



House of Commons
Transport Committee

Cycling safety

Third Report of Session 2014–15

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 14 July 2014*

The Transport Committee

The Transport Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Transport and its Associate Public Bodies.

Current membership

Mrs Louise Ellman (*Labour/Co-operative, Liverpool Riverside*) (*Chair*)

Sarah Champion (*Labour, Rotherham*)

Jim Dobbin (*Labour/Co-operative, Heywood and Middleton*)

Jim Fitzpatrick (*Labour, Poplar and Limehouse*)

Karen Lumley (*Conservative, Redditch*)

Jason M^cCartney (*Conservative, Colne Valley*)

Karl M^cCartney (*Conservative, Lincoln*)

Mr Adrian Sanders (*Liberal Democrat, Torbay*)

Chloe Smith (*Conservative, Norwich North*)

Graham Stringer (*Labour, Blackley and Broughton*)

Martin Vickers (*Conservative, Cleethorpes*)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

The Reports of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the internet at <http://www.parliament.uk/transcom>. A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

The Reports of the Committee and the formal minutes relating to that report are available in a printed volume. Written evidence is published on the internet only.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Gordon Clarke (Clerk), Nick Beech (Second Clerk), Richard Jeremy (Committee Specialist), Alexandra Meakin (Committee Specialist), Adrian Hitchins (Senior Committee Assistant), Stewart McIlvenna (Committee Assistant), and Hannah Pearce (Media Officer)

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Transport Committee, House of Commons, 14 Tothill Street, London SW1H 9NB, The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 6263; the Committee's email address is transcom@parliament.uk

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Summary	3
1 Introduction	5
2 How safe is cycling?	7
3 Cyclist safety measures	9
20mph zones	9
Education	11
Cycle infrastructure	14
4 HGVs	20
Volumetric mixers	23
5 The role of Government	26
Funding	28
6 Conclusion	30
Conclusions and recommendations	31
Formal Minutes	36
Witnesses	37
Published written evidence	38
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	42

Summary

In 2013, 109 cyclists were killed, and 3,143 were seriously injured in road accidents in England, Scotland and Wales. An increase in the number of people cycling in the past decade may mean that these figures hide a decline in risk of cycling, as the proportion of cyclists killed or seriously injured per journey falls. This, however, is no comfort to the families and friends of cyclists who have lost their lives, nor does it improve the perception of risk around cycling. We are clear that there is far more that can be done to improve the safety of our roads and to encourage more people to cycle.

Reducing the dangers faced by cyclists on the road—including poorly designed junctions, aggressive driving and unsegregated, narrow cycle lanes—will mean thinking about the kind of communities we want to live in. Our roads must be safe for all who want to use them, whether pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists or cars. Infrastructure projects should consider cycling from the earliest stage, with road design treating cycling as a valid form of transport, rather than as an afterthought. There is no one-size-fits-all solution that is right for all our villages, towns and cities, so we call on local authorities to work with cyclists and local residents to develop and design ways of making roads safer.

We repeat the recommendation in our 2012 Report for greater political leadership. The Prime Minister's support for cycling must be demonstrated by a steady and planned increase in the funding for cycling, which should reach £10 a head by 2020. The Department for Transport can and should do more to promote a culture of mutual respect and safety among all road users by, for example, increasing the availability of cycle training, amending the driving test and reducing risks associated with HGVs. Above all, as we stressed in our 2012 Report, improving road safety requires a cross-departmental effort. We are concerned that this has not yet materialised. We look forward to a clear commitment, backed by a timetable for action, on making our roads safe for all users.

1 Introduction

1. In July 2012 we warned that the number of road fatalities should be a wake-up call for the Government to provide stronger leadership on road safety.¹ We warned that, although there was evidence of an increased commitment to cycling safety, without stronger leadership, there would be no progress in the cross-departmental work required to make the roads safer.² A year later the Prime Minister called for a “cycling revolution” to make it easier and safer to cycle, and to take the success of the country’s track cyclists onto the roads.³ The safety of these roads for cycling remains, however, a matter of great concern. Despite a small fall in 2013 in the overall number of cyclists killed or seriously injured, the fact that 109 cyclists still lost their lives on the road in Great Britain last year demonstrates the need to look at what steps are required to make our roads a safe place for cyclists of all ages and abilities, reflecting the position of cyclists as valid road users.

2. We launched this inquiry in November 2013 with a call for evidence on the safety of cycling, particularly in cities and towns. We asked the public to share their views on what central and local government could do to improve cycling safety; and on the feasibility and desirability of segregating cyclists from other road users. We also sought tweets highlighting examples of local cycle infrastructure. We received around 140 formal written submissions and numerous tweets. We held three oral evidence sessions in which we heard from cycling groups, motoring organisations, local authorities; the Metropolitan Police; the Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency; the Road Haulage Association and Batched on Site Association; Val Shawcross, the then Chair of the London Assembly Transport Committee; Andrew Gilligan, the Mayor of London’s Cycling Commissioner; Chris Boardman, Adviser to British Cycling; and Robert Goodwill MP, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Department for Transport (the Minister). We would like to thank all those who contributed to our inquiry.

3. This Report builds on our *Road Safety* Report and considers the developments in the two years since the publication of that Report in July 2012. Cycling and road safety have continued to have a prominent place in public debate: in Westminster the All-Party Parliamentary Cycling’s Group report, *Get Britain Cycling*, called for a “transformation of our towns, streets and communities, and to the way we think about cycling”; with a long-term ambition of increasing cycle use from less than 2% of journeys in 2011, to 10% of journeys in 2025 and 25% by 2050.⁴ Over 36,000 people have now signed up to The Times “Cities fit for cycling” campaign, which has continued to campaign to improve cyclist safety and for “a different kind of urban realm”.⁵ There have also been developments in Government policy, not least the Prime Minister’s personal commitment outlined at the

1 Transport Committee, Second Report of Session 2012-13, *Road Safety*, HC 506, para 52

2 Transport Committee, Second Report of Session 2012-13, *Road Safety*, HC 506, para 40

3 GOV.UK, *Government shifts cycling up a gear* (12 August 2013)

4 All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group, *Get Britain Cycling*, April 2013

5 “Second gear”, The Times, 5 November 2013

start of this chapter, but also numerous cycling safety initiatives from the Department for Transport.⁶ At a regional level the Mayor of London has published his *Vision for Cycling in London*, setting out ambitious plans for a “a true Crossrail for the bicycle [...] the longest substantially-segregated continuous cycle route of any city in Europe”.⁷ We have sought to assess the success of these initiatives and to scrutinise proposals for future reforms to make the roads safer for cyclists.

6 GOV.UK, *Government shifts cycling up a gear* (12 August 2013); GOV.UK, *Successful THINK! cycle safety campaign extended* (24 March 2014), GOV.UK, *Major investment in cycle infrastructure*, (30 January 2014); GOV.UK, *Cash boost to get Britain cycling* (28 November 2012)

7 Greater London Authority, *The Mayor's Vision for Cycling in London*, March 2013

2 How safe is cycling?

4. Our starting point was to consider one question: how safe is it to cycle on our roads? In 2012 the number of cyclist fatalities in Great Britain reached its highest level for five years, and the number of cyclists experiencing serious injuries also increased for the eighth successive year.⁸ The figures for 2013, released in June this year, set out a small decrease from the 2012 figures, but still reported 109 cyclists killed and 3,143 seriously injured; figures higher than that of 2011. The Minister stressed his view that “any death on our roads is one too many”.⁹

5. The raw numbers for deaths and serious injuries do not, we heard, take into account the proportion of journeys by bike, and thus the likelihood of being injured or killed on the roads. There has been a substantial increase in the number of journeys by bike: the Department for Transport highlighted road traffic estimates demonstrating a 12% rise in the distance cycled in Great Britain between the 2005–2009 average and 2012, and noted that the National Traffic Survey suggested that the growth in pedal cycle traffic in this period could be closer to 23%.¹⁰ More than 2.1 million adults in England cycle at least once a week, compared to 1.6 million in 2005-06.¹¹ The Department for Transport argued that, per mile travelled in 2012, a cyclist in Great Britain was “no more likely to be killed than a pedestrian”.¹² The previous Government’s February 2010 *Active Travel Strategy* stated that:

The actual risk of cycling is tiny. There is one cyclist death per 33 million kilometres of cycling, while being sedentary presents a much greater risk. Over 50,000 people die in the UK each year due to coronary heart disease related to insufficient physical activity, compared to around 100 cyclists killed on the road.¹³

6. We heard from Dr McNally, Head of the Structural Integrity, Dynamics and Bioengineering Research Group at the University of Nottingham, that in 2011 one cyclist was killed or seriously injured per million miles, and that while this risk appeared to be small, it corresponded “to a 5% chance of being killed or seriously injured whilst cycle commuting 10 miles each way for 10 years.”¹⁴

7. In London the deaths of six cyclists in a period of just a fortnight in November 2013 brought an additional focus to this inquiry. Fourteen cyclists were killed in total in London in 2013, the same number as in 2012.¹⁵ The Greater London Authority (GLA) sought to

8 Department for Transport ([CYS 104](#)) appendix A

9 Q 73

10 Department for Transport ([CYS 40](#)) paras 10-11

11 Sport England, *Active People Survey APS8* (April 2014)

12 Department for Transport ([CYS 104](#)) appendix A

13 Department of Health and Department for Transport, *Active Travel Strategy*, February 2010, p 41

14 Dr Donal McNally ([CYS 119](#)) para 8

15 Greater London Authority, *Pedal cycle casualties, killed or seriously injured* (May 2014)

place the reports of fatalities in London against the context of the city's population, stating that "fourteen deaths in eleven months in a city of 8.3 million people—even when six of the deaths come close together—is not carnage".¹⁶ The Mayor's Commissioner for Cycling, Andrew Gilligan, added further context of a rising number of cyclists and cycle journeys on the road. He told us:

