitable funding to enable us to bring up the reality of Vision Zero on London's streets. Moving slightly beyond the political situation of short-term funding for TfL, there needs to be some braver decisions made by our leaders on longer-term strategies and approaches that will help us achieve Vision Zero.

I will use the example of Monument junction. I know you have talked about the Holborn gyratory but Monument junction is in a similar position. It has been highlighted as a junction that is a cause for concern. It has been on that waiting list for a long time and we need to move beyond the potential traffic disruption in wanting to achieve a longer-term benefit for people, for commuters and for passengers and whatever mode of transport they are in. There needs to be a certain amount of political bravery as well brought into this debate to enable some of this to be realised. Certainly the longer-term funding is something we would gain confidence in for us to be able to achieve that 2040 Vision Zero.

On the consultation side - and this goes back to the COVID piece specifically - over 90% of the journeys in the Square Mile are pedestrian and so that is a real concern for us when we talk about fatalities and injuries on our streets because they are not in metal cages. We certainly give priority to that pedestrian personality in our outlook on transport. What we have is a unique situation, though, where we do not have many residents in the

Square Mile but we have a lot of commuters coming in and out in normal times. Running the regular cycle of consultation that we would on experimental traffic orders and so on just could not be done.

We took the approach of putting in various measures – the wands, if you like – increasing pavement widths, introducing temporary cycle lanes and so on, and we have taken feedback from various groups as people have returned to work and as people have returned to the city. We have taken those feedbacks on board, especially from groups representing disabled [people] and people with accessibility issues, to then alter the way the City's streets are laid out. That is an ongoing, iterative process that we are in. We will then go down the route of experimental traffic orders and the general, more normal consultation routes that we would undertake.

Unmesh Desai AM: Simon, welcome back. We know that you had to attend to a call. I have two specific questions about drink driving. In 2014, Scotland reduced the legal limit from 80 milligrams of alcohol per 100 millilitres of blood to 50 milligrams per 100 millilitres of blood. What discussions have you had with the UK Government about implementing such a change in London?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): Personally, none. I am not aware whether anything has been done on a national level with the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC) but I can certainly undertake to find out and get back to you on that.

Unmesh Desai AM: If there is none, then hopefully you will consider approaching the Government. My second question, again on drink driving: what discussions have you had with the Government, if any, over allowing random breath testing and police use of mobile evidential breath testing equipment? What benefit would such changes bring in London?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): There are two parts to that question. On the first part, again, none that I am aware of, but I can find out and get back to you.

Secondly, any tool that helps us to intervene to prevent people drink driving is useful and would be very welcome, but, obviously, we would be guided by the Government and the legislation – Parliament, rather – as to whether that is something it would wish to introduce for the UK.

Unmesh Desai AM: My final question, if you can be as brief as possible: can you give us a MPS perspective on how far the pandemic has affected progress towards Vision Zero? We have heard from TfL. We have heard from the City.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): That is a big question, isn't it?

Unmesh Desai AM: I know and I am conscious of the time.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): I will try to give a potted approach. We actually found that it has been almost a pandemic of two halves for us in terms of policing and Vision Zero. The original lockdown in 2020 saw quite a significant drop in the call for policing overall in many areas. Colleagues and members will be aware that the streets really did go quiet. This gave us an opportunity to focus on a range of other things where we would normally actually divert into larger public order sporting events, etc, to really concentrate on things. Our enforcement on roads at the time went up quite extraordinarily in that year. Again, I can share figures if you want, but it really

allowed us to bring far more focus and far more time onto a whole range of different criminal traffic offences. From a Vision Zero point of view, 2020 really allowed us to put even more effort than we would normally be doing into this because my officers were not so distracted or tasked into other areas of day-to-day policing that just were not happening.

The second half of the lockdown, if you like, in 2021 has seen more of a return to normal day-to-day type policing and so, again, a bigger requirement for my officers to take part in public order events, sporting events and stuff that happened. We saw a return to the more normal levels of reduction.

If the question is whether the pandemic has harmed our policing of Vision Zero, I would say, no, the opposite. It has actually allowed us to put, particularly in 2020, more effort into it, which has shown through in the number of prosecutions that have been undertaken for the 'fatal four' [offences] and indeed other road traffic offences as well. Does that help, sir?

Unmesh Desai AM: Yes. You can write to us in due course along with my other two questions. Chair, I must ask this question. It is on funding. It is important. We heard from TfL that the Roads [and Transport Policing] Command gets £91 million, which allows for some 2,000 officers to work under you. Given the uncertainty over TfL's long-term funding and the short-term deals that we have had over the last couple of years, how important is this support that you get from TfL?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): The TfL budget for the last financial year paid for 963 police officer and Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) posts. That is out of a total command in my command of about 2,200 people. A vast majority of the money for those 963 posts paid for the safer transport teams and the policing of the bus routes, both on the buses and off the routes as well. £91 million is an extraordinary and a very significant amount of money and, as has already been mentioned, the partnership is not only extraordinary for London but is recognised as extraordinary nationally and as was noted by HMICFRS, as already mentioned. It is a great partnership to work on. That £91 million makes a huge difference to the policing of the road transport networks in London and I very much welcome it continuing along the lines that it is.

Unmesh Desai AM: It makes a huge difference. Thank you, Chair.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. I have Assembly Member Rogers and then we will move on to the next section.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Thank you, Chair. Just to pick up on a point that Will made earlier about learning, we have seen travel patterns change quite dramatically during the pandemic. I was wondering if there is anything specific you have learned from those changing travel patterns that would help progress towards Vision Zero.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Yes. That is a good question. Where to start is a challenge. Can I give you one example of where there has been a really significant piece of learning? That is around the LTNs. Driving on residential streets in London, if you go back in history, from 1994 to 2008, traffic on residential streets was broadly stable. From 2009 onwards, the amount of motoring on those streets increased from 5.5 billion vehicle miles to almost 9.5 billion vehicle miles in 2019.

As the traffic on those local neighbourhood roads increased, so, sadly, has the number of collisions. This comes back to this thing that actually more traffic and more motoring results in more road danger. When we

look at the data over the past decade, walking and cycling casualties on those neighbourhood streets increased by something like 38%. That is almost double how much they increased on main roads, which was closer to about 20% but I cannot remember the exact figure. It was about 20%. That is a real problem, this increase on local roads. I would argue a lot of that is down to increased traffic because the figures are quite extraordinary.

During the pandemic, a whole series of LTNs were introduced by boroughs across the city. These were borough schemes. One of the things that came out of that was that [Westminster] University did some research into 30 of those neighbourhoods in over six months. These were not the ones that have been in there for the long term because LTNs or things like them have been around for donkey's years for various different things and have provided benefits for communities. For just those that went in during the pandemic, we saw a 50% fall in the number of casualties. That cut the number of casualties in half within a six-month period.

Clearly, with all of these things - and that is why we come back to that baseline - I am always worried about looking at short-term periods. We need to look at it over a longer-term period because the data is more solid, but that indication that was done by Westminster University clearly shows that if we want to tackle those local journeys, people walking to school, to the shops, to the surgeries, and drive that mode shift -- I am not being anti-car in any way, but 250,000 car journeys every morning in London are associated with the school run. Many of those can be walked. What is one of the barriers? It is the threat of kids being injured on those local streets. One of the learnings I take from this that while numbers have increased, there are solutions to this and so we need to continue to monitor and we need to continue to look at that data.

That is a really impressive change. I am not aware of anything else, maybe 20mph speed limits, but other than that, those relate to a 50% fall in casualties on roads and that really is significant. That is one item of learning I would take from certainly over the last 18 months.

Nicholas Rogers AM: You do touch on mode shifts. I wonder. You talked about LTNs. Is there anything else you have learned from changing travel patterns about how you can help drive that mode shift?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Yes. I will let Lilli come in. Lilli is great on stats. For cycling, for example, while the overall number of journeys, as mentioned, as Shravan [Joshi MBE] talked about, the number of people going into the City has remarkably changed and so the overall number of journeys has changed, but the mode share for cycling has almost doubled. For walking, we have seen an extraordinary change. At one point over 50% of the journeys were being made by walking in some parts of London.

Those changes show for me what is possible. These changes are possible. We are seeing change. For the number of new people who have started cycling or the people who have shifted some of those local journeys to the shops, whether by foot, the trick is how we sustain that and how we keep that pattern going forward. To help encourage that shift from those local car journeys to walking and cycling.

Obviously, a key area we need to focus on is getting public transport numbers up because, while the proportion of car journeys is back to pre-COVID levels, public transport is still down. Walking and cycling are up but we know we need to enable more people to make that shift from the car to public transport.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Let us move on to looking at safer speeds and streets and Assembly Member Berry is going to kick this off.

Siân Berry AM: If it is OK, I would just like to start with Lilli Matson to ask about something she said earlier before I move on to the regular questions.

Lilli, you earlier on talked quite interestingly about the fact that you were liaising with central Government. You said you had met on 17 December [2021] to discuss the possibility of legislation to allow a London-wide residential road default speed limit reduction to 20mph.

I found that really interesting. My colleague Caroline Russell [AM], who proceeded me on this Committee, wrote during the pandemic asking for this to the Minister [for Roads, Buses and Places], Baroness Vere [of Norbiton], in the DfT and she was not keen at that point. The reply says, essentially, apart from potentially the word 'consistently', she says she is not keen on allowing blankets and is wanting to consider individual streets.

I just wondered if you could tell us a little bit more about that and when you expect anything to actually happen.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Well done, Caroline [Russell AM], for kicking off the discussion. It was, yes, 17 December [2021]. Members of my team met with officials in the DfT. As I said, we were not talking about legislation. We were talking about and we have talked about using London as a pilot because they are not keen on legislation. There are different ways that we could consider using it as a pilot. I cannot remember exactly what measure we were thinking but we have worked jointly, for example, on experimental traffic orders previously. It might be a mechanism such as that where we have worked jointly with London Councils to have London-wide initiatives or it could be that Government gives us that. We are just exploring what the options are, but this is not a formal legislative change. What we are looking at is whether we could at least pilot this to see whether, measured over a period of time, it would deliver benefits and whether that would help overcome some of the concerns. These are exploratory conversations and we need to keep working with the officials. I see you are frowning and so ask your follow-up because I have confused you.

Siân Berry AM: A little bit, obviously, because currently we can and we have seen borough-by-borough blanket residential speed limits come in and more and more boroughs are doing that, whereas other some boroughs are essentially holding out against it. To get it done presumably would mean a power at the mayoral level rather than simply doing it street-by-street.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes, it could, but we also have jointly worked with boroughs to do London-wide initiatives. You can do --

Siân Berry AM: Do you think there is hope that you might get all the boroughs to agree to introduce it very consistently?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): The Vision Zero Action Plan refresh was jointly launched by the MPS, by TfL and by London Councils and it includes --

Siân Berry AM: It really is in there.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes. That is an initiative. It does require further work. One of the benefits that we see from that is it would actually help reduce costs for boroughs because it is a simpler way of implementing it. It is not pie-in-the-sky. Wales, for example, has introduced this as an urban requirement and has said that that will be the default speed in that

country. We will continue those conversations and I am happy to share progress with the Committee and let you how we get on.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Could I just add something very quickly on that default or just two things?

The default does not mean all roads would be 20mph, just for those people who might be watching who think that. At the moment, the default is 30mph. We can make roads 20mph, which we are doing.

Over half of London's roads are 20mph. Some are 40mph, like the North Circular. There are stretches of London's roads on which 20mph would be absurd to have.

Siân Berry AM: I will come back to you on that.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): The idea would be, if it is the default, you do not have to put a sign up every time it is 20mph because that would be the default and so it would be cheaper. You would have to make the assessment of why that road is 30mph or 40mph or whatever speed limit rather than being 20mph. It totally flips the psychology, the decision-making the costs and the ability to deliver this.

It is really interesting that Wales has done that. I also talk to Ministers and I keep on wanting to push this because we have got to half of London's roads being 20mph. How do we rapidly accelerate? I do not want to take the same amount of time to get to all of London roads being that. As you said, some areas are resistant to that change as well.

Siân Berry AM: Thank you. Yes, to clarify, residential roads are what we are talking about as a default, like it is nationally at 30mph.

In terms of Vision Zero, though, potentially, there is an argument for reducing more speed limits on more of the TLRN, which is directly under your control. That is nothing you need to negotiate with boroughs, but progress on that seems to be a little slow. It is mainly focused on the centre of town. Is there more work you might do to investigate bringing down the speed limit on more TfL roads? You said it would be absurd to make the North Circular 20mph. That is not the case for most of the South Circular, which is mostly high streets.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I would challenge that it has been slow in terms of the progress. Now all of central London TfL's roads are 20mph and they were delivered on time in March 2020.

The way we have gone about identifying where we should be introducing 20mph is very much to look at the busiest roads in terms of where vulnerable road users are most at risk and to try to assess by risk and by benefits to those road users. In the latest Vision Zero report, we set the ambition of adding an additional 140kms of TfL roads to be 20mph by 2024. The current number is around 80kms and so that is quite a significant increase. We have delivered not just within the centre but in places like Whitechapel, Archway and Brixton 20mph and there are more planned. I have a whole list here.

However, as we look and seek to roll them out further - and we very much do want to - we are back in the question around funding and we are at risk of not being able to afford to do that, but you are right. We have

the evidence base. We have the know-how, if you like. We need the funding to be able to do that and to continue to roll it out because it is a really important part of making many parts of these high streets even safer and definitely more liveable.

Siân Berry AM: Obviously, the target is zero and you would think that wanting to eliminate all higher-speed vehicles having contact with pedestrians would be part of that. Will, you wanted to say one more thing? I do need to move on to my real questions.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): I have one more thing just on that. On some roads, it is fine just changing the speed limits with signs, but there are other roads where there really need to be engineering changes to those roads to make them feel more like 20mph zones so that they begin to enforce themselves. On residential roads, which might be narrower and feel like that, it is a much different thing, but actually some of the bigger roads that TfL are responsible for require other interventions as well as the signs, which is why there is a cost associated with some of these changes, which is what we rolled out on some of the TfL roads in central London to get those changes as well. It is not necessarily a cheap option with some of the bigger roads.

Siân Berry AM: Thank you very much. My main questions are to Chief Superintendent Ovens. Again, it is nice to meet you. I wanted to ask about 20mph speed limits and what you have seen in terms of evidence on improvements in safety from those speed limits.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): Can you be a bit more specific in terms of what I have seen? We have certainly seen a reduction in road deaths and an increase in enforcement.

Siân Berry AM: Any particular evidence or examples that you might have of an area where a speed limit came in and there were improvements and why that might be? Your team have the insights into the causes and reasoning behind changes, sometimes, that we just do not see in the statistics.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): It is a difficult question for me to answer in terms of individual examples and I do not have any individual examples. We know speeding is one of the 'fatal four'. The faster you go the more likely you are to injure someone and, equally, to injure them more seriously the faster you go. The reduction in speed limits is welcome.

I would pick up on what Will said around making it clear and a default position would be really good because I do not know about you but I am often in a position now of saying, "Is this a 20mph road or is this a 30mph road?" My satnav will still say it is 30mph and sometimes the signs are not always as clear as they can be. Psychologically, that is a really good point, but any reduction in the speed of traffic travelling around London where it comes into contact with pedestrians has to be welcomed.

Siân Berry AM: That is really useful. You talked earlier about your team and the work that you did and, during the pandemic, you increased the amount of enforcement. Is there more that can be done in terms of enforcement work and activity? Are there things where you might reprioritise different types of work to do more about speed and would that be something you would consider?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): There is always more that can be done anywhere, but TfL has a clear position to get to a target of

1 million prosecutions a year for speeding. In 2020 we saw that at 263,000. In 2021 it was over 360,000. It is going in the right direction. I know TfL is budgeting for more investment into the MPS prosecution side of things to make sure even more people caught on camera at all the different speed levels are prosecuted. We would certainly welcome that. Huge amounts of prosecutions are going on and that must knock just about every other city in the country into the shade in terms of those high figures and the fact that TfL is very clear and putting its money where its mouth is in terms of getting to 1 million prosecutions a year is a great signal as well.

Siân Berry AM: Thank you very much. Obviously, there is enforcement and you have this target of doing more enforcement. Part of the reason you want to do that is to communicate to people that if they speed they will be enforced against and, therefore, you are cutting the behaviour. That is part of the process of change.

I spoke at the whole Assembly meeting last month [2 December 2021] with the Commissioner [of Police of the Metropolis] about getting more information about enforcement out there. One thing was the delay in the publication of the roads enforcement bulletin that comes out from TfL, which is TfL's responsibility but is all information that comes from the MPS. The other thing I asked for was a dashboard because there are lots of MPS dashboards and there does not seem to be a Vision Zero dashboard yet. On both of those things, the Commissioner gave essentially positive promises and I will be following up on that.

I just wanted to check if you were working on either of those things and whether you agree that being able to see the amount of enforcement that goes on would be a deterrent.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): It is the way it is presented. We all have lots of information available to us but it is getting that across to the public. We are part of a number of initiatives. I have a few in front of me: Community Roadwatch, Junior Roadwatch. The introduction and launch of enforcement by PCSOs and the publicity that will surround that is all going through.

It is getting that message out, a very clear message of the 20mph limits. It really slows people down. Again, I was born in London, live in London and have lived in London all my life. It is a big topic of conversation amongst Londoners - not always positive, I have to say - about how slowly we have to go on the roads now. Although there are some people who are still saying, "They cannot enforce it", and all of that and they need to be disabused of that position, it is becoming more in the London psyche about going slower, but, again, we know, as Will said, people get confused and consistency is really important. If 20mph became the new 30mph, then everyone would know where they are and you are then looking psychologically for the exception. The other way around is, "Should I do 30?", rather than "Should I only be doing 20?"

Siân Berry AM: Thank you. Will, were you about to give us an update on the enforcement bulletin?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Yes. This came up in conversation when I had a meeting yesterday and so, clearly, something has filtered down the chain with one of Simon's colleagues, just in terms of the speed of that and how we talk about and publicise it. You are right. We need to do the enforcement but we also need to talk about the enforcement so that it becomes -- ultimately, I do not want to enforce against anybody. I want people to drive at 20mph and be safe to protect people. The goal is not to get to however many prosecutions. The goal is to not enforce at all, but we have to use the messaging on that. That is something that we are keen on working on together to make sure that that messaging is out there and some of that data can come out. We can maybe see what we can do to make it come out a bit quicker.

Siân Berry AM: Thank you. One of the issues with the bulletin in general is that it is a year out of date when we receive it in any case.

Moving on to enforcement, there are plans now to designate Police Constable traffic enforcement powers to Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). I have experienced this going out with the Community Roadwatch team. We needed to have an officer with us before we could do any enforcement with the speed guns that we were using as a community. Will those changes to allow PCSOs to do enforcement on events like that make a difference and what further powers might be needed?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): It certainly will make a difference because in one fell swoop it allows 564 more of my staff to take part in this type of work. The trainers have all been trained to train the PCSOs to do that and that training has been going on. Within a few days there will be PCSOs using their new powers to do that.

Yes, it is really good news because, again, the more enforcement that goes on, the more the message goes out. Again, it is widely shared about amongst people when they have been done on a camera or stopped by the police for speeding and so the message gets out there.

Also, we are quite demonstrative in the way that that is being enforced as well and so people will necessarily see an increase in the amount of enforcement going on, focused between 6am and 10pm to begin with these extra ones through the PCSOs, during the really busy peak times.

Siân Berry AM: That is really useful. I wonder if as a Committee we might ask for early reporting back on that progress and the amount of activity that is going on. That would probably appear on a dashboard if we had a dashboard but, if we can get early information, that would be really interesting to see.

I actually have one very quick final question to TfL. Are there any plans or thoughts about bringing speed limits below 20mph in areas of very high footfall? I know there is a handful of places where speed limits are lower. There is a stretch of 10mph road in my ward but it is a private road. What are your plans to think about really slow speeds just where it is appropriate?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Obviously, the safest approach, if you want to look at that, is to remove traffic altogether and certainly there have been lots of parts of London - back to the LTNs - where we have seen those benefits.

On the TLRN, we are not currently looking at below 20mph, but certainly I have to say certain boroughs have definitely looked at that and I can definitely see the case for it. Do you want to pick that up, Shravan?

Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman, Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, City of London Corporation): Yes, if you do not mind. We have looked at 15mph for the City Square Mile area. If you try to drive at 20mph in most city streets, you feel like you are going fast and so it is about measure and proportion.

The issue we have faced around that has been around potential enforcement issues and whether you can actually enforce in 5mph increments around that 20mph piece. That is the message we have had back but we are still pursuing that approach if we can.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Also, we have talked earlier. There is an awfully long way to go on 20mph. Our focus should be at the moment on expanding that. Where there is lower speed guidance like 15mph, that is great but, really, the 20mph piece is the really significant thing.