In 2002 there were 118 million cycle journeys in London, of which 20 ended in death. Last year there were 209 million cycle journeys, of which 14 ended in death, so the death rate per journey has more than halved. Serious injuries have come down as well. One journey in every 299,000 ended in serious injury in 2002; it was one in every 320,000 last year.¹⁷

It was therefore safe to cycle in London, Mr Gilligan argued, citing "a dramatic fall in the number and the proportion of cyclists dying on the roads in the last 10 years".¹⁸

8. British Cycling, the national governing body for cycling, stressed that cycling was safe but needed "to be made safer and look safer" if the Government was to achieve its ambitions of increased cycling levels, and tap into the 2.75 million people in this country who wished to cycle more, but were concerned at a perceived lack of safety on the road.¹⁹ A BBC poll in July 2014 reinforced concerns over the lack of safety on the roads: 52% of adults questioned agreed with the statement that it was too dangerous to cycle on the roads in their local area.²⁰ Val Shawcross AM, the then Chair of the London Assembly Transport Committee, argued that improving safety was the only way to achieve "a cycling revolution", as this would encourage a broader demographic of cyclists onto the road.²¹

9. We share the Minister's view that one death on the roads is one too many, and wish to express our sympathies with the families and friends of all the cyclists killed on our roads. We accept that a focus solely on the number of casualties may not reflect a reduction in the proportion of cyclists killed or seriously injured, but believe that road safety measures should seek to reduce the overall number of casualties at the same time as increasing the number of cyclists on the road. Achieving both of these will require steps to increase not only the actual levels of safety for cyclists on the road, but also the perceived levels of safety. This can be achieved through measures that promote the safer sharing of the road between cyclists and drivers; increase understanding of safe cycling among cyclists and drivers, and reduce the risks from poorly-designed or maintained cycling infrastructure.

16 Greater London Authority (CYS 60)

17 Q 52

18 Q 52

19 British Cycling (CYS 143) paras 1-2

20 "Roads 'too dangerous' for cyclists BBC poll suggests", BBC News, 1 July 2014

21 Q 16

3 Cyclist safety measures

10. Cyclists from across the country shared with us their experiences of cycling on roads that were not safe for cycling. On urban roads cyclists reported the dangers of junctions, and in particular, left-turning buses and HGVs. Cycling on rural roads meant a lower risk of collisions, but when collisions did occur they were more likely to end in death or serious injury. There was, we heard, a range of factors affecting how safe cyclists felt on the roads, including the existing road safety measures, cyclist and driver behaviour, and road design and maintenance. We asked for ways that these factors could be addressed to improve cyclist safety. We received dozens of suggestions, including examples of policies, schemes and infrastructure design from other European countries, including the Netherlands and Denmark. There was a recognition, however, of a different cycling culture between countries, and indeed, between cities and towns, and rural areas. It could not be assumed, we heard, that successful models for increasing cycle safety abroad could be simply transported to a different context and have the same effect.²² We have set out our views on some of the suggestions we received.

20mph zones

11. Several witnesses called for a reduction in speed limits in local roads, noting that a cyclist involved in a collision with a car travelling at 20mph had a 2.5% chance of a fatal injury, compared to a 20% chance if the car was travelling at 30mph.²³ There was also, we heard, less chance of collisions when cars travelled at lower speeds, as they had more time to react to cyclists and take action to avoid collisions: Sustrans told us that there had been a 60% reduction in injury collisions in 250 existing 20 mph zones.²⁴ Sustrans noted, however, that the “profound effects on road safety” that could be achieved with lower speed limits required the police to enforce these limits.²⁵ This was highlighted by several witnesses as unlikely, due to limited resources. Councillor David Hodge, Leader of Surrey County Council told us:

The problem is that it is all very well putting in a 20 mph limit, but unless somebody is going to enforce it you have wasted a whole load of money. My view is that I have no intention of wasting public money putting in 20 mph zones. When I drove here today I went through Kingston and saw the extent of a 20 mph zone. Nobody was doing 20 mph, but 20 mph was painted on roads almost half a mile from the schools. It went on and on, and nobody was doing it. That is the problem. If you have a 20 mph limit and people obey it, that is fine, but I do not have the resources—I do not think the police in

22 TRL Ltd (CYS 68), para 8

23 Brake (CYS 129), Sustrans (CYS 058) para 10

24 Richard Armitage, David Hurdle, Adrian Lord and Alex Sully (CYS 128) para 54, Sustrans (CYS 058) para 6

25 Sustrans (CYS 058) para 6

Surrey have the resources—to man nearly 600 different sites with a 20 mph limit, never mind looking at towns and everything else.²⁶

In Chichester, where West Sussex County Council introduced 20mph limits for all residential streets in 2012, the local cycling campaign group, ChiCycle, told us that the police had been “very reluctant” to enforce the 20mph limit, due to limits on their resources.²⁷ The costs of introducing 20 mph zones were also highlighted by witnesses. Councillor Ian Davey, Deputy Leader of Brighton and Hove Council, told there was a case for default 20 mph zones, due to the cost of introducing lower speed limits on certain roads:

At the moment we have to mark all the 20 mph roads as an exception. It just means that, as it is, there is a lot more work—a lot more infrastructure, paint on the ground, signs and expense—so changing that default would make it cheaper, easier and safer.²⁸

Councillor Davey added that, in his view, reducing speed limits, and making the roads safer would not have “anything other than a positive impact on the viability of local economies”.²⁹ Several witnesses also called for 20 mph zones to be accompanied by traffic calming measures to encourage reduced speed, such as sinusoidal profile speed humps, to help the enforcement of the lower speed limit.³⁰

12. Local authorities should be encouraged to consider introducing 20 mph limits, accompanied by traffic calming measures, in high-risk areas to improve the safety of all road users. When a car collides with a cyclist, the outcome of the incident can differ significantly depending on the speed of the car. A lower speed limit in residential areas could not only improve safety, but could also contribute to creating town and city environments that people of all ages can enjoy as pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. We note, however, that lower speed limits will not be appropriate or necessary on all roads, and in all areas and consultation with local residents to ensure local support for lower speed limits will be critical to their success. It is also for local police forces to consider how much priority is placed at present on the enforcement of lower speed limits.

13. *It is for local authorities to consider whether lower speed limits in residential areas, as part of a wider package of cycle safety measures, would be appropriate for their local environment. We ask the Government to consider what steps it could take to make it easier and cheaper for local authorities to introduce lower speed limits.*

26 Q 164

27 ChiCycle (CYS_055)

28 Q 164

29 Q 164

30 Anoop Shah (CYS0018), Shirley and John Littlefair (CYS 125)

Education

14. The Road Danger Reduction Forum stated that the main danger to cyclists was the behaviour of drivers, whether they were behind the wheel of a lorry, car or bus.³¹ For this reason, the most effective way of increasing cyclist safety was viewed as changing driver behaviour.³² The not-for-profit research company, Road Safety Analysis, endorsed this view, concluding from an analysis of DfT statistics that most crashes resulted from human error.³³

15. We received evidence calling for a change of culture among drivers and cyclists to change behaviour and reduce errors. In a written evidence submission that was criticised by some other witnesses, Greater Manchester Police reported what they perceived to be a “culture” among cyclists of treating “red automatic traffic signals as give ways”, cycling on the footpath instead of the road, wearing dark clothing and not using lights.³⁴ Councillor Helyn Clack of Surrey County Council warned of examples of discourteous behaviour by cyclists which had startled horses and blocked roads.³⁵ Many cyclists called for the wider use of advanced stop lines at signal-controlled junctions and explained why currently they considered it could be safer to break the law by riding through red lights.³⁶ Several criticised the aggressive behaviour of other cyclists.³⁷ We also received substantial evidence from cyclists regarding driver behaviour: one cyclist told us that it was “usual to experience hostile driving at some point every week”.³⁸ Another cyclist argued that “the single biggest contributor to poor cyclist safety” was “driver behaviour and attitudes”.³⁹

16. A consistent theme was the need for cycle safety training: to help cyclists identify the safest position on the road, and for drivers to understand why it is safer for a cyclist to be part of the traffic stream, and not ride next to the kerb. Access to such training, however, was not comprehensive. The Greater London Authority stated in evidence that it funded cycle training for every schoolchild in London who wanted to take up the scheme.⁴⁰ Nationally the Department for Transport spoke of the £24 million funding available to Local Highway Authorities and School Games Organiser Host Schools, which would allow a minimum of 600,000 children between April 2013 and March 2015 to receive Bikeability training.⁴¹ Despite this funding, the Bikeability scheme was reported as being available to only half of all school children.⁴² For adults, access was also varied, with examples of best