Siân Berry AM: That is really useful. There may be the possibility to look at examples from Europe of this. If I am right, 20kmh is about 15mph and so, therefore, there might be some trials in Europe that we could look at. OK. I will pass back to the Chair now.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Assembly Member Prince and then Assembly Member Clarke.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): This one is really for Will. Do you think that the 20mph default limit might be less effective rather than having it in targeted zones? You will find that a number of drivers would agree that outside a school or a certain area, maybe a hospital or somewhere like an old people's home, certainly warrants 20mph but that out in the wilds of Essex or Havering there are roads where, quite honestly, doing 20mph would be absolutely ridiculous. You are going to find a situation where people just will not respect the speed limit.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): We have to come back to why we want to lower the speed limit. Sadly, if someone is hit by a car doing 30mph they are five times more likely to be killed than someone who was [hit by a car] doing 20mph. Then, if you look at older people, it is even more so. About 7% of people are killed who are hit at 30mph and 50% of people over 60 years old are killed at 30mph. There is a very clear reason and clear evidence and why this is important.

I come back to the point around the default for urban speeds being 20mph. That does not mean that all roads would be 20mph. It would mean that you would have to make a decision on why that road would be higher. Why would that road in the wilds of Essex - and Essex is not that wild - be --

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Obviously, you are going to the wrong places.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Maybe you could show me some of those spots. The psychology, as I said earlier, would be, if urban areas are 20mph, why would that road be different? I come back to something that both Simon [Ovens] and I have touched on in terms of consistency. At the moment, I find that I do not know where one borough starts and one stops. Actually, since doing this job, I know which roads TfL controls and which ones it does not, but I did not before I did this job. When I was driving or when I am driving, it is confusing. There is a consistency point.

There is also a thing that we are asking the Government for, which is a digital map of speed limits because, as Simon said earlier, with more technology in our cars, without that digital map of speed limits, it is very hard to actually manage that, particularly if you have new technologies coming into cars that might regulate that themselves and make it harder for people to speed. There are things that need to come into place on here.

Not all roads would be 20mph, but the local authority and the highway authority would ask why that road needs to be faster than a default.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I do quite a lot of walking around outer London and so I know exactly the roads that you are talking about but this is part of the reason why collisions still remain quite stubbornly high in outer London and why some of these roads are quite

unattractive to walk and cycle on. There is an issue about, on the residential roads, making them feel and be safer and, actually, having a wider application of 20mph on a number of those roads would be really significant in liberating them and opening them up to people who want to travel sustainably on them. I do agree with Will that there is a real challenge and you would need to look road-by-road to see whether it might justify being higher, but there is an awful lot of residential roads in outer London that would be a lot safer if they were 20mph.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Again, that makes the point that I am making that there are specific cases that you could make for 20mph but, quite frankly, there are areas where it is really quite absurd. I drive around London a lot and I have to go down towards Croydon sometimes and it is a nightmare.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Let us not insult Croydon here, Keith.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): One minute it is 20mph. The next minute it is 30mph. There are other parts of London where you see a 20mph sign and then you do not see any more signage and then, all of a sudden, you realise that this car that has been up very close to your rear has been frustrated and realised that it had changed to 30mph although there was no clear signage of that. My car does indicate what it thinks the speed limit is. It does not always get it right, unfortunately. It reads the road signs but, if there are not any road signs for it to read, it cannot tell me what I am supposed to be doing. It is an absolute nightmare.

Repeat signage is very important. Unless we do that, people are not going to be able to respect the speed limits. There are parts of London where I just do not know what the speed limit is but, even with a 20mph limit, certainly when I am driving around after 9am, I have people right up the back of my car - I am trying not to use an Essex term - and it is very frustrating for them. They then make an absolutely ridiculous manoeuvre as a result because they do not think I am going fast enough and they endanger someone else's life. That is the risk. If we are going to make it a blanket 20mph, people are going to be driving irresponsibly because they do not feel it is right or proper.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): OK. Let us just move on. I am conscious of time.
Assembly Member Clarke?

Anne Clarke AM: Thank you, Chair. Just getting back to this borough boundary thing, I can think of a very good example in Camden, where it is 20mph. If you go into Barnet where I live and come down North End Road, the residents have been asking and asking Barnet for speed controls because it is 30mph. Barnet does not believe in speed humps. We do not believe in lots of things or LTNs.

I am really worried, though, that this misinformation that has come from somewhere - and it has not come from anyone present - and is consistently presented to residents in Barnet is, "We cannot possibly because 20mph is unenforceable". I am just wondering if there is anything that is happening to educate boroughs that are taking that attitude that actually it is not just enforceable but it is desirable and it is what residents want and is actually safer. Particularly when you get those crossovers into boroughs is where it gets dangerous because, if you are at the top, like if you are at Hampstead Heath and you are coming downhill into Barnet, whereas the higher stuff is in Camden. That is exactly where accidents happen. It is dangerous and residents do want to see a change. Thank you.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): What I would offer you is the figure that have been enforced at 20mph. Some 75,000 people last

year were done for speeding for the 20mph limit in London and 52,000 the year before. Of course it is enforceable if the proper signage is there and the roads have been adapted.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Can I add to that? That is really welcome but, also, as part of the relaunching the Vision Zero Action Plan, Will and I worked very closely with London Councils and the MPS, obviously. We have been going regularly to the Transport and Environment Committee meetings at London Councils to talk to this and everyone signed up to this document, which is talking about that. I have then followed that up with a joint letter with Philip Glanville [Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils] to all of the leaders of London Councils to talk about Vision Zero and how we can progress jointly on this initiative. That was sent just before Christmas and part of my spring will be going out and having these conversations with boroughs. It is really good to have hard data that this is enforceable. This is part of making places more liveable.

I totally take your point about consistency, Keith [Prince AM], and that is part of the challenge we face but it is also part of why we are interested in exploring this option of a default 20mph. Bear in mind the challenges you face about behaviour. It is all within that context of culture and that somehow, through continually raising the importance of this and just the unacceptability that your child or my child could be killed on the road network, we need to change the culture of driving in London.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Can I add that the education has to be top down from the local councils and from an official level and also needs that bottom-up piece. I would give significant praise to Simon [Ovens] and his team on the Community Roadwatch and the Junior Roadwatch, which work in schools and in communities. I was on one just before Christmas in Lambeth and we went out. Local residents had been complaining of high speeding in an area. We went out with PCSOs and an officer. We went out and the residents themselves were involved in tackling them and talked to the drivers who then got pulled over. Also, the local councillors were there as well. This had come from the residents themselves who felt that it was dangerous on their roads. This cannot just be a top-down piece. There needs to be that bottom-up piece to explain to drivers the risks associated with this and have it at a community level as well as from a borough perspective. I would happily take that up with the local council on that because I recognise the challenges.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Assembly Member McCartney?

Joanne McCartney AM: During the pandemic, Will, it was primarily from the Government to introduce those walking and cycling schemes but also LTNs in certain boroughs. They were hotly contested and still are. I want to ask about the consultation and what lessons have been learned from the consultation and what we can do going forward to make sure that there is better discussion around these schemes.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Thanks, Joanne. As I said earlier, during the height of the pandemic when the Emergency Active Travel Fund was coming into London and there was the bailout that came out with the financial support package, that was overseen in London with the Active Travel Advisory Group. That was the DfT, a representative of Number 10, me representing the Greater London Authority (GLA), TfL colleagues and borough colleagues working together to deliver that Street Space programme. That was, as you said, done under this guidance and, frankly, the consultation was not there. We know how important consultation is in this process and I am very pleased that that guidance has been changed from the Government. Now, while there is none in the current funding deal that ended in December [2021] and runs until February [2022], we are continuing to spend the money that was allocated

from the previous Government funding package, which is now being done through proper and adequate consultation with communities.

During this, we have learned a lot – and Shravan [Joshi MBE] picked up on this – in terms of how consultation is happening. With schemes that are on the street and some of those temporary schemes that went in, the plastic wands – the ‘magic wands’, as some people call them – in places and some of those temporary schemes that went in, because they are there, they are being looked at as a live consultation and engagement. If you go onto the TfL website, there is a whole area where people can comment and contribute to that. TfL is doing local outreach to communities in those schemes and I know the boroughs are doing exactly the same thing. There is so much engagement at the moment. There are so many schemes happening across different boroughs, I do struggle to keep up with it all, but I know that that feedback is being taken on board. These are not referendums on schemes but a lot of this is about improving things.

One of the messages I have certainly mentioned earlier from how much we have learned during COVID is that the lack of engagement and consultation is a real problem. Not only does it affect people the way people react when suddenly something appears on their road and they are legitimately quite upset and they say, “I did not know anything about this. Why has this suddenly showed up?” That creates an adverse reaction and you have almost already lost people before you have even had a chance to explain what the benefits are. It also means that schemes are just not up to the standards that we would want.

A good example is some of the LTNs, where we have been working with Transport For All and looking at how some of those schemes can affect disabled people in terms of visual impairments or also mobility scooters. That level of engagement is absolutely vital to make sure the quality of the schemes and the way that they are designed for the particular contexts comes into place and so that they work for everybody.

Joanne McCartney AM: My second question – and you have touched on it there, Will – was about those groups that are particularly vulnerable. I know the RNIB, for example, has expressed concerns particularly about some of these schemes that were put in with very short notice and about how they do have a great deal of impact upon their members. Can you just say what is being done in the subsequent discussions to make sure that those concerns have been taken on board?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London’s Walking and Cycling Commissioner): It is again worth noting that as things were being rolled out in that emergency phase, the Government guidance was not to consult at that point. We know that engaging and making sure that these schemes are accessible for everybody is really important.

When we go back to the inequalities that exist within the Vision Zero data, people from deprived backgrounds are twice as likely to be injured by road traffic collisions and black people are 2.3 times more likely to be killed or seriously injured on our roads than white people. We do not have full data on disability but, at a national level, it shows that disabled people are four times more likely to be injured by a motor vehicle than non-disabled people. It is essential that we do that engagement. That is why we are working with the RNIB, as I said, on the London Street Space Advisory Group but also at a local level learning from and working closely.

There was a brilliant report done by Transport For All, which I know the Committee has looked at, in terms of the impact of Street Space schemes on disabled people. Its conclusion was that these are not the wrong things to be doing but how do we engage with people to make sure that they work for them as well? Particularly where temporary schemes have gone in and then maybe people are considering if those temporary schemes

should remain, that is where the intervention needs to happen to make sure that they work for everybody in that space.

Joanne McCartney AM: I recently had a meeting with Sustrans and we were talking about the Safer Junctions Programme, which is extremely welcome. There are certain criteria that should be met and a scoring system, but they did raise concerns. Occasionally, there had been critical safety issues raised on some of the junctions that have had adaptations where there had been a nil score, the lowest score possible – in fact, no score – and yet the scheme had still gone ahead. Is there any comment from Will or perhaps you could write to us afterwards about that?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): I would happily look at those particular junctions, but the broader point here is that the most dangerous junctions in London are usually the most difficult junctions to tackle from this perspective. I would not want some safety measures to not happen and I would not want perfect to be the enemy of good in these spaces. The Safer Junctions Programme has reduced collisions overall for all forms of road users, but I will happily pick up those individual schemes, Joanne, to follow up on that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you. Members, I am really conscious of time. We have got quite a few sections to go and if you have got another question you might want to bring it into a section you are coming up with shortly. Let us move on to the progress on initiatives and I have got Assembly Member Rogers.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Thank you, Chair. As well as the DVS, what more do you think can be done to improve safety with regards to heavy goods vehicles (HGV) in London?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): The Safe Systems approach implies that you are going to tackle all elements of the system. The DVS is directly amending the physical design of the vehicles, it has a further iteration to be strengthened in coming years and it is incredibly important. In addition to that, there is the work that [Dr] Will [Norman] has been talking about in terms of on the right roads segregating vulnerable road users from traffic, and that is really critical that we continue to do that because that has proven safety benefits. There is also the importance of us continuing to liaise directly with the freight industry around what they can do in terms of training drivers and the whole promotion of what has been the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS). That is now taken forward separately from TfL but really drives and demands improvements in terms of how the freight industry manages itself and manages risk among its drivers. That is incredibly important. Then the final thing is the wider work that we do in terms of helping educate cyclists and improving behaviour on the road network more generally from road users so that people can be aware of the risks, particularly when cycling, and understand how to navigate safely on the road network. It is a jigsaw, there are lots of different pieces and we cannot stop pushing on any one of them or we may see the progress we have seen slipping away.

Nicholas Rogers AM: In your discussions with the freight industry, do you see any initiatives coming forward from them that would help with road safety?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): [Dr] Will [Norman] might want to add to this. If you work in the freight industry, no one wants to be involved in a serious collision, let alone a fatality. It is awful for everyone concerned and, more coldly, it has a direct business impact. Beyond the issues around training, around looking after fatigue and about good

management of hours, that all in itself is innovative. I am not aware of anything particularly new on the block, but I will defer to Will. He may have some and then Shravan.

Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman, Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, City of London Corporation): Yes, if I can come on this specifically because we have done quite a lot of work with logistics companies/supply chain in the square mile where we are starting to building in their service programmes to their planning applications. We want to know how and when they are going to service those buildings and businesses as they go through that whole phase with the council. Trying to phase those services away from peak times when you have got more vulnerable road users around seems to work really well. We find that that collaborative approach means that you are not frustrating either party because everyone knows where they are coming from, from the very beginning.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Very quickly, to echo Lilli's [Matson] point, the freight industry is so engaged in this space and we would have never been able to deliver the DVS without the manufacturers. We are totally dependent on their data, that is a joint partnership and, having been out with the freight industry, the drivers really benefit from this. What I am really pleased about is as part of FORS there are all sorts of innovations popping up, the FORS operators are trialling innovations all the time in this space and that is a great forum to try new things. There are always new schemes, inventions and gadgets coming on and the FORS partnership is the mechanism to do that.

I would echo Shravan's [Joshi] piece that on HGV safety it is not just about making those vehicles safer that are on the roads; it is actually putting fewer of them on the roads. I refer back to a scheme that happened on New Bond Street a while ago that tracked all the movements of the number of vehicles that were picking up rubbish and things. At one point, there were 144 different vehicle movements a day to pick up the amount of rubbish from all the different companies, firms and everybody else. By working together, those businesses collaborated through the Business Improvement District and got it down to nine vehicle movements a day. For me, there is a freight consolidation piece of businesses working together and that saves them costs, makes it environmentally better and cut NO₂ and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions by 90%, as well as reducing the number of vehicles on the road. We need fewer vehicles on the road through initiatives like that and businesses working together, but then those vehicles we do need, need to be safer and that is where those innovations through the FORS partnership are so important.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Thank you. It sounds like an interesting initiative in New Bond Street. Shravan, it seems a little unfair to ask you to speak on behalf of all of London's local government, but I have a question here. What more do you think you could do to support the rollout of safer vehicles through the DVS such as in the procurement of your own fleet vehicles? Maybe you can just speak about what the City [of London Corporation] is doing there.

Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman, Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, City of London Corporation): Sure. Yes, it is difficult for me to speak for every borough, but where we are concerned our own fleet is certainly compliant and we are working to the highest standards we can. I think we are a FORS Gold Standard on our own operations and we work very closely with external stakeholders to make sure they are also trying to implement the highest standards.

One thing that we have missed out is TfL's bus driver training schemes as well and we have seen those having a big impact on road safety, too, and that broader awareness. The other piece we have been looking actively at from a Streets and Walkways perspective is also how you make the urban environment more pedestrian-dominant. That in itself, moving away from enforcement, drives that positive behaviour change amongst other

road users. That is something we are actively pushing and that goes hand in hand with enforcement, driving that sort of constructive behaviour change in road users.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Thank you. Sticking with HGVs - you did touch on this - do you think that the DVS could be a planning condition for major developments? You have touched on using the planning process on this.

Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman, Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, City of London Corporation): It is difficult to enforce that kind of thing at the planning stage. We want their plans put in front of us at the planning stage and we certainly scrutinise those, as this Committee would as well, but it is very difficult to enforce that in reality. We have to trust those developers and work with them on that enforcement.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): From a GLA and TfL perspective, all GLA and TfL construction projects costing more than £1 million do specify the FORS and Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS) standards as part of the procurement contract. The DVS falls outside of that and is a citywide piece. Really, that should be a national scheme. It is odd that a city has to bring in vehicle regulations. We did it because it is the right thing, but really that should be done nationally because the last thing I want is all the dangerous trucks then driving to Birmingham or Manchester because that is not fair on those residents either. That is something that, again, we continue to talk to Government about, making lorry safety a national scheme.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Thank you. Moving on to buses and questions for Lilli now, what would you say are the major factors for the success of the Bus Safety Standard and do you think that the new bus safety action in the progress report will allow you to reach your 2030 target?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Again, the key factors are multiple in terms of what has been effective. The Bus Safety Standard itself is a definition of vehicle amendments to help and it was underpinned by an awful lot of research, which helped us pinpoint exactly which aspects of the vehicles are involved in causing harm when collisions occur. We have things such as intelligent speed adaptation, non-slip flooring to help reduce the likelihood that people will fall over within the bus, and the removal of wing mirrors to reduce the incidents in which people are hit as pedestrians outside the bus. That is matched, exactly as we are hearing, by training. For example, our Destination Zero training, which has been rolled out to all bus drivers, is an incredible thing. We are happy to invite Assembly Members to try this at some point where you have virtual reality training headsets to allow you to experience complex London road networks and understand driving techniques to help mitigate the impact on vulnerable road users. Training has been really important.

Then, critically, we are working with the bus operators to introduce fatigue management programmes and wellbeing programmes to try to tackle every aspect of the way the driver feels when they get in the bus, their understanding of how to drive safely, and the ability of that vehicle to be as safe as it possibly can be. Then there is the adaption of certain additional technologies like intelligent speed adaptation, which ensures that the buses do stay at the speed limit on that road. It is that combination of evidence-driven measures that has led to the improvements and will continue to deliver benefits. We are looking at about 18% of the bus fleet having the full Bus Safety Standard by the end of 2022 and that is still pending funding. There are around 525 buses that have it now and so it depends on the further rollout. All the other measures such as the training and fatigue management does carry on, but certain elements, as I indicated in my answer on funding earlier, such as the ability to roll out intelligent speed adaptation would slow with reduced funding.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Would it be your ambition to have 100% of the bus fleet having the full Bus Safety Standard by the end of 2022?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes.

Nicholas Rogers AM: When would you ideally like that to happen by?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): One of the challenges we face is with reduced funding we will be keeping old buses for longer, simply put, and that will slow the transition. Otherwise - I am not going to guess the actual final end date - over maybe five to six years would be the normal cycle. Currently, this is part of broader programmes. If you remember, and I am sure you have talked about our transition to net zero, we know that with funding we could transition to electric buses by 2030. That was our ambition. Those new buses would include the measures that we are talking about, but we are now talking about a slower transition.

Nicholas Rogers AM: At our previous meeting on Vision Zero, we heard some quite compelling evidence from a recently retired bus driver around driver fatigue and the impact that that has, and I have got several questions on this. First, how often do you find that driver fatigue is a factor in incidents involving buses and how is bus driver fatigue in general being addressed by TfL?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Driving a bus on London's roads is a really challenging job and we recognise that. The drivers have done an absolutely amazing job driving throughout the pandemic and we are really grateful for the work they have done. During that time, we have been working with bus operators on this Fatigue Management Programme that I mentioned. From my experience, fatigue is not classified necessarily in the way collisions are recorded by the police, but it is something when we do follow-on detailed surveys if collisions occur that you could potentially address. It is not the prime factor at all and I do not think it even comes out as the main factor. I do not want to really undersell that because many collisions are multifactorial and it is quite hard to pinpoint exactly when fatigue might be the key issue. It is significant enough that it is a core part of our Bus Safety Programme and it is why we are working with all bus operators to have Fatigue Management Plans in place. This relates to just general wellbeing in the wake of the pandemic as well and we are looking to work with them on a whole health and wellbeing innovation programme, we are working with bus operators to try to provide the right information and facilities to ensure that bus drivers are well and well in themselves and in their work because that is all part of helping to manage fatigue.

There are options to introduce fatigue detection technology and with funding we would want to roll that out to around 500 buses this year. That is a way of potentially monitoring drivers for subtle signs of fatigue such as eye blinks. We have a similar thing in trams to try to see what else we can learn about managing fatigue. At its heart, what we really want is to create an open and trusted safety culture so any driver who turns up at the depot and feels tired or has had a terrible night's sleep is able to raise that, is able to have a more open conversation and make sure that they ultimately are not driving while fatigued.