31 Road Danger Reduction Forum ([CYS 114](#)) para 4.5

32 Road Danger Reduction Forum ([CYS 114](#)) para 4.5

33 Road Safety Analysis ([CYS 28](#))

34 Greater Manchester Police ([CYS 39](#)) para 7

35 Q 160

36 Tim Gent ([CYS 141](#)) para 4; Simon Lay ([CYS 117](#)) paras 2.3, 4.3, Hari Lehal ([CYS 79](#))

37 Tim Gent ([CYS 141](#)) para 3a; Amanda Carter ([CYS 43](#))

38 Mr Stephen Bellows ([CYS 41](#)) para 4

39 Mark Goddard ([CYS 140](#))

40 Greater London Authority ([CYS 60](#))

41 Department for Transport ([CYS 40](#)) para 18

42 British Cycling ([CYS 143](#)) para 30

practice in some local authorities which promoted free or low-cost cycle training under the branding of urban cycling skills.⁴³ There was considerable support for extending the scheme: Edmund King, President of the AA described cycle training as a “life skill”, and noted that only 25% of AA members who cycle regularly had received such training.⁴⁴ The All-Party Parliamentary Cycling Group called for cycle training to be available at all primary and secondary schools, and for affordable (or free) cycle training to be available for people of all ages.⁴⁵ In response to the All-Party Group the Government referred to existing funding for Bikeability, and the use by some local authorities of funding from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund for the provision of both child and adult cycle training.⁴⁶ We also heard that such training would also help the enforcement of laws in instances when cyclists had broken the law: David Davies, Executive Director, Parliamentary Advisory Counsel for Transport Safety argued that it was “difficult to enforce actions against cyclists vigorously when many cyclists may not have had any education”.⁴⁷ The Metropolitan Police’s “Operation Safeway”, set up in response to the deaths of cyclists in London in November 2013, targeted unlawful behaviour by drivers and cyclists. In the first five weeks of Operation Safeway 9,733 motorists and 4,085 cyclists received fixed penalty notices, for offences including jumping red lights, cycling on the pavements, or driving using a mobile phone at the wheel”.⁴⁸

17. Reciprocal training for cyclists and drivers in urban areas was recommended by the Freight Transport Association, involving schemes such as Exchanging Places, in which some 10,000 cyclists have had the opportunity to sit in the cab of an HGV to understand the driver’s view of the road, and learn the location of blind spots from the cab.⁴⁹ British Cycling recommended making cycle awareness training a mandatory part of the CPC qualification.⁵⁰ The ability to treat cyclists and other road users with respect should, we heard, be an increased part of the driving test: the theory test should require knowledge of how to share the road with cyclists, and the practical test to assess the appliance of this knowledge where possible.⁵¹ We also received requests for the Highway Code to be updated to be more inclusive of all road users; for example, through stating a minimum distance between vehicles and bikes while overtaking.⁵² Transport for London (TfL) argued that while London had experienced an increase of more than 170% since 2003 in the number of people cycling, the Highway Code has not been updated since 2007. TfL

43 Greater London Authority (CYS 60)

44 Q 119, 135

45 All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group, *Get Britain Cycling*, April 2013, p 13

46 Department for Transport, *Response to the “Get Britain Cycling” Report published by the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group*, 28 August 2013

47 Q 34

48 “More than 13,000 motorists and cyclists fined in crackdown on road offences”, The Times, 7 January 2014

49 Q 51 [Commander Martin], Freight Transport Association (CYS 49) para 25, City Of London Corporation (CYS 67), CTC (CYS0053) para 43

50 British Cycling (CYS 143) para 25

51 Life Cycle UK (CYS 112) para 3, Stephen Flaherty (CYS 116) para 2, Transport for London (GMA 7) para 4.4

52 Claire Morgan (CYS 107) para 6.1, Jolyon Western (CYS 97)

recommended that the Code should be updated “to improve attitudes among new drivers to sharing the roads and to highlight safety for cyclists and other vulnerable road users cycling”.⁵³ Witnesses also called for road safety awareness campaigns to promote mutual respect between cyclists and drivers, and to highlight the consequences of bad, dangerous or aggressive driving.⁵⁴

18. Training on cycle safety for both cyclists and drivers will not eliminate casualties on the road, but could contribute to a culture of mutual understanding and respect between different types of road users. The evidence suggests that the growth in confidence and knowledge of safer cycling positions and driver blind spots could help reduce collisions caused by driver and cyclist behaviour. Cyclists will also be able to make an informed choice about the measures they can take to contribute to a safer cycling culture.

19. Cycle training should be available to all cyclists: children of primary and secondary age, adults seeking to gain confidence, and those looking to refresh their road skills. Local authorities should work with local cycling organisations and retailers to fund and promote this training and ensure that it is best suited to the local environment.

20. We call on the Government to set out in its response to this Report how it will use the data available on road safety and cycle usage to monitor the effectiveness of cycle training on both the safety of cyclists on the road and cyclists’ perception of their safety.

21. Drivers should be encouraged to share the road responsibly with bikes. We welcome the Government’s statement that cycle safety is part of the driving test, with drivers assessed on their approach to sharing the road with cyclists—in the practical test if possible, and certainly through the theory test. The DVSA should place significant emphasis on a driver’s approach to motorcyclists, cyclists and pedestrians: a driver should not receive a licence without demonstrating a level of respect and understanding for more vulnerable road users and pedestrians. (We have considered the responsibilities of cyclists in paragraph 18).

22. As part of its next revision of the Highway Code, the Government should consider amending the code to promote cycle safety and to ensure that it reflects the rights of cyclists to share the road with drivers.

23. The Government should reassess its approach to road safety awareness and set out, in its response to this report, the steps it will take to ensure a clear and consistent message of mutual respect between all road users and compliance with the law by cyclists and drivers.

53 Transport for London ([GMA 7](#)) para 4.3

54 British Cycling ([CYS 143](#)) para 29, Wystan Palm ([CYS 142](#)) para 6.7, Mark Goddard ([CYS 140](#)) para 5, Aviva ([CYS 134](#)) para 4, Brake ([CYS 129](#)), Claire Morgan ([CYS 107](#)) para 5, London Travelwatch ([CYS 94](#)), John Handley ([CYS 69](#)), See Me Save Me ([CYS 059](#)) para 3.26 CTC ([CYS 053](#)) para 30Mr Stephen Bellows ([CYS 41](#)) para 5

Cycle infrastructure

24. Witnesses told us of a link between behaviour and infrastructure. We heard that one of the principles of safe cycling in the Netherlands was the design of “forgiving environments”, in which roads and streets are designed so that mistakes do not lead to crashes, or, if crashes do occur, serious injuries are avoided.⁵⁵ Ashok Sinha, Chief Executive of London Cycling Campaign agreed, stating that the “greatest dangers” that cyclists faced on the road were from “the poor quality of infrastructure” which, alongside sometimes poor driving standards, meant that a perfectly innocent mistake resulted in a cyclist being killed or seriously injured.⁵⁶ Katja Leyendecker, Chair of Newcastle’s Cycling Campaign, Newcycling, argued that the present road environment made “cycling a transport option available only to the ‘brave and fit’”, and added that improving the road layout would make cyclists’ behaviour clearer and more predictable, and help reduce conflict between cyclists and drivers.⁵⁷

25. The most frequent request we received for improved cycle infrastructure sought an increase in the number of segregated cycle lanes.⁵⁸ Professor Colin Pooley cited his research from the *Understanding Walking and Cycling* project that “most non-cyclists and recreational cyclists will only consider cycling regularly if they are segregated from traffic and that pedestrians are hostile to pavement cyclists”.⁵⁹ A significant number of witnesses, however, warned that seeking to segregate cyclists from other road users “would erode the rights of cyclists to use the road network, and increase perception that cyclists shouldn’t be on the road in the way of cars”.⁶⁰ Segregation was viewed as a costly measure, and only ever applicable on a small proportion of our roads; witnesses such as the British Beer and Pub Association and the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry noted also the risk of segregated cycle lanes on kerbside deliveries to pubs and other businesses.⁶¹ The Department acknowledged this point, stating:

The segregation of cyclists can bring some safety benefits; however, separating cyclists from other traffic will not always be better for cyclists, as if implemented inappropriately it can increase the potential for conflict between cycles and motor vehicles at intersections with the road network. Whilst we encourage segregation alongside high speed roads, in urban environments space is often at a premium. Providing a broad, high quality cycle route segregated from motor traffic in these circumstances might be desirable but in many cases it is not always practicable. It is important that each proposal to improve conditions for cyclists is considered in relation to the prevailing circumstances and not with a presumption that removing

55 Cycling Embassy of Great Britain ([CYS 133](#))

56 Q 14

57 Q 33, Newcycling (Newcastle Cycling Campaign) ([CYS 19](#))

58 Caroline Hodges ([CYS 87](#)) para 2, Graham Paul Smith ([CYS 138](#)) para 2.2.1, Brake ([CYS 129](#))

59 Professor Colin Pooley ([CYS 126](#)) para 5.2

60 Christopher Howell ([CYS 101](#)), Claire Morgan ([CYS 107](#)) para 2.1

61 British Beer and Pub Association ([CYS 51](#)), London Chamber Of Commerce And Industry ([CYS 27](#)), para 15

cyclists from the carriageway is always a good thing. This is why these decisions are best made by local authorities.⁶²

26. Where cycle lanes have been introduced, we heard that they had in some places made the roads more unsafe, and “very rarely” conformed to the Department’s design requirements.⁶³ We received dozens of examples of cycle lanes that posed a real danger to cyclists and have shared a selection in Box 1.