Nicholas Rogers AM: When you investigate or when you have oversight of incidents involving buses, is it registered that fatigue could even be a contributing factor to it? Do you collect that information at all?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): The bus operators are responsible ultimately for their safety and we support this through the process for investigating

collisions. I do not know exactly the different factors that are precisely recorded, but I know that fatigue can be identified. It would be better if I wrote to you specifically on that point afterwards.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Yes, that would be helpful, thank you. Are you aware of the fatigue indexing practices that operators use to look at the fatigue impact of their driver rosters? How does that compare with other fatigue indexing done across TfL, for example, Tube driver rosters?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): In terms of discussing fatigue and rosters with the bus operators, yes. To be really clear, I am the overall Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer and a lot of this work is led through the Bus Safety Management Team. It has the direct relationship with the bus operators. They do talk about rostering, they do talk about best practice in rostering and we, through my team, do also co-ordinate a broader Fatigue Management Programme across TfL, which shares the information from London Underground, the rail services and the bus network so that we are sharing approaches. We have been introducing and piloting new approaches such as sleep monitoring tools, just even within our own team, so that we have trusted tools that we can then offer to operators also across our London Underground network, trying to share that information across the organisation.

Nicholas Rogers AM: Thank you. You have talked of a number of fairly high-level initiatives and you are working with the industry, but are you checking how this is actually playing out on the ground? When I was having this similar line of questioning with the bus driver at our last meeting, she said that fatigue simply is not recognised by bus operators and that if she called up prior to a shift to say, “I simply am too fatigued to do the shift”, she could potentially be facing disciplinary action. Is this actually filtering through to the operational level of bus companies?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I would say from my position, yes, I understand it is and I would really want to know from that person exactly which bus company they were talking about and we would follow it up with them. There is really close dialogue between the Bus Operations and Safety Teams and operators, they have been on weekly calls throughout the pandemic to talk about this and they do talk about fatigue and how it plays out in practice. I do not recognise the picture that is being described, but I would want to know about it. I do not know exactly which person you are talking about or which company, but that kind of information should be shared back with us because we do absolutely hold this in very high concern and high focus.

Nicholas Rogers AM: The minutes of our previous meeting should be available; all the information will be there and I would suggest there is some very concerning evidence that that driver gave. My final question is around fatigue then. You mentioned that you are working with the freight industry and sharing best practice also on fatigue. Are there any initiatives that they are doing that you think we could borrow and we could use in our bus network?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): On the freight industry, there is nothing really that I have not already talked about in terms of fatigue monitoring-type information, the management of hours and the focus on wellbeing. These are tried, trusted and understood fatigue management techniques which we are trying to take, not just from the freight industry but also from the rail industry and make sure that they are well understood across all of our operations. As [Dr] Will [Norman] said, the freight industry is innovative in many ways and we will continue to work really closely with them to learn any kinds of tools that they might have.

Nicholas Rogers AM: It is interesting that you mention the rail industry. A lot of the rail rostering practices came up following the 1988 Clapham [Junction] rail disaster, that is still the gold standard for how you deal with these things and we have known about these lessons for over 34 years. What we heard from the bus driver at the previous meeting shows that that best practice does not seem to be filtering into the bus industry and that is something to really look into.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I would, but I would just challenge. We have done extensive research into fatigue at TfL in the bus industry and that has translated directly into actions that are being put in place, working with bus operators, such as Fatigue Management Plans. I will look into detail with colleagues at what comes out of that evidence, but I would also challenge that there are an awful lot of actions being put into place and the feedback on those is that they have been well received.

Nicholas Rogers AM: I have one last question. Who do you liaise with in TfL with the operators and the actual garages who deal with fatigue?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): We as an organisation would liaise at all levels from the Chief Executives down to the managers of the garages, every level, as well as visiting garages and meeting with people.

Nicholas Rogers AM: OK.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I am not sure I am going to be very helpful on that in terms of saying --

Nicholas Rogers AM: No, that is fine. Basically, I just want to establish you have direct relationships with managers of individual bus depots.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes, at different levels. Yes, absolutely.

Nicholas Rogers AM: OK, excellent, thank you. My next question is around training. Do you think that training for bus drivers is sufficient and is it consistent with the training that is available for HGV drivers? I am thinking particularly of the Safer Urban Driving scheme that is available for HGV drivers.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I would say I do not know the exact provisions of that Safer [Urban] Driving scheme and I would defer to the Head of Bus Operations to do that direct comparison. I would expect it to be so and also the type of safety training that we put in place and have recommended for bus operators is very consistent and built on what we learnt from the freight industry. When we helped work with the freight industry to develop the FORS Programme, which developed that Safer Urban Driving, we then used that very basis to deliver the Destination Zero training, which I was just mentioning. It is based exactly on the same approach but has gone further than that by being much more impactful and virtual. We are trying to learn and read across at every stage from the measures that have been put in place for the HGV [training]. I hesitated at the beginning because I would not want to say off the top of my head exactly every single legal requirement is the same. I do not know that and I would need to check that, but in terms of the ethos and the approach that we recommend through whether it is the Urban Driving course or whether it is Destination Zero, they are very similar in approach.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Lovely, thank you. Assembly Member Garratt?

Neil Garratt AM: I am going to come on in a moment to ask some questions about e-scooters, but I have a couple of follow-up questions on the bus safety topic if I may. I have looked at this and it appears to be in common with almost all politicians these days. My Dad used to drive buses and it is something I am a bit familiar with. There seems to have been quite a bit of work done on this already and lots of questions asked by previous Assembly Members before I got here, and one of the things that I find comes out consistently is it is not clear who exactly is responsible for the safety of buses. What I mean by that is that when things are going well, of course lots of people want to claim credit, but when there is a problem it seems there is a sort of Spiderman meme situation where everything is somebody else's problem. I am afraid to say I have heard a bit of that maybe hinted at today and in your answers to Assembly Member Rogers, there was lots of talk of dialogue and conversation and talking about things. What I want to know is - for example, in relation to rosters - do you have or have you considered having a direct power to enforce rostering and say to bus companies, "This is the safe way to roster bus drivers", based on, for example, the railway industry or the airline industry? Do you have the power to do that? Would you like the power to do that? It feels a bit like you ask them nicely and maybe they do and maybe they do not, and if they do not we all just sit here talking about it and drivers are still driving fatigued.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I would have to ask the Director of Buses whether she would want that direct power. From a safety point of view, I feel that through the dialogue and the way we set conditions for the bus operations we have a productive and really fruitful way of setting out the outcomes we want. I do not think - for me, I would be clear - that just directing rosters is necessarily the best way of getting the outcome that we want. You might just think I am evading the question, but the issue about managing fatigue is much broader than just rosters. It is about the whole safety culture within the organisation. It is about the openness for people, which I believe we are working with operators to do, to say that if they do arrive fatigued they do not drive and they have a safe and open culture. That is not just down to the rosters. That is due to what I am saying, a lot of different factors. I do not know if the Director of Bus Operators would like to direct rosters, but we can achieve the safety outcomes that we need and we have shown really good progress in terms of driving improvements in safety from buses in London. It is really important that you get the different evidence that you have and clearly there is more to do.

Neil Garratt AM: Yes, the evidence that we had from Lorraine [Robertson] at the last meeting here essentially flatly contradicted what you have just said. What I should probably also add is that subsequently other bus drivers have come forward anonymously, not just anonymously but insisting that we do not reveal anything about them precisely because the culture is exactly not what you have just said. The culture is one of fear that if anybody raises safety concerns in the scenario that my colleague brought up where somebody feels fatigued - they do not feel rested enough to drive a bus for a full shift - those drivers, more than one driver, not just Lorraine and more than one besides Lorraine, felt very clear that the culture was absolutely 180 degrees the opposite of what you have said.

What I am sitting here thinking is that yet again we have a scenario where here at the level that we are having this conversation everything is lovely, you think you are having these productive conversations and the drivers actually doing the job think that it is not happening. Somewhere between here and the bus cab, the message is not getting through and so I come back to my question. Who exactly is responsible for the fact that the message is not getting through or for finding out whether the message is? You clearly think that it is; the information that I am getting and other Members are getting is that it is not. Who is taking charge of finding out if it is and, if it is not, make adjustments?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I will follow up with the Director of Bus Operations to find out exactly what is behind the statements and witnesses that you have spoken to. We do go out, I met with bus drivers and I go to the depot and so I have colleagues in my team and primarily the Bus Operations is liaising with them every day. We do get positive feedback and we do also get the counter argument, which you are not getting here. That does not mean to say that what you have heard is not really, really important and it is, which is why we are driving a Bus Operations Programme with bus operators. We will work with all operators, who clearly hold the employment responsibilities. They are the ones interfacing day-to-day with their staff to make sure that it is really clear that the message coming from TfL is that this is important and we know that this does drive safety. I am listening to what you say and we will take that away, but it is not to say that there is not also positive feedback. Just because you have not spoken to someone who might give you a different account does not mean to say that that is not true and we can --

Neil Garratt AM: With respect, what I would say is I had a perfectly safe journey - two journeys, in fact - to get here on my bike today and I could give you a positive account of my time on my bike. That does not mean we do not have a problem with safety for cyclists.

The fact is that we appear to have a significant number of drivers who have a totally opposite view of the safety culture. My question is: what is the process by which this Vision Zero [Action] Plan ends up in the minds and in the culture of the bus depots? It really does not seem to be.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Again, I would challenge that. There is more progress than you are saying.

There is a Bus Safety Programme. There is a Bus Safety Manager within TfL, who sits within the Director of Buses, and that person works directly with the bus operators all the time to progress the training that we have talked about to ensure that our contracts are delivering the safer buses that we have talked about and to monitor the data that we have talked about. That results in ongoing dialogue with the bus operators, they do follow up on investigations on any incidents that are significant that happen and they are looking at the data. There are people scrutinising this and working with the bus operators every day to try to drive this forward and where it is not happening in the right way, we will take action and we will follow up.

Neil Garratt AM: If someone is killed or seriously injured on the road by a bus, what investigation does TfL carry out into that?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): It is called a Notification and Investigation of Major Incidents (NIMI) process. There is a Go Look See immediately to go and look at the location where it happened to see if there is anything at all within the physical environment of the road network that could immediately be amended. Maybe there is a problem with the lights or maybe there is a defect with the road network that we could address. We work really closely with the bus operator to understand what the circumstances are and that results in a report, which is examined, and then actions are put in place as far as possible to address it. If it was unfortunately a serious incident, the police would be likely to be involved and if it was, indeed, a fatal incident there would be a fatal collision investigation by the police and we would work very closely to understand any learnings from that process. It is quite extensive and I can think of a number of examples where we have very carefully looked at the lessons that have come from such tragedies.

Neil Garratt AM: I am very conscious of time and hopefully this is a “Yes” or “No” answer. It is TfL that carries out that process and it happens every time there is a KSI?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): No, it is jointly with the operator in the incident of a bus and --

Neil Garratt AM: OK, but is there a TfL person there?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Yes.

Neil Garratt AM: OK. I will perhaps draw that to an end, Chair. I am very conscious of time.

I have a couple of questions about e-scooters. I have some written questions, some further questions, and if I may, Chair, can we add them to a letter subsequently?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Yes, we are going to be writing with some follow-up.

Neil Garratt AM: In terms of the e-scooter trial that is coming to an end shortly, how would you assess briefly how that has gone to date and where that might go next? Perhaps if we start on the other end since we have heard less from you.

Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman, Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, City of London Corporation): Sure. We have not had conclusive data on it yet. Obviously, it is still ongoing. We have worked closely with the operators providing the e-scooters and the City [of London] Police have been quite heavily involved in trying to make sure that the regulations are very clearly set out for how people operate. One thing we have noticed is the type of people renting the e-scooters is very different to the type of people who ride bikes or use other modes of transport. It does seem we are able to reach a wider demographic through that trial, but we have not had conclusive data and I could not really say more right now.

Neil Garratt AM: OK, thank you. Will?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London’s Walking and Cycling Commissioner): E-scooters: I cannot remember how many times I have been asked about the e-scooters but the e-scooter trial is a DfT national trial on this. London is in a unique situation, as we alluded to earlier, just because of the number of authorities it has required and because of all our colleagues in the boroughs and the number of highway authorities, it took us slightly longer to set up the e-scooter trial than elsewhere in the country. My personal view is e-scooters are not going away. They cannot be uninvented; they are there. It is very clear that the situation with the private e-scooters is simply not working. I was out with one of [Chief Superintendent] Simon’s [Ovens] colleagues the other day and we found one that could do 60mph. 60mph on one of those things? I just would not want to go anywhere near one of those things. There is no regulation and it is horribly confusing for customers to think, “I can buy this, but I can’t use it on public space. Unless I’ve got an estate in Wiltshire, I’m not going to be able to use it.” It is madness.

The objective of our trial was to inform that DfT national study on what role these might play in future urban transport and how we can make them as safe as possible. That is safe for the riders and for the other road users. We did a whole series of things in this to try to improve that safety. One was you had to be 18 years old and you need a provisional driving licence at least to register on the apps that do it. We forced some things. Rather than 60mph, it is 12.5mph max speed in London. Nationally, it is 15mph, but we took the

understanding that 12.5mph would be a more appropriate speed for London. There are technical things, like the diameter of the wheels is important in terms of hitting a bump and particularly with the regulations that we have over potholes and how quickly they need to be filled in. A pothole with a tiny little wheel is going to cause an awful lot of problems. There are no-go areas, there are slow areas and there are designated parking areas. We do not want them scattered all over the pavements. So far in the trial, different boroughs have been on it and it has been a gradual evolution. We now have 3,585 scooters on the ground, and we have had over 500,000 journeys on those. We have been tracking the KSIs, the number of people being killed and seriously injured, and we have had 13 serious injuries reported, no fatalities, on the trial.

Neil Garratt AM: Do you know if the serious injuries were the rider or someone else that they hit?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): I do not have all the details.

Most of them have been the riders and there have been a couple of incidents where it has been someone that they have hit. One of the challenges here is part of the reporting mechanism. These are not registered, legal vehicle types, the reporting mechanisms that exist structurally across the MPS and across things, it is not a specified thing or it has not been. That is one of the challenges. It is ongoing, it would be premature to draw any firm conclusions and I really do not want to at this point. I am cautiously optimistic that making the safety provisions that we brought in have brought in less risk than the private e-scooters. Sadly, we have had three fatalities of people driving private e-scooters. It is too early to say. We are working really closely with the DfT on this, as you would expect. It is a national trial and I do not know where this will go in terms of things with the DfT.

My personal belief is that if it decides to change the law and amend it legally - which it probably should do because, as I said, the current situation is a mess - the Government needs to set out vehicle regulations. It is crazy that they do not exist and they need to be defined, where they can and cannot go, so not on pavements, yes, in bike lanes, yes, on the roads. It needs to give cities the power to manage these if they are legalised as well. Some of you will recall dockless bikes where they got scattered all over the pavements. We need a plan to regulate and make it work for the city in a way that works, but we also need to give the police the powers to adequately enforce this. The ambiguities over the legal status make it very difficult from an enforcement perspective as well, talking to [Chief Superintendent] Simon's [Ovens] colleagues. We can be cautiously optimistic thus far, it is too early to draw those conclusions, but it is very obvious that the *status quo* is not working and that private e-scooters are not safe.

Neil Garratt AM: From the police's point of view for all the reasons that Will has just explained, it is, let us call it, a challenging situation. What safety measures from the police's point of view do you think would be necessary if this was going to become not a trial as it is now, if it was going to become a permanent situation? I suppose we are thinking about the private ones, which Will has just touched on, and also the rental scheme ones.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): There is no ambiguity about their current status in that they are illegal to use on the roads, illegal to have on the pavement or anywhere else. The trial has been welcomed in --

Neil Garratt AM: Sorry. By "ambiguity", I meant the fact you have the scheme ones, which are legal in some boroughs --

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, I was going to come on to that. The trial has been very useful in two areas. One is the input that we in the MPS had with yourselves in terms of coming up with some safety conditions to make them safer, not totally safe but safer. One of the issues we had a particular problem with was the lack of headgear. I understand why eventually it was decided not to have headgear, but that is a glaring issue. We had a doctor at a meeting the other day from The Royal London Hospital, saying that 20% of all serious head injuries coming in now are from people on e-scooters. Now you touched on the lack of reporting and because of all the legal problems around them, people are not reporting when they are having an accident necessarily unless it is a very serious accident involving another vehicle or it is a fatality. We are unsure about the level of reporting.

I absolutely echo the fact that Parliament needs to make a decision on things. Are they staying or are they going and if they are staying, what are the legal requirements around them? I think the private e-scooters are death traps. They do not have suspension, they do not have indication, they throw you off, they have very small turning circles and because of the complete lack of need of insurance or anything else around them, they are death traps. We have gone a long way to see what the trial ones might be like if society decides they are going to stay and what they might be like in a more ordered and more regulated way. Again, I mentioned consistency early on. It is absolutely crazy that there is no regulation around them and we need to have some very clear lines. At the top of the agenda for me would be a requirement for headgear to be worn at all times while they are being ridden but also that wider look at their suspension, their indication and anything else, certainly speed limitation. As [Dr] Will [Norman] said, we have caught people doing 50/55mph on them, we have tested them and they will do 60mph and more. One of the fatalities unfortunately involved a pothole, a little over 1mm, it threw the individual off into the path of an HGV and that individual died. We need consistency, a decision from Parliament about whether we are going to have them or not and the regulations required around them.

Neil Garratt AM: In terms of that enforcement and thinking now specifically about the private ones - let us put the scheme ones to one side for a minute - on the private ones there is presumably a resource allocation issue from the police point of view. I am curious to understand how you think about this. If somebody is just trundling along the road in a fairly safe way at a fairly low speed, regardless of the fact that is illegal, presumably it is debateable whether that is a high priority for the police. Some of the examples you have given are where people are going at very high speeds or they are going along the pavement, weaving through people in pedestrianised streets. I am sure all of us have had lots of emails from people, certainly residents, who think that should be a very high priority for the police.

With the current situation, how do you prioritise your resources from that point of view and how much work is going on? Secondly, in terms of if the private ones were legalised, presumably it would make that enforcement bit easier if, in some of the ways that Will was talking about, say, they were legal on the road in a similar way that electric bicycles are legal on the road and then blatantly illegal on the pavement. Would that make your enforcement job more straightforward?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): There are a number of points there. Just because we see it as pottering along, it does not mean that it cannot be used at high speeds and in different places elsewhere. Although there is a discretionary approach of my officers to deal with what is in front of them, people must understand that if they are riding a non-trial e-scooter they are on a motor vehicle without insurance and without a driving licence in most cases and face the consequences. We certainly have moved to a position where we want to show more discretion to people perhaps using them safely but misguidedly. My boss, Commander Kyle Gordon [Uniformed Operations, Metropolitan Police Service], has done a lot again with the manufacturers who, as [Dr] Will [Norman] said, are

flogging these things merrily. Shops are saying, “Well, we have signs up”, etc, but come on. No one goes in and buys all these hundreds and hundreds of things thinking, “I can’t use them except on a bit of land out in the country”.

They are selling lots of things to people that are not only illegal but are putting people and pedestrians at great risk. One of my sisters is blind, she has had a number of close misses and she is waiting for the day when one of these things is going to sweep her off her feet. She cannot hear them coming and they are not stopping at red traffic lights and things, let alone being on the pavement. She has a great deal of fear there.

Neil Garratt AM: In terms of police resource allocation for enforcement, presumably when you decide “OK, we are going to allocate some resource this week in this place on these things”, your focus is, what, more on the pavement? There are two scenarios. One is that an officer is just going about his or her job and they encounter one and the second one is we have targeted enforcement. Is there targeted enforcement going as well?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes, in 2021 we seized 4,000 of them. Just under 4,000 were seized from people and taken off them and all of those people ended up facing prosecution either for not having a driving licence or for having no insurance. If my officers come across them, I expect them to be dealt with in what they see but, yes, we do have targeted operations, particularly in high footfall areas where we will deploy officers just to deal with that. It is not every day, it is not 24 hours a day, but it is high enough up on my agenda around safety. As [Dr] Will [Norman] said, three people were killed on these in London last year and, sadly, people will be killed in London this year on them, I have no doubt. They are high up on my agenda to deal with, but what I would cry out for is a Parliamentary decision about their status and if they are going to stay, regulation around them, particularly with headgear at the top of the agenda for me.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London’s Walking and Cycling Commissioner): The police’s job is to enforce the law and the legislation is the problem here. I have a huge amount of time for [Chief Superintendent] Simon’s [Ovens] team on how they are managing this. There could well be an important role that these e-scooters play in our streets and our urban transport that shifts people to a greener form of transport, but at the moment it is not working.

Commander [Kyle] Gordon [Uniformed Operations, Metropolitan Police Service] and I wrote to all the major retailers in London just before Christmas to remind them again to make that point to customers that people are buying these things without really being aware. Why would you spend £400 on something that you cannot actually use in the city in which you live? It is not being prioritised in that respect. Secondly, in terms of Simon talking about his sister’s visual impairment, one of the things that has come out of this trial already is the need for these things to have sounds on them. That came out of the trial in London, the current design of the machines does not accommodate for that, but we have asked for future ones to have that. One of the outcomes of the trial already is positive in terms of this, in terms of how we can build these into the future.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): OK, thank you. I have got Assembly Member Desai, who wants to come in specifically on this. Then, Members, we have got four sections still to go, we are going to be here probably until 1pm and we just need to pick up a bit of pace.