Box 1: Examples of cycle lane infrastructure

1) Dr Tabitha Tanqueray: “Almost every cycle lane/advanced stop line in London has been tacked on or put in as an afterthought aiming to somehow let bicycles quietly fit in and filter around “proper” traffic.”⁶⁴

2) John Trueman: “Most town and city off-road cycle lanes and joint pedestrian/cycle lanes are of limited use to cyclists as currently configured. They stop and start in unexpected ways. They are very poorly signed—only a local would know where they go. The beginnings invariably are unmarked for the approaching on-road cyclist and are very easily missed, even impossible, sometimes, to turn into. These off-road paths typically involve steep grades and rough surfaces while the cyclist must stop to negotiate driveways, road crossings, kerbs and the like and quite often is expected to get off and walk at junctions or bus stops”.⁶⁵

3) Chris Kearton: “Cycle lanes in Sheffield are incoherent, difficult to navigate and at times pitch cyclists and pedestrians against each other. [...] I cycle along the A61 from Hillsborough to Shalesmoor and there is a pitiful cycle track which includes some pavement, some abandoned side road, and many dangerous small/private junctions. It is not possible to cycle safely on the path at more than 8-10 miles per hour, and even then I think it is more dangerous than using the wide dual-carriageway which has good visibility and a reasonable surface”.⁶⁶

4) Peter Garland: “I see numerous examples of so called “bike lanes” where a strip of road margin has been marked with a white line, often filled in green. Usually this strip will continue for a short length of road but only for as long as the road is wide enough for traffic to pass a bike without crossing the centre line. As soon as the road narrows the “bike lane” terminates [...] the installation of these schemes is driven by a misguided sense of a need to do 'something' or, worse, to meet some arbitrary target for installed length of bike lanes”.⁶⁷

62 Department for Transport (CYS 40) paras 53-55

63 Martin Porter (CYS 98) para 5

64 Tabitha Tanqueray (CYS 61)

65 John Trueman (CYS 93) para 14

66 Chris Kearton (CYS 64)

67 Peter Garland (CYS 8) para 1

27. Edmund King, President of the AA, stressed the need to be realistic about the fact that not all roads would be suitable for cycle lanes, and that one solution would not be suitable for all roads.⁶⁸ He added, however, that improved design standards were required so that the cycle lanes that were introduced did improve safety.⁶⁹ Roger Geffen agreed, stating that drivers responded to narrow cycle lanes by leaving less space when overtaking.⁷⁰ He added:

When cycle lanes are marked too narrowly, that is obviously safety-critical; so are things like visibility at junctions and how you provide cycle priority at junctions to not create conflict between turning drivers and cyclists moving straight ahead, particularly if you are going to create safe segregated cycle routes. There is a whole load of issues where we need consistent standards.⁷¹

The Institute for Civil Engineers has called for “national direction and leadership needs to be provided on design guidance”, stating that:

The actions that local highway authorities (and the Highways Agency) take stem directly from the direction and leadership that they see emanating from central government.⁷²

Councillor Davey told us that national standards for cycle lanes “would be invaluable”.⁷³ The Minister accepted that the Department had a “part to play” in disseminating best practice from local authorities on cycle infrastructure.⁷⁴

28. In June 2014 Transport for London (TfL) launched a consultation on the London Cycling Design Standards. The standards had originally been published in 2005 and had been updated to reflect best practice and to set out “the design outcomes that would deliver the ambitions” of the Mayor of London’s *Vision for Cycling*.⁷⁵ The consultation also sets out the ambition that all cycle schemes should be designed by people who cycle regularly: as a minimum, the Design Standards state that “anyone who designs a scheme must travel through the area on a bicycle to see how it feels”.⁷⁶ The Design Standards set out minimum levels of service rather than a one-size-fits-all model; noting that minimum width standards of 2.5m for cycle lanes (3m for a two-way cycle lane) would be desirable, but may

68 Q 143

69 Q 143

70 Q 142

71 Q 142

72 Institution Of Civil Engineers (CYS 54) para 2.3

73 Q 162

74 Q 104

75 Transport for London, *London Cycling Design Standards: Draft for Consultation*, June 2014, p 2

76 Transport for London, *London Cycling Design Standards: Draft for Consultation*, June 2014, p 12

be inadequate for non-standard bikes, such as tandems, bikes with trailers, or purpose-built bikes for people with disabilities, such as handbikes.⁷⁷

29. We heard that the provision of cycle infrastructure must also go beyond cycle lanes. The road safety charity Brake warned that “simply marking a cycle lane on otherwise normal roads, especially busy, fast roads with hazardous junctions, does not constitute provision of a safe route”.⁷⁸ Cycle lanes did not eliminate (and could even exacerbate) the risk at or near junctions—where 75% of cyclist collisions take place.⁷⁹ The Department pointed to amendments made in 2011 to traffic signing to allow easier introduction of cycling safety measures including Advanced Stop Lines.⁸⁰ British Cycling called for the Department to go further to ensure that roads and junctions are designed and built with cycling in mind, recommending that:

As a start, the government should urgently update traffic sign regulations to allow local authorities to develop safe junctions for cycling and continuous routes to give people confidence. This should allow features like, ‘cycle only traffic lights’, ‘parallel pedestrian cycling crossing points’ and ‘Dutch-style roundabouts’. This should be backed by national design standards to ensure continuity and consistency of approach to help all road users.⁸¹

The All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group called for “a statutory requirement” for all new development schemes to consider cyclists’ and pedestrians’ needs at an early stage.⁸² Andrew Gilligan, the Mayor of London’s cycling commissioner told us about the new template for cycle-segregated junctions in London, which includes a segregated run-in to the stop line for cyclists, special cycle-specific traffic lights, with a cycle red-amber-green phase, and special cyclist movements through the junction to minimise conflict with other vehicles.⁸³ Box 2 sets out examples from members of the public about cycling infrastructure in their towns and cities.

77 Transport for London, *London Cycling Design Standards: Draft for Consultation*, June 2014, p 61-62

78 Brake, The Road Safety Charity (CYS 129)

79 CTC (CYS 53), para 44

80 Department For Transport (CYS 40) para 33

81 British Cycling (CYS 143) para 22

82 All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group, *Get Britain Cycling*, April 2013, p 9

83 Q 53

Box 2: Examples of local cycle infrastructure

1) Michael Stead [@MichaelStead](#): “*@CommonsTrans They've added quite a few advanced stop lines in @WiganCouncil. They're also good at maintaining and repairing road surfaces.*”

2) Mike Prior-Jones [@mrpj100](#): “*@CommonsTrans Leicester built a nice secure bike park under their Town Hall*”

3) Oli Coyle [@OliCoyle](#): “*@CommonsTrans York has excellent storage and cycle lane accessibility which seems to be well used*”

Matt Hoffbrand [@hoffbrandm](#): “*@CommonsTrans Brighton. they created a full segregated path with the path going behind the bus stop and everything - just like Holland*”

4) Jim Taylor [@JimTaylorNHS](#): “*@CommonsTrans I think the vast increase of dedicated cycle routes around Bristol has been great, particularly concord way*”

5) Steve Parrott [@steveparrott50](#): “*@CommonsTrans at Grimsby we have a dedicated @CycleHubLincs in the town centre. Suits locals & commuters*”

6) Shoestring Cycling [@ShoestringCycle](#): “*@CommonsTrans Cornwall Council fail very badly at cycling infrastructure provision - very patchy, ill-maintained and poorly-designed*”

7) Josh [@technicalfault](#): “*@CommonsTrans not Manchester - there are a lot of half-baked ideas, poorly implemented that are then never maintained.*” “*@CommonsTrans e.g. all the segregated cycle lanes put in for the Commonwealth Games are poorly designed and not maintained.*”

8) Paul Holdsworth [@pual9](#): “*@CommonsTrans @CTC_Cyclists Cumbria County Council - refuses to accept that ultra-narrow cycle lanes on 60mph A roads are unsafe (viz A591).*”

9) Craig S [@_CraigS](#): “*@CommonsTrans Dartford have a hilarious 1 metre long cycle lane on London Road right before a Cyclists Dismount sign*”

10) ShapeThePlace [@ShapeThePlace](#): “*@CommonsTrans @BoroughofPoole disconnected routes, dangerous junctions & connections badly designed shared paths, focus on car movement.*”

30. To create a country of mass cycling as envisaged by the Prime Minister would require more than the introduction of new infrastructure and include a change in mindset about the use of the road, argued Roger Geffen of CTC. He told us:

We are not going to have mass cycle use if we continue to work on the assumption that the road space is predominantly for motor vehicles, and

cyclists just have to squeeze into whatever is left over. That will never create conditions where people of all ages and all abilities feel able to cycle comfortably and safely. We have to do something about reallocating road space.⁸⁴

Val Shawcross AM, the then Chair of the London Assembly Transport Committee, identified the key issue as the “balance of interests in sharing the road space”, on the medieval road patterns of central London.⁸⁵ This was, Katja Leyendecker argued, a question about the future of our cities and how we would like them to run.⁸⁶ One example of thinking in this way is the “mini Hollands” proposed in the Mayor of London’s *Vision for Cycling in London*. Three outer London boroughs: Waltham Forest, Kingston and Enfield have been selected to receive up to £30 million to invest in redesigning their town centres around cyclists, with the aim of making the areas as cycle-friendly as their Dutch counterparts.⁸⁷

31. We are grateful to all the cyclists who shared examples of cycle infrastructure. We were concerned to hear about the cycle lanes that have not only failed to increase safety for cyclists, but were in some cases more dangerous than cycling on the carriageway. In too many cases our cycling infrastructure not only fails to protect cyclists, but also treats cycling as an add-on to roads—an optional extra to be added if there was spare space, rather than a valid mode of transport, as entitled as motor vehicles to space on the road.

32. Safe cycling should be an integral part of the design of all new infrastructure projects. Local authorities should be able to demonstrate that the cycling has been considered and incorporated into the design of new roads at the earliest stage, and that local cyclists have been consulted as part of this process.

33. Cycle-proofing should not necessitate a blanket design and protocol for cycle lanes, which would inevitably fail to reflect local circumstances. Instead there should be an emphasis on sharing best practice. For example, to improve cycle lanes the Department for Transport should set out different options for local authorities to adopt, each designed with cyclists and meeting or going beyond minimum standards of safety. We ask the Department to report back on progress on the sharing of good practice between local authorities.