Unmesh Desai AM: I should say, Chief Superintendent and Will, at Christmas in Westfield I saw a reputable retailer selling these things without any warning notices or any signs whatsoever, unless things were explained at the till when one of these things was bought. Simon, you said that 4,000 of these e-scooters were seized in

2021. It has been recently reported that your enforcement of illegal e-scooter use has changed, with scooters no longer routinely seized unless a scooter rider is a repeat offender. Can we expect this change in enforcement stance to be reviewed once the current e-scooter trials have finished? Can I just give a context, Chair, if I may in terms of data, because there is some data that I got from the Mayor's Office? In 2021, in the first six months alone there were 258 incidents, some sort of collision involving e-scooters, as opposed to 266 for the whole of 2020 and in 2018 there were only nine reported incidents. We can see it has escalated dramatically.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): As with any other uninsured motor vehicle, it would be seized and taken off the street and this was the same for e-scooters. The position of the organisation changed late in November [2021] that unless there was an aggravating factor - ie, they were being used dangerously, for instance, at very high speed or on the pavements or the person had been previously warned - the default position would be to speak to them, ask them to get off it, explain the rule around them, ask them to wheel it home, record those details and if in future they were stopped again, then it would be seized. My understanding is that will be continuing to be our position so far as enforcement is concerned going ahead.

Unmesh Desai AM: Judging from your answers, Will and Simon, with the right legislation you said you are cautiously optimistic but things would help in achieving Vision Zero. Is that right?

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): Yes.

Unmesh Desai AM: Thank you, Chair.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We are moving on to safe behaviour, cycling and motorcycling/motorbikes. Assembly Member Prince?

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): My first question is to Shravan. Do you think enough is being done to support cyclists through training and is there sufficient money available to do this?

Shravan Joshi MBE (Deputy Chairman, Streets and Walkways Sub Committee, City of London Corporation): From our local perspective, yes, we feel there is sufficient funding to support that level of training. It is almost ironic that we are providing training for the vulnerable on the road but do not have the same emphasis on those that are the main perpetrators of fatalities. We feel that there probably could be a shift in emphasis on information and training for drivers of vehicles in the metal cages, rather than just those vulnerable groups. Obviously, there is a proportion of errant riders as well and we will continue that training process, but we think there is probably a broader message shift that could be put around, for example, the recent changes in the Highway Code. More emphasis needs to be put around informing drivers of that and, we think, perhaps a shift in mental liability in how people use our road systems.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Good, thank you very much. That has answered two questions that I had.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Sorry, could I just add to that because I slightly disagree on the funding point? Would that be possible, Keith?

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Yes, why not?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): I do not think there is adequate funding available for cycle training at the moment. We provide or we have provided Bikeability skills for kids in schools and there are three levels of that through ability Level 1, 2, 3, predictably. Then there are also the adult skill sessions that we provide for people through the boroughs and there is an online cycle skills piece. Historically, the way that funding for cycling training works in London is that TfL has provided a budget for cycle training in London and the boroughs have also been providing funding through their Local Implementation Plans (LIP), which is a discretionary piece. In 2019/20, to give you some idea of the numbers, the TfL money was about £2.5 million into cycle training that went through the boroughs and is provided by the boroughs because it is a local thing, but then that was topped up by £4.2 million of the boroughs' money to provide that. The situation at the moment is that TfL has managed to retain and keep that core money, the £2.55 million, which is one of the few bits that has not been cut due to funding, but the borough money through the LIPs has been cut. That has been replaced through a sort of emergency priority which has been staff, in-flight schemes and safety-critical schemes because there has been less money available. The net impact of that is that there is £4 million less money going to cycle training in London at the moment.

Some boroughs and the city clearly manage it, but the city does have fewer residents than other boroughs. In other boroughs, this is becoming a real problem, not just for the amount of training that can happen, but what I am also very worried about is the impact on the cycle trainers and instructors themselves. If we lose that critical resource and they do not have enough training to sustain themselves and they go off and do other jobs, then it becomes very hard to continue that. It is another indication of the impact of uncertainty and lack of money.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): OK, thank you. I am going to let that ride because of time. Can I ask Chief Superintendent Ovens why you think that motorcycle user safety is such a difficult area to tackle and what more do you think can be done to reduce fatalities? Up until the pandemic, it has been really stubborn, around about 30-odd motorcyclists dying every year.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): We are in a good position with the amount of training that is going on, but we still have the issue around the use of the motorbikes in that we find that many of the road accidents concerned are more about the driving ability or behaviour of the motorcyclists than anything else. For instance, most of the fatal collisions involving motorbikes have been not involving another motor vehicle, with the cyclist coming off/hitting a piece of street furniture because of speed, control or whatever. Yes, more can be done, but again this is more to do with the control of the motorcyclist, perhaps a speed limit thing again coming into here about the expectation of the speed being done. I drew up a little list of legislative changes I would like across a number of things and one of those would be to formally limit the speed of motorcycles in London. Why should they go above 20mph or 30mph, whatever the decision is, at all? Have some sort of limiter to be required on a motorbike if they were to be used in London along the lines of the emissions requirements, that you simply cannot come in or you pay a huge penalty/charge to come into London if it does not reach those criteria.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): I would argue that it is not a very sensible suggestion because I have to ride 50 miles an hour to get into central London on the A13 where 50mph is quite legal and then when I am in central London I have to drive at whatever the speed limit is. I do not quite see how that would work, to be perfectly blunt.

Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens (Roads and Transport Policing Command, Metropolitan Police Service): Of course, no one has to ride at any particular speed. People choose to ride at a speed and these are maximum speed limits rather than minimum speed limits. We said right at the beginning that there does need to be some decision-making and some political leadership around that. If we are really going to get to no one being killed on the road, one of the big issues about people being killed on our streets is speed. If people cannot be trusted to stick to the speed limits, particularly in these more vulnerable categories like pedal cycles, motorcycles, e-scooters, sometimes some tough decisions need to be made and some impositions. That includes a 20mph limit generally.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Sorry, with all due respect, on a motorbike how do you get from Romford to Canning Town if you are driving at 20mph on the A13 where you have got a juggernaut coming up your backside? In fact, that is a very good point because around Canning Town there is a flyover which reduces to 30mph, which has got no signage other than the initial signage. Every time I use that, I have cars and lorries up my rear, forcing me to go faster because everyone else is doing 40 and 50mph and not respecting the speed limit. There is not a single reminder on that flyover to tell people that 30mph is the limit.

Can I just move to TfL? I do agree absolutely with the Chief Superintendent around training and the fact that there does need to be more training. I have asked this of the Mayor before. As an organisation, cannot TfL try to have a conversation with the delivery companies and ask if we can have some kind of voluntary code? I am an experienced motorcyclist and I have the scars to prove it. I watch motorcyclists – I saw one last night – and they are not even in control of the thing they are riding. It is suicidal.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I do agree with you on this and I will update you. Your message has got through because we have been having those conversations. I have just two points of context though. There is a real issue just about getting the basic training right, the training that is set by national Government. We know that 64% of motorcyclists who are killed or seriously injured in London are on smaller motorbikes, the ones under 125[cc], and you can gain access to those with a quick day's training that does not have a pass or fail. Back to what can national Government do, it can really strengthen that and help us in that. We do, as TfL working with the MPS, offer training on top of that in terms of bike-safe training, which is one-to-one training, and beyond Compulsory Basic Training (CBT), training drivers for delivery drivers.

We have been meeting with the delivery industry and we are interested in the idea of some minimum safety standards that it might sign up to. I know you are meeting with colleagues within TfL later this week and they can update you in more detail on those conversations. Just as we did at the freight industry at the beginning of talking about safety, we brought them together and we talked about what we could do collectively. That is exactly the same approach we are taking with the delivery industry now. Therefore, there is a fruitful way forward in that area.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Probably what is important is that shift, given that the riders of these bikes, their status, whether they are employees or not, was an obstacle in the past. Now that there has been a court ruling around that, I would hope that you can start to make some progress on getting these minimum safety standards, because I constantly see bikes all over the pavement and people driving dangerously.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): The rest of our Vision Zero work also applies to motorbikes, the safer speed, safer streets and that sort of thing. I did ask the team to look at safer junctions. The work that we have done on junctions, for some reason people also fixate on that just as a cycling issue. It is not a cycling issue. There is pedestrian safety and also for motorbikes. The evidence

shows that so far the work that we have done on those junctions has had an 18% improvement of all types of severity for people motorcycling through those areas. We need to think that the changes that we are making to the roads make the junctions safer for everybody, all road users, and it is not just exclusive to one particular mode.

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): Can I ask you again what is being done to allow motorcyclists to use bus lanes, which clearly does have an effect on those safety?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Motorcyclists can access a large number of TLRN bus lanes already. As far as I am aware there is no further work to expand that access, but different boroughs may be interested in that as well. That is an update on that. Do you have something more specific in mind with regard to TfL?

Keith Prince AM (Deputy Chairman): The last time I asked the Mayor the question he said that he would do something about it. That is not the case, then.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Motorcycles are allowed in many of the TfL bus lanes and you will be pleased to know that we have now made those 24-hour bus lanes. That creates a safe space for a reliable bus network, makes it safer for some of those motorcycle journeys as well as some of the cyclists using that space. Therefore, there has been a change in that space.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Assembly Member Baker, and maybe roll our next section into one or two questions.

Elly Baker AM: I have a couple of questions initially for Lilli around post-collision analysis. Could you talk about any lessons that have been learned from your post-collision analysis?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Just to make sure, do you mean the fatal analysis that we are looking at or just in terms of how we approach the overall understanding of collisions?

Elly Baker AM: Specific learnings from fatal analysis would be useful, and if you have anything else to add to that, that would be useful.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): Starting at the broadest level, we obviously work closely with the MPS to get all the data and learnings from any collisions. Those are analysed both by area and by understanding of rates so that we can begin to pinpoint where dangerous areas are on our road network. That information informs the safer junctions prioritisation as well as other work that we do with the boroughs.