84 Q 143

85 Q 16

86 Q 17

87 Greater London Authority, *The Mayor’s Vision for Cycling in London*, March 2013, p 20

4 HGVs

34. There is evidence that heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) are disproportionately involved in fatal collisions with cyclists: some 20% of cycling fatalities in the last five years involved HGVs, despite the vehicles only accounting for 5% of motor traffic.⁸⁸ This disproportionate effect was in even greater evidence in London, in which the vehicles were involved in 37% of cycling fatalities since 2009, despite accounting for just 3% of motor traffic on the roads.⁸⁹ Construction vehicles—particularly concrete or tipper lorries—were viewed as the most likely to be involved in such collisions. We heard that seven out of nine fatal collisions in London between cyclists and large good vehicles in 2011 involved construction vehicles.⁹⁰ The record varied between companies: while some, including CEMEX had adopted best practice around cycle safety, we heard that a minority of companies were “cutting corners” when it came to safety.⁹¹

35. We received a number of suggestions on how to reduce the number of collisions between HGVs and cyclists. One proposal was for the Bikeability scheme to include “the experience of sitting in an HGV cab so that cyclists can fully appreciate the extent of blind spots”: as used in the Exchanging Place scheme.⁹² Other suggestions focused on safety measures within HGV cabs, including mirrors and sensors. The “See Me, Save Me” campaign, was established by Kate Cairns, with the charity Roadpeace, after her sister Eilidh was killed in a collision with a HGV in London in 2009.⁹³ Ms Cairns argued that

There is much that central government can do to improve cycling safety through legislation for better standards for HGVs, the vehicles that pose the greatest risk, and best practice driver training but also through stipulation and enforcement of such standards through contractual documents for publicly funded construction projects.⁹⁴

Jerry McLaughlin of the Mineral Products Association, the trade association representing the aggregates, asphalt, cement, concrete and related industries, told us that in his view, the sensors and cameras inside cabs worked and were valued by drivers, adding:

It may be secondary, but it does have some effect. In terms of giving a driver extra assistance, we think that either a camera or a sensor is really valuable.⁹⁵

88 Department For Transport ([CYS0104](#))

89 Department For Transport ([CYS0104](#))

90 Richard Armitage, David Hurdle, Adrian Lord and Alex Sully ([CYS 128](#)) Freight Transport Association ([CYS 49](#))

91 Q 54 [Christopher Snelling]

92 Richard Armitage, David Hurdle, Adrian Lord and Alex Sully ([CYS0128](#)) para 53

93 See Me Save Me ([CYS 059](#)) para 1.1, Roadpeace ([CYS 56](#)) para 4

94 See Me Save Me ([CYS 059](#)) para 3.2

95 Q 59

The Mayor of London's Vision for Cycling in London states that "no lorry should be allowed in London unless it is fitted with safety equipment to protect cyclists, and driven by someone fully trained in cycle awareness".⁹⁶

36. Concerns were raised with us that the technology still had faults to the extent that street furniture and other vehicles could be picked up by the sensors, raising the possibility that drivers would learn to ignore the alerts emanating from the sensors.⁹⁷ Such a situation could result in cyclists being falsely reassured, as they would feel that the driver had been informed of their presence and would act accordingly, while the driver may not have taken notice of the alert, been overloaded with information or, as the Minister warned, even been distracted by the alert.⁹⁸ Christopher Snelling, Head of Urban Logistics and Regional Policy at the Freight Transport Association, cautioned us against the belief of "one magic fix" from technology that would solve the issue of HGVs and cycle safety.⁹⁹

37. The Greater London Authority called for the EU to change directives 96/53/EC and 2007/38/EC which specify the mirrors required in a lorry's cab. The GLA stated that "this life-saving change" appeared to be "bogged down in Brussels".¹⁰⁰ The Freight Transport Association urged the Government to "promote the necessary reforms at EU level" to promote redesigning HGV cabs to improve visibility.¹⁰¹ Since we took evidence, the European Parliament has approved these changes but they await ratification by the member states.¹⁰²

38. Some witnesses argued that mirrors and sensors to HGVs would be less successful in reducing cyclist fatalities compared to separating cyclists and large vehicles.¹⁰³ The CTC told us that compared to driver carelessness "a far more important point is that the lorry itself is an inherently dangerous machine, whose design is simply not appropriate for urban streets".¹⁰⁴ There have been many calls for a ban on HGVs within cities for certain time periods: the insurance company Aviva suggested that such a measure could be explored in London.¹⁰⁵

39. The London Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LCCI) argued that a ban on HGVs in central London during peak hours "would be impractical, has no little, or no,

96 Greater London Authority, *The Mayor's Vision for Cycling in London*, March 2013, p 20

97 Q 60

98 Q 59, Q 78

99 Q 60

100 Greater London Authority (CYS 60)

101 Freight Transport Association (CYS 49) para 19

102 Commission proposal [COM(2013)0195 - C7-0102/2013- 2013/0105(COD)]

103 Anthony Cartmell (CYS 42) para 3

104 CTC (CYS 53) para 41

105 Anoop Shah (CYS 18), Shirley And John Littlefair (CYS0125) para 6, Aviva (CYS 134) para 11

international precedent and would lead to extra costs on business supply chains”.¹⁰⁶ The LCCI added:

Many HGVs are already barred from using the majority of central London roads between the hours of 9pm and 7am, Monday to Saturday, Saturday afternoon and all day Sunday under the London Lorry Control Scheme. Further restrictions on operating at peak hours (7am-10am and 4pm-9pm, for instance), extending to all HGVs would leave freight with only a 6-hour window with which to make all deliveries.¹⁰⁷

Calls for bans on HGVs came from a “fundamental” misunderstanding of how integral the vehicles were for everyday life, the Freight Transport Association (FTA) told us. The FTA added that many accidents happened outside rush hour, and outside of city centres, but did agree that more could be “done to get some HGV movements shifted out of the peak periods when most cyclists are on the road”.¹⁰⁸ Such a move was often prevented by regulations that banned HGVs at quieter periods.¹⁰⁹ As a medium-sized HGV carried the equivalent of ten vans’ worth of freight, banning HGVs would, we heard, also lead to a substantial increase in smaller vans on the road, with an impact on congestion, safety and the environment.¹¹⁰ There was also a danger that HGV and other drivers would assume that there would be no cyclists on the road outside of the “quiet hour” when HGVs were banned.¹¹¹ Jack Semple, Director of Policy at the Road Haulage Association, suggested that a ban on HGVs during certain time periods would add a minimum of 25% to 30% to haulage costs in London, with unproven benefit for road safety.¹¹²

40. Alternatives to a HGV ban were raised in the written evidence we received. The Greater London Authority pointed to the development of “quietways”—a “cross-London network of high-quality guided routes created on back streets, through parks and along canal towpaths for those who prefer to avoid the main roads”.¹¹³ These roads would have little or no HGV traffic.¹¹⁴ We also heard from PIE Mapping, a London small business that has developed satellite navigation mapping systems to direct HGVs onto compliant routes around the capital, away from cycle routes at key times or in certain locations.¹¹⁵

41. Witnesses suggested that greater enforcement of current HGV regulations could improve safety on the roads. Christopher Snelling, Head of Urban Logistics and Regional Policy at the Freight Transport Association, reported evidence about London in particular,

106 London Chamber Of Commerce And Industry (CYS 27) para 5

107 London Chamber Of Commerce And Industry (CYS 27) para 6

108 Freight Transport Association (CYS 49) para 18

109 Freight Transport Association (CYS 49) para 18

110 Freight Transport Association (CYS 49) para 9

111 John Trueman (CYS 93) para 15

112 Q 55

113 Greater London Authority (CYS 60)

114 Greater London Authority (CYS 60)

115 Freddie Talberg, CEO of PIE Mapping (CYS 26)

that HGV operators “not of the highest quality” were “overrepresented in the cycling casualty figures”.¹¹⁶ Mr Snelling argued that these operators should be removed from the roads, and welcomed the “increased and targeted” enforcement on the roads in the previous months.¹¹⁷ The Minister echoed these views, and suggested that Vehicle and Operator Services Agency had previously “not been as active” in checking HGV vehicles for compliance in London, as it had been on the motorways, a situation which had now changed.¹¹⁸ The Minister added that while the “vast majority of road haulage companies” had a responsible attitude towards road safety, there remained a need a “culture of safety across the industry”.¹¹⁹

42. We are greatly concerned by the number of cyclists killed in collisions with HGVs. The disproportionate number of HGVs involved in collisions with cyclists demonstrates that the industry must improve its road safety record. We are particularly concerned by the number of construction vehicles, such as concrete and tipper lorries, involved in fatal collisions with cyclists, and the failure of some haulage companies to follow best practice around cycle safety.

43. We welcome the European Parliament’s approval of changes to the design of HGV cabs to reduce drivers’ blind spots. We call on the Government to ratify these changes which will improve safety for cyclists and other vulnerable road users.

44. We are not persuaded that a ban on HGVs in town centres would be workable in practice. Instead, we endorse the Minister’s call for a culture of safety for all HGV drivers and support the education of HGV drivers and cyclists about road safety.

45. We call on the freight industry to create a culture of safety among HGVs. We recommend the establishment of a timetable for the development of an industry-wide code of conduct, and a clear programme of work to promote the enforcement of HGV safety regulations. The effectiveness of these measures must be monitored, and demonstrated by a reduction in the proportion of cyclists’ collisions involving HGVs, and by the number of cyclists injured or killed in collisions with HGVs. If such a reduction is not forthcoming once safety measures are implemented, we expect the Department to consider set out the steps it will take to ensure the safety of cyclists on our roads.

Volumetric mixers

46. We considered evidence on what the Minister described as the “loophole that needs closing” of volumetric mixers—vehicles that carry stone, sand, cement and water in compartments and mix the concrete when on site—which are classed as plant and not goods vehicles. The Minister stated that the Government needed to “take some action” on

116 Q 54

117 Q 54

118 Q 92

119 Q 98

volumetric mixers, as the classification as plant meant they were exempt from a number of regulations in place for goods vehicles.¹²⁰ The Government is to bring forward consultation on changing the regulations to close the loophole around volumetric mixers: the Department clarified the legal status of the vehicles as below.

[...], our view is that volumetric concrete mixers fall within the definition of “goods vehicle” as defined in regulation 3 of the Construction and Use Regulations. We consider these vehicles do not satisfy all the requirements to be considered “engineering plant” so are goods vehicles for the purposes of Construction and Use and other legislation that is dependent on the Construction and Use definition.

However, the definitions relating to exemptions contained in the Goods Vehicles (Plating & Testing) Regulations 1988 and the Goods Vehicles (Licensing of Operators) Regulations 1995 are different, and case law has indicated that volumetric mixers can take advantage of the exemptions from these regulations in these cases.

The broad effect of the two exemptions is that operators of exempted vehicles do not require an operator’s licence and they are not required to subject the vehicles to annual roadworthiness inspection.¹²¹

47. The industry representative, Andrew Collins, disagreed with the Minister and argued against changing the regulations to include volumetric mixers.¹²² Mr Collins was speaking for the Batched on Site Association, which represents the estimated 500-600 volumetric units operating in the UK, He told us that the vehicles were “not actually on the roads a lot”, and suggested that the mixers spent 30% of their time on the road and 70% on site.¹²³ His colleague Tom Baker told us that questions about volumetric mixers were not part of the debate on cycling safety and had been brought up “to try to score a point”, although he stepped back from suggestions that the Minister had raised the issue after lobbying by cyclists.¹²⁴ The Batched on Site Association stressed that there was no evidence that their vehicles had “contributed badly to cycle safety”.¹²⁵ In follow-up written evidence the Association stated that the mixers were “subject to the majority of regulations other Heavy Goods Vehicles are subjected to”.¹²⁶ The Association sought to emphasise again their belief that the regulating the vehicles would not “alter cyclist safety”.¹²⁷

48. The Department has confirmed that targeted vehicle inspections by the newly-formed Industrial Heavy Goods Vehicle Task Force unit had found that five out of six volumetric

120 Q 107, Q 109

121 Department For Transport ([CYS 146](#)) paras 4-6

122 Q 187

123 Q 188

124 Qs 202, 204

125 Q 208

126 Batched On Site Association ([CYS 150](#)) para 3

127 Batched On Site Association ([CYS 148](#)) para 7

mixers stopped “received immediate prohibitions for mechanical defects”.¹²⁸ In addition, three of the stopped vehicles “were also prohibited because of either overloading or an insecure load”.¹²⁹ One such vehicle had some fifteen items listed on the prohibition: this included “no parking brakes, insecure body, [and] side-guards about to become detached”.¹³⁰ The Batched on Site Association accepted that having prohibitions given to five out of six volumetric mixers was “not good enough”; although it argued in mitigation that the small sample size meant that “inferences about the entire sector [could not] be safely drawn”.¹³¹ The Department emphasised that the high non-compliance rate was the result of a targeted approach to inspections, but warned of a “tendency” for volumetric mixers to operate at weights in excess of regulations and the design weight of the chassis.¹³² The Mineral Products Association warned us that a failure by the Government to act “to ensure that volumetric plant are regulated to LGV standards” would have “clear and adverse implications for road safety and in particular for the safety of vulnerable road users”.¹³³

49. We note the Batched on Site Association’s argument that there is no evidence that volumetric mixers had contributed to cycle accidents. We do not, however, accept their argument that such vehicles should not be regulated as goods vehicles. By the Batched on Site Association’s own evidence, the vehicles spend close to a third of their time on the roads, and should be regulated in the same manner as goods vehicles.

50. We welcome the Minister’s commitment to closing the loophole around volumetric mixers and ask that the Department provides an update on progress, as part of their response to this Report.

128 Department For Transport ([CYS 146](#)) para 16

129 Department For Transport ([CYS 146](#)) para 16

130 Department For Transport ([CYS 146](#)) para 16

131 Batched On Site Association ([CYS 151](#))

132 Department For Transport ([CYS 146](#)) para16

133 Mineral Products Association ([CYS 48](#))

5 The role of Government

51. This inquiry received many suggestions and proposals for how to make cycling safer on our roads. Where there was disagreement on the precise measures that should be taken—particularly reflecting local circumstance, and the difference between rural and urban roads—the overwhelming message from witnesses was that political leadership, as we recommended in 2012, was critical to achieving the Prime Minister’s stated ambition of increasing cycling rates.¹³⁴ The London Cycling Campaign argued that “political will” would be the “single most important fundamental and overarching factor that will deliver improved conditions for cycling in the UK, and unlock the huge latent demand there is for cycling as an everyday means of transport”.¹³⁵ The CTC called for the support of all government departments for “a vision to make cycling a normal mode of transport that anybody of any age and ability can do for any journey, safely, comfortably and enjoyably”.¹³⁶ This would ensure what was described by Martin Porter QC as a “cultural shift” in Government, from the tradition of putting the interests of motorists first”.¹³⁷ British Cycling argued that:

All nations and cities that have achieved the greatest success in developing cycling have a common thread binding them. They have all had politicians at the highest levels make an explicit and genuine commitment to make cycling a serious form of transport.¹³⁸

52. We considered whether a specific role should be assigned this leadership responsibility: a cycling tsar or champion. The charity Living Streets called for “ministerial” leadership.¹³⁹ Others called for local champions.¹⁴⁰ The role of the Mayor of London’s commissioner for cycling was highlighted with Mr Gilligan viewed as having a mandate and authority, direct from the Mayor.¹⁴¹ This was seen as crucial: Chris Boardman argued that a cycling champion or tsar would only work if it carried the mandate of a senior elected politician, and if the post-holder had influence or control over a significant budget.¹⁴² The post would also need the authority to work across government departments, as policies affecting cycling range across departmental boundaries.¹⁴³ Roger Geffen, Campaigns and Policy Director at CTC, told us that such a role would only be useful if it had the authority from the Prime Minister to coordinate work from across departments:

134 British Cycling ([CYS 143](#)) para 31, Leeds Cycling Campaign ([CYS 132](#)) para 4, Chartered Institution Of Highways And Transportation ([CYS 57](#)) para 2.2, Living Streets ([CYS0037](#)) para 9, Mr Chris Terrell ([CYS0032](#)) para 9.1,

135 London Cycling Campaign ([CYS 71](#)) para 2.1

136 Q 116

137 Martin Porter QC ([CYS 98](#)) para 7

138 British Cycling ([CYS 143](#)) para 31

139 Living Streets ([CYS 37](#)) para 9

140 Transition Town Totnes Cycling Group ([CYS 136](#)) para 2

141 Q 126

142 Q 125

143 Q 126

If there is to be a cycling tsar, his authority would need to come from the Prime Minister, so that he has prime ministerial backing to go into all the other Government Departments that need to contribute to a cycling revolution, to make sure that not only the Department for Transport is playing its role, but that the Departments for education, planning, businesses, employers, rural access, culture, media and sport, traffic law enforcement, the justice system and, ultimately, the Treasury are all playing their roles; and so too are public transport operators, the police, the criminal justice system and so on.¹⁴⁴

Mr Geffen added that “without that authority, the role would be a poisoned chalice”.¹⁴⁵

53. The Minister told us that the country had many cycling champions, and as the minister responsible, he would be one of the champions; adding that he viewed himself as responsible for ensuring that the interests of cyclists are represented, that cycling is made safer, and that capital projects take account of cyclists where possible.¹⁴⁶ He cautioned against the appointing of tsars without a clear purpose and cautioned that:

In the past politicians have often said, “Here is a problem. What shall we do about it? Let’s appoint a tsar or a champion.” [...] I am just cautious that we do not just think, “This is a quick fix. We will appoint a champion,” but then we do not give that person the resources or the role to do what they want to do. [...] I hope that we will not have a situation where we appoint a champion and say, “That is dealt with and we can move on to other things.”¹⁴⁷

54. As the Prime Minister has set out his ambition for a cycling revolution it must be for the Government to champion cycling and not outsource it to a powerless, and inevitably short-term, tsar or champion. It is right for a minister in the Department for Transport to take on this role, and be accountable to Parliament for his performance. We welcome the Minister’s willingness to take on this role.