When we want to understand a particular user group in particular, such as motorcyclists or pedestrians, we then have commissioned quite often Transport Research Laboratory (TRL), as experts in this field, to delve deeply into a wide number of the fatal files that the police will have compiled during those investigations. From that, for example, that work has directly informed the work we did with both the DVS, as a previous example, and the Bus Safety Standard, because it allowed us to understand – giving a very obvious example – that with cyclists it was the left-hand turning manoeuvre and it was the front left-hand bumper of HGVs that were disproportionately identified. That kind of detailed analysis can give you such insight into the behaviours, for

example – I do not want to harp on about cyclists – of cyclists going up the inside of an HGV, and the vehicle design.

We have more research that is looking into motorcycle safety and has done further research in this area that will be published later this year. I have yet to see it in draft. That will be furthering the insights that we have had to date. We will continue to do that. I am trying to think if there is anything else that I can offer you. It is that kind of work that drives our understanding of how we evidence – it starts with the data and then you go into a certain area and drive into what the fatal files can tell you.

I would also say that that is not the only way to get insight. Some of the other areas that we are looking at are hospital admission data. On the very point that you raised about e-scooters, not all incidents are recorded by the police. Therefore, we often look at hospital incidents data to see if there is a mismatch or if there are things that are happening that are not necessarily being driven through the collision statistics. We also work with innovators and data companies. Our idea would be to get more information on near misses and close passes because that is the information that we need to understand how to prevent collisions before they occur.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): Could I add one thing? Lilli is right that the fatality work is important and it has shaped why we came up with the update on the report and on the Vision Zero plan and those things. However, as I said before, the difference between somebody being seriously injured and a fatality is often centimetres in terms of distance of something happening, or seconds in terms of where they were. Thankfully, the number of people being killed on the road is going down. It is still too high, but a lot of our analysis is done on serious injuries as well because there is a larger number of them and there is more learning to be had and potential patterns can come out of that in a different way that is not always there with the fatality. Therefore, it is important that we look at the fatality in detail but also look at the KSIs.

Elly Baker AM: That is interesting. I do think that near misses, if they do not result in serious injury, are very, very difficult to find out and it would be interesting to hear any more information, other than hospital admissions, about what other ways you can find that out. I do not think we have time to go into a lot of that.

Are there any emerging technologies that you think are coming over the horizon that could help road safety objectives in the future?

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): If you look at the figures on where there have been massive changes across the UK in the number of people being killed and seriously injured on the road, it is inside vehicles, in terms of passengers inside the cars over history. There have been massive technological advances, whether that is crumple zones, seatbelts, airbags, all of the above. There has been far less on the outside of those vehicles and I think that the adoption of a lot of the technology in the UK has been sadly slow, whether that is the intelligent speed assistance (ISA), that Keith [Prince AM] mentioned comes on his car, which gives you an indication if you are breaking the speed limit. I do not know what car Keith has but it does not come on all the standard models of some of the vehicles and is not a default on all vehicles, sadly.

Similarly with the advanced emergency braking (AEB). In my view some of these things should be mandatory for all vehicles coming into this country, and that is a national piece. As I said earlier, vehicle regulations are challenging and some of that has been slower than anticipated. Alcolocks are available, where you can do a breath test to unlock the vehicle from the very outset. That would be a great thing to have on our vehicles.

You cannot not even start the car if you are breaking the law on alcohol. There are those technologies that can become an advantage.

Technology is a double-edge sword, though. There have been massive advancements in some technologies that have led to more problems on the roads. Mobile phones and driver distraction in the vehicles is one of what you called the fatal four core reasons why there are problems. If you look at the size of some of the vehicles on London's roads. If you look at an old Mini back when I was a kid and you look a new Mini, there is nothing mini about that new Mini. It is a large vehicle. Look at the growth of SUVs on our roads. The sheer physics of kinetic energy of a larger, heavier vehicle hitting someone makes them intrinsically more dangerous. Therefore, there is a double-edged sword with the technology. Some of it is there and can make it much better. We have been very slow to bring that into the UK.

TfL is leading the way on these new things. Every new bus now has the ISA adaptation that means that it will go at the speed that is legal in that area. That helps make the buses safer but it also helps slow down the vehicles in that area because you have a slow-moving bus in front of you. Sorry, not a slow-moving bus, a vehicle moving at an appropriate speed and legal speed for that road.

Elly Baker AM: An appropriately-moving bus.

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): To add to that, when we put together the original Vision Zero action plan, we commissioned research from TRL that looked at the impact of those vehicle technologies that Will mentioned, particularly ISA, alcolocks, assisted braking and so on. Those were shown to have a significant impact if they were introduced together in helping us meet our targets. The fact that we have been slow as a country in introducing those will impact on the speed at which we reach our targets.

The final point to note is that the European Union (EU) is introducing the General Safety Regulation (GSR), which comes into force in European countries in 2022. It includes the requirement for a number of these measures within new vehicles. We are encouraging central Government to follow and not fall behind on that. We would encourage central Government to match the standards in the UK as set by the EU GSR so that we do not fall behind. That is important to make sure that we continue to see the benefits of new technology. We know that in particular ISA will be a very important measure and we are introducing it on our own vehicle fleet, where it has reduced speeding incidents by over 90%.

Elly Baker AM: Thank you, that is very helpful. Finally on the Vision Zero dashboard, how successful do you feel that dashboard has been an what figures do you have on stakeholder groups using this resource?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I know Siân [Berry AM] mentioned the Vision Zero dashboard, but this is not on enforcement data but on collision data. I was left thinking about whether we should be thinking about whether we can combine other data into that data. That was an action I took away from this to have a think about it.

The Vision Zero dashboard, we had always been providing London collision data but this was refreshed and made a much more effective tool through the use of Power BI mechanisms in it. It allows the public to get a real insight into what is happening on your road and your neighbourhood in terms of what type of collisions. It shows data from 2017 and it allows the user to filter it. If you are interested in a postcode or in a particular user type you can get that information. I have some update in terms of who is using it. Obviously there are many different potential users but one of the key ones that we are interested in is making sure that the

boroughs fully have access to all the data that they need. The dashboard is a quick way for them getting that but we also provide much more detail, bespoke information if they require it.

In terms of the dashboard, it has been 30 views a day in recent months. It has also been adopted by the DfT at a national level. We could do more to promote it and make sure it is being used as much as possible. It is user friendly and it is a great way of getting insight into what is happening on your road and in your area. If you have particular concerns, it is how to get more information on that. I would always say that we can also, as an institution, provide more detailed and bespoke information if any user has requirements for that, to help them get the insight they need into road risk.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): I know that 30 users a day is not TikTok. It is not going to drive that same volume of internet usage but I know that every stakeholder group that comes to me asking for a bus lane or a pedestrian crossing or improvements outside a school comes with the data from that dashboard. Therefore, it is being used at a borough level for planning. We know that boroughs have been using that as part of the next phase of the local implementation plan and what scheme they prioritise, because they have been using it and they have shown us. I also know that stakeholders are coming to me as part of the campaigning and lobbying for road improvements in their area and I regularly find that data being quoted back to me.

Elly Baker AM: That is good to hear. Maybe quality not quantity on the dashboard at the moment. Thanks, Chair.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Lovely, thank you. We might write to get some of the detail on offences, as you talked about - the alcohol lock, which is interesting - to get an understanding of drug, drink and other causes. We will put that in our correspondence afterwards.

Anne, very briefly, could you pick up the lead questions on those two blocks and then we will move to finish this meeting?

Anne Clarke AM: Thank you, Chair. Which national and international examples of Vision Zero do you think London could learn from?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): The classic, of course, is Sweden. I work very closely with transport colleagues in Sweden and also at an international level through the United Nations (UN) to try to understand what is happening nationally with different countries. Will quoted earlier the experience of cities such as Oslo and Helsinki. Those are very inspirational in terms of the fact that they have at certain points achieved the goal. However, it is perhaps the experience at the national level in Sweden. Where that is particularly influential is the culture point of view. It has done what we are seeking to do over many, many years in terms of technology and redesigning roads but most important in terms of influencing public understanding and acceptance road danger. It is at a totally different level of awareness than it is currently in London and I look to that for inspiration.

I also think no one city has it exactly right but there is much to learn from many. Other cities such as Paris are doing interesting things in terms of reallocating road space. In terms of leadership, when New York originally launched its Vision Zero scheme it was also inspirational. However, it is the consistency of what we have seen in some of the northern European cities that has led to this visible change.

Dr Will Norman (Mayor of London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner): It does not need to be badged Vision Zero. A city does not need a Vision Zero policy for us to learn from it. I have learnt a huge amount from the Netherlands in terms of its cycle infrastructure. I went on a tour. It has a Dutch Cycling Embassy that provides this service for other cities that are interested in improving things.

When we looked at e-scooter work, the team did a lot of work looking at understanding what was going on in Tel Aviv, in Austin, in San Francisco, in Paris, to shape our response to what we would do on e-scooters. This issue is always learning. However, interestingly, people are coming to us to learn as well. It is not one-way traffic. The Dutch are so good at some of the cycling things, but we now have over 300 school streets in London and people are coming to us to understand what is going on there to make it safer around schools. Therefore, I think the international and national learning is a two-way process and it does not need to be done under the badge of Vision Zero to achieve the Vision Zero outcomes that we want to see.

Anne Clarke AM: Excellent. The final question of the day is would a UK-based approach to Vision Zero or Vision Zero under a different badge be beneficial or do different areas require different approaches? That is probably a cultural question but do you think a national picture would be beneficial?

Lilli Matson (Chief Safety, Health and Environment Officer, Transport for London): I definitely would welcome a strong direction at the national level that we are aspiring towards zero casualties. That would allow us to do a number of things. It would allow us to have a national speed-limit map, which means that ISA would be able to work nationally. We have had to do one in London that works at London level, but why not nationally? It would allow us to have the same safety standards that we have aspired to in London for lorries at a national level. That would reduce costs nationally for logistics fleets that have to serve the London market and other markets.

It would, crucially, help to move this whole issue around road culture. People in London are not immune to the advertising that they see to the broader dialogue about what is good and what goes on the roads. We have to move to the position that it is no longer acceptable that people should die and that that is just the risk you take. Therefore, I think a strong drive at a national level would help very much move that along. Of course the implementation at a local level would need to be relevant to that local area and reflect those needs, but it is more about saying that we want to reduce risk and make our roads safer for everybody. As a goal, that is what Vision Zero offers us and it would really help.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Does anyone else want to add on to that? No. Let us leave it there. I thank our guests so much for your time. I am sorry we have gone on so long. It is such an important topic and there are so many different aspects. Our last meeting overran as well. We will probably write to you with a few more questions. Thank you to Lilli Matson, Shravan Joshi, Will Norman and Chief Superintendent Simon Ovens for your contribution today.