55. To achieve the Prime Minister’s ambition of a cycling revolution, it is necessary but not sufficient for cycling to be championed by the Department for Transport. Government must work across its self-imposed departmental boundaries to fund and facilitate a culture change supporting cycling. We ask the Minister to set out in his response to this Report the specific steps he will take to coordinate cycling policy across the departments for Transport, Communities and Local Government, Health, and Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

144 Q 126

145 Q 126

146 Q 106

147 Q 106

Funding

56. Witnesses highlighted the short-term and fragmented nature of the funding for cycling: Sustrans described investment in cycling as “sporadic, rather than long term consistent funding”.¹⁴⁸ Chris Boardman argued that, while cycling had received a “significant amount of money” in the last two years, that funding had always been “very short term and as one-offs”.¹⁴⁹ British Cycling told us that current funding levels were only committed for a two-year period.¹⁵⁰ The Local Government Association noted the uncertain future of the funding for a number of cycling initiatives which had been funded by the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, due to be subsumed into the Local Growth Fund from 2015.¹⁵¹ In a further example Sustrans highlighted the £20 million Cycle Safety Fund, announced in April 2013, which “went ahead with limited time for applications and assessment and did not form part of a wider programme of longer term funding”.¹⁵² Mr Boardman argued that to achieve the targets of increasing cycling as a proportion of travel, the funding would have to be committed for the long-term.¹⁵³

57. The Minister emphasised that the Government was spending twice as much on cycling as its predecessor administration.¹⁵⁴ The detail he provided on this funding demonstrated the fragmented nature of the funding, however, with references to four separate sources of funding for cycle infrastructure:

Funding scheme	Money allocated
“Cycling ambition grants for cities and national parks”	£94 million
Cycling infrastructure at rail stations and in communities	£30 million
Improving safety at junctions	£35 million
Local sustainable transport fund	£600 million in total; although only part of this funding will be on cycling projects. ¹⁵⁵

58. The split of funding between various initiatives can make it difficult to clarify total funding levels for cycling. Witnesses identified this total as approximately £2 per head of population, and compared this to the equivalent of over £24 per head in the Netherlands.¹⁵⁶ British Cycling compared the funding levels against the £27 billion spending allocated to roads until 2021—equivalent to £75 per head of population per year.¹⁵⁷ In its *Get Britain*

148 Sustrans (CYS 058) para 4

149 Q 114

150 British Cycling (CYS 143) para 24

151 Local Government Association (CYS 25)

152 Sustrans (CYS 058) para 4

153 Q 114

154 Q 83

155 Q 83

156 British Cycling (CYS 143) para 24

157 British Cycling (CYS 143) para 24

Cycling report the APPG for Cycling called for a cycling budget of at least £10 per person per year, rising to £20 per person.¹⁵⁸ This was backed by many of our witnesses, including the national charity for cycling, CTC, and Mr Boardman.¹⁵⁹ Some members of the public called for the budget to be increased even further, with suggestions of £40 per person per year, for at least the next decade.¹⁶⁰ The Mayor of London has committed to spending £145 million on cycling next year: approximately £18 per resident of the capital.¹⁶¹ The results of the Cycling Demonstration Towns—six towns which received sustained funding of £10 per head on cycling between 2005 and 2008, and recorded an average increase in cycling of 27%—suggested that a concentrated focus on removing barriers to cycling, accompanied by sustained investment, can result in a significant increase in the number of cyclists.¹⁶²

59. Cycling funding should, we heard, come from a range of different departments, rather than just the Department for Transport. Roger Geffen of CTC argued that the Department of Health, Department for Education and Department for Business, Innovation and Skills could play “a significant role” in cycling funding with just a “relatively small” part of their overall revenue spending.¹⁶³ There was a particular role for the Department of Health, given the health benefits of cycling, and subsequent cost savings to the NHS.¹⁶⁴

60. The cycling budget is currently fragmented between different initiatives with no consistency or clarity over funding sources. There is no confirmed figure for the annual spending per capita, but witnesses estimated it was just £2 per head, and compared this figure to the higher levels of funding in other European countries.

61. *We recommend that the Government publishes each year the total budget for cycling to enable strategic and long-term planning of cycle infrastructure, training and promotion.*

62. *We have set out the improvements required to cycling infrastructure and training, and view these measures as essential to keep cyclists safe on the roads. To achieve these safety benefits, we need to see a steady and planned increase in per-capita spend on cycling. We call on the Government to set out an ambition to reach £10 per head by 2020, with a timetable of how this will be achieved.*

158 All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group, *Get Britain Cycling*, April 2013, p 7

159 CTC (CYS 53) para 17, Q 131

160 Anthony Cartmell (CYS 42) para 2.1.4

161 Greater London Authority, *The Mayor's Vision for Cycling in London*, March 2013, p 5

162 Richard Armitage, David Hurdle, Adrian Lord and Alex Sully (CYS 128) para 16

163 Q 139

164 Dr Carl Egdell (CYS 16), Transition Town Totnes Cycling Group (CYS 136) para 1 (i), London Cycling Campaign (CYS 71) para 1.4, Local Government Association (CYS 25)

6 Conclusion

63. It is too soon to know whether the fall in cycling casualties in 2013 represents the start of a long-term reduction in the numbers of cyclists killed or seriously injured on our roads. We hope that this is the case, but do not think there is any cause for the Government to be complacent. As we stated in 2012, a cross-departmental effort is required to improve safety for cyclists. We remain concerned that, despite the warm words of the Prime Minister, this coordinated working has not yet materialised.

64. There is also limited evidence of a widespread culture that is supportive of cyclists as road users. Progress in developing this culture will inevitably vary across different areas of the country, reflecting local road use and support for cycling, but there remains a role of the Government in enabling this culture to flourish and making it easier for local authorities to introduce cycle safety measures. Above all, it is for the Government, and regional and local authorities, to use all the tools at their disposal to promote the sharing of the road between drivers and cyclists.

65. *Making the roads safe for cyclists requires adherence to the rules of those roads, from both cyclists and drivers, and the development of a mutual respect between the two. Improving cycling infrastructure can help to improve this behaviour and culture; and we call on the Department to show leadership in this area, in particular through the development of consistent design standards for local areas and guidance on how local authorities can design roads safe for cyclists and pedestrians, while still reflecting local need and circumstance. It is the duty of Government ministers to ensure that all government policies reflect the fundamental understanding of cycling as a valid form of transport, and promotes the safety of all road users.*

Conclusions and recommendations

How safe is cycling?

1. We share the Minister's view that one death on the roads is one too many, and wish to express our sympathies with the families and friends of all the cyclists killed on our roads. We accept that a focus solely on the number of casualties may not reflect a reduction in the proportion of cyclists killed or seriously injured, but believe that road safety measures should seek to reduce the overall number of casualties at the same time as increasing the number of cyclists on the road. Achieving both of these will require steps to increase not only the actual levels of safety for cyclists on the road, but also the perceived levels of safety. This can be achieved through measures that promote the safer sharing of the road between cyclists and drivers; increase understanding of safe cycling among cyclists and drivers, and reduce the risks from poorly-designed or maintained cycling infrastructure. (Paragraph 9)

20mph zones

2. Local authorities should be encouraged to consider introducing 20 mph limits, accompanied by traffic calming measures, in high-risk areas to improve the safety of all road users. When a car collides with a cyclist, the outcome of the incident can differ significantly depending on the speed of the car. A lower speed limit in residential areas could not only improve safety, but could also contribute to creating town and city environments that people of all ages can enjoy as pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. We note, however, that lower speed limits will not be appropriate or necessary on all roads, and in all areas and consultation with local residents to ensure local support for lower speed limits will be critical to their success. It is also for local police forces to consider how much priority is placed at present on the enforcement of lower speed limits. (Paragraph 12)
3. It is for local authorities to consider whether lower speed limits in residential areas, as part of a wider package of cycle safety measures, would be appropriate for their local environment. We ask the Government to consider what steps it could take to make it easier and cheaper for local authorities to introduce lower speed limits. (Paragraph 13)

Education

4. Training on cycle safety for both cyclists and drivers will not eliminate casualties on the road, but could contribute to a culture of mutual understanding and respect between different types of road users. The evidence suggests that the growth in confidence and knowledge of safer cycling positions and driver blind spots could help reduce collisions caused by driver and cyclist behaviour. Cyclists will also be able to make an informed choice about the measures they can take to contribute to a safer cycling culture. (Paragraph 18)
5. Cycle training should be available to all cyclists: children of primary and secondary age, adults seeking to gain confidence, and those looking to refresh their road skills. Local authorities should work with local cycling organisations and retailers to fund

and promote this training and ensure that it is best suited to the local environment. (Paragraph 19)

6. We call on the Government to set out in its response to this Report how it will use the data available on road safety and cycle usage to monitor the effectiveness of cycle training on both the safety of cyclists on the road and cyclists' perception of their safety. (Paragraph 20)
7. Drivers should be encouraged to share the road responsibly with bikes. We welcome the Government's statement that cycle safety is part of the driving test, with drivers assessed on their approach to sharing the road with cyclists—in the practical test if possible, and certainly through the theory test. The DVSA should place significant emphasis on a driver's approach to motorcyclists, cyclists and pedestrians: a driver should not receive a licence without demonstrating a level of respect and understanding for more vulnerable road users and pedestrians. (Paragraph 21)
8. As part of its next revision of the Highway Code, the Government should consider amending the code to promote cycle safety and to ensure that it reflects the rights of cyclists to share the road with drivers. (Paragraph 22)
9. The Government should reassess its approach to road safety awareness and set out, in its response to this report, the steps it will take to ensure a clear and consistent message of mutual respect between all road users and compliance with the law by cyclists and drivers. (Paragraph 23)

Cycle infrastructure

10. We are grateful to all the cyclists who shared examples of cycle infrastructure. We were concerned to hear about the cycle lanes that have not only failed to increase safety for cyclists, but were in some cases more dangerous than cycling on the carriageway. In too many cases our cycling infrastructure not only fails to protect cyclists, but also treats cycling as an add-on to roads—an optional extra to be added if there was spare space, rather than a valid mode of transport, as entitled as motor vehicles to space on the road. (Paragraph 31)
11. Safe cycling should be an integral part of the design of all new infrastructure projects. Local authorities should be able to demonstrate that the cycling has been considered and incorporated into the design of new roads at the earliest stage, and that local cyclists have been consulted as part of this process. (Paragraph 32)
12. Cycle-proofing should not necessitate a blanket design and protocol for cycle lanes, which would inevitably fail to reflect local circumstances. Instead there should be an emphasis on sharing best practice. For example, to improve cycle lanes the Department for Transport should set out different options for local authorities to adopt, each designed with cyclists and meeting or going beyond minimum standards of safety. We ask the Department to report back on progress on the sharing of good practice between local authorities. (Paragraph 33)

HGVs

13. We are greatly concerned by the number of cyclists killed in collisions with HGVs. The disproportionate number of HGVs involved in collisions with cyclists demonstrates that the industry must improve its road safety record. We are particularly concerned by the number of construction vehicles, such as concrete and tipper lorries, involved in fatal collisions with cyclists, and the failure of some haulage companies to follow best practice around cycle safety. (Paragraph 42)
14. We welcome the European Parliament's approval of changes to the design of HGV cabs to reduce drivers' blind spots. We call on the Government to ratify these changes which will improve safety for cyclists and other vulnerable road users. (Paragraph 43)
15. We are not persuaded that a ban on HGVs in town centres would be workable in practice. Instead, we endorse the Minister's call for a culture of safety for all HGV drivers and support the education of HGV drivers and cyclists about road safety. (Paragraph 44)
16. We call on the freight industry to create a culture of safety among HGVs. We recommend the establishment of a timetable for the development of an industry-wide code of conduct, and a clear programme of work to promote the enforcement of HGV safety regulations. The effectiveness of these measures must be monitored, and demonstrated by a reduction in the proportion of cyclists' collisions involving HGVs, and by the number of cyclists injured or killed in collisions with HGVs. If such a reduction is not forthcoming once safety measures are implemented, we expect the Department to consider set out the steps it will take to ensure the safety of cyclists on our roads. (Paragraph 45)

Volumetric mixers

17. We note the Batched on Site Association's argument that there is no evidence that volumetric mixers had contributed to cycle accidents. We do not, however, accept their argument that such vehicles should not be regulated as goods vehicles. By the Batched on Site Association's own evidence, the vehicles spend close to a third of their time on the roads, and should be regulated in the same manner as goods vehicles. (Paragraph 49)
18. We welcome the Minister's commitment to closing the loophole around volumetric mixers and ask that the Department provides an update on progress, as part of their response to this Report. (Paragraph 50)

The role of the Government

19. As the Prime Minister has set out his ambition for a cycling revolution it must be for the Government to champion cycling and not outsource it to a powerless, and inevitably short-term, tsar or champion. It is right for a minister in the Department for Transport to take on this role, and be accountable to Parliament for his performance. We welcome the Minister's willingness to take on this role. (Paragraph 54)

20. To achieve the Prime Minister's ambition of a cycling revolution, it is necessary but not sufficient for cycling to be championed by the Department for Transport. Government must work across its self-imposed departmental boundaries to fund and facilitate a culture change supporting cycling. We ask the Minister to set out in his response to this Report the specific steps he will take to coordinate cycling policy across the departments for Transport, Communities and Local Government, Health, and Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. (Paragraph 55)

Funding

21. The cycling budget is currently fragmented between different initiatives with no consistency or clarity over funding sources. There is no confirmed figure for the annual spending per capita, but witnesses estimated it was just £2 per head, and compared this figure to the higher levels of funding in other European countries. (Paragraph 60)
22. We recommend that the Government publishes each year the total budget for cycling to enable strategic and long-term planning of cycle infrastructure, training and promotion. (Paragraph 61)
23. We have set out the improvements required to cycling infrastructure and training, and view these measures as essential to keep cyclists safe on the roads. To achieve these safety benefits, we need to see a steady and planned increase in per-capita spend on cycling. We call on the Government to set out an ambition to reach £10 per head by 2020, with a timetable of how this will be achieved. (Paragraph 62)

Conclusion

24. It is too soon to know whether the fall in cycling casualties in 2013 represents the start of a long-term reduction in the numbers of cyclists killed or seriously injured on our roads. We hope that this is the case, but do not think there is any cause for the Government to be complacent. As we stated in 2012, a cross-departmental effort is required to improve safety for cyclists. We remain concerned that, despite the warm words of the Prime Minister, this coordinated working has not yet materialised. (Paragraph 63)
25. There is also limited evidence of a widespread culture that is supportive of cyclists as road users. Progress in developing this culture will inevitably vary across different areas of the country, reflecting local road use and support for cycling, but there remains a role of the Government in enabling this culture to flourish and making it easier for local authorities to introduce cycle safety measures. Above all, it is for the Government, and regional and local authorities, to use all the tools at their disposal to promote the sharing of the road between drivers and cyclists. (Paragraph 64)
26. Making the roads safe for cyclists requires adherence to the rules of those roads, from both cyclists and drivers, and the development of a mutual respect between the two. Improving cycling infrastructure can help to improve this behaviour and culture; and we call on the Department to show leadership in this area, in particular through the development of consistent design standards for local areas and guidance on how local authorities can design roads safe for cyclists and pedestrians, while still

reflecting local need and circumstance. It is the duty of Government ministers to ensure that all government policies reflect the fundamental understanding of cycling as a valid form of transport, and promotes the safety of all road users. (Paragraph 65)

Formal Minutes

Monday 14 July 2014

Members present:

Mrs Louise Ellman, in the Chair

Sarah Champion
Jim Dobbin
Jim Fitzpatrick

Karl M^cCartney
Graham Stringer
Martin Vickers

Draft Report (*Cycling Safety*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 65 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Third Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Monday 1 September at 4.00 pm

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the Committee's inquiry page at www.parliament.uk/transcom.

Monday 2 December 2013

Question number

David Davies, Executive Director, PACTS, **Val Shawcross**, CBE AM, Chair, London Assembly Transport Committee, **Ashok Sinha**, Chief Executive, London Cycling Campaign, **Katja Leyendecker**, Chair, Newcycling Campaign, and **Commander David Martin**, Public Order Task Force and Roads Policing, Metropolitan Police; Q1-51

Christopher Snelling, Head of Urban Logistics and Regional Policy, Freight Transport Association, **Jack Semple**, Director of Policy, Road Haulage Association, **Jerry McLaughlin**, Director of Economics, Mineral Products Association, **Dr Marcus Jones**, Principal Consultant, Transport Research Laboratory Ltd, and **Andrew Gilligan**, Mayor of London's Cycling Commissioner, Transport for London Q52-72

Wednesday 4 December 2013

Robert Goodwill MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Transport Q73-112

Monday 10 February 2014

Chris Boardman MBE, Policy Adviser, British Cycling, **Roger Geffen**, Campaigns and Policy Director, CTC, and **Edmund King**, President, AA Q113-152

Councillor Mike Haines, Deputy Chair, Economy and Transport Board, Local Government Association, **Councillor Ian Davey**, Deputy Leader, Brighton and Hove Council, **Councillor David Hodge**, Leader, Surrey County Council, and **Councillor Helyn Clack**, Cabinet Member for Community Services, Surrey County Council Q153-176

Alex Fiddes, Chief Operating Officer, Vehicle Testing and Enforcement, Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency, **Peter Weddell-Hall**, Head of e-assessment, Training and Accreditation, Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency, **Tom Baker**, Treasurer, Batched on Site Association, **Andrew Collins**, Committee Member, Batched on Site Association, and **Robert Armstrong**, Committee Member, Batched on Site Association Q177-212

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the Committee's inquiry web page at www.parliament.uk/transcom. INQ numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 A Cyclist ([CYS0014](#))
- 2 Alan White ([CYS0022](#))
- 3 Alastair Reeves ([CYS0075](#))
- 4 Alex Sully ([CYS0137](#))
- 5 Amanda Carter ([CYS0043](#))
- 6 Amanda Carter ([CYS0062](#))
- 7 Anoop Shah ([CYS0018](#))
- 8 Anthony Cartmell ([CYS0042](#))
- 9 Association of Chief Police Officers ([CYS0147](#))
- 10 Aviva ([CYS0134](#))
- 11 Batched on Site Association ([CYS0151](#))
- 12 Batched on Site Association ([CYS0148](#))
- 13 Batched on Site Association ([CYS0150](#))
- 14 Ben Colman ([CYS0038](#))
- 15 Bikebiz Magazine ([CYS0065](#))
- 16 Boyd Johnston ([CYS0100](#))
- 17 Brake, The Road Safety Charity ([CYS0129](#))
- 18 British Beer & Pub Association ([CYS0051](#))
- 19 British Cycling ([CYS0143](#))
- 20 Callum Bowler ([CYS0003](#))
- 21 Capital Traffic Management Limited ([CYS0139](#))
- 22 Carl Egdell ([CYS0016](#))
- 23 Caroline Hodges ([CYS0087](#))
- 24 Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation ([CYS0057](#))
- 25 Chicycle ([CYS0055](#))
- 26 Chris Bowers ([CYS0106](#))
- 27 Chris Kearton ([CYS0064](#))
- 28 Christopher Howell ([CYS0101](#))
- 29 City of London Corporation ([CYS0067](#))
- 30 Claire Morgan ([CYS0107](#))
- 31 Colin Clarke ([CYS0099](#))
- 32 Colin Clarke ([CYS0149](#))
- 33 Ctc, The National Cycling Charity ([CYS0053](#))
- 34 Cycle to Work Alliance ([CYS0044](#))
- 35 Cycling Embassy of Great Britain ([CYS0133](#))
- 36 Cycling Tynedale ([CYS0012](#))
- 37 Cyclox (Cycling Campaign for Oxford) ([CYS0130](#))
- 38 Dave Holladay ([CYS0046](#))
- 39 Dave Holladay ([CYS0102](#))

- 40 Dave Holladay ([CYS0103](#))
- 41 David Bridge ([CYS0081](#))
- 42 David S Garfield ([CYS0036](#))
- 43 Department for Transport ([CYS0040](#))
- 44 Department for Transport ([CYS0104](#))
- 45 Department for Transport ([CYS0146](#))
- 46 Dr Charles Heatley ([CYS0011](#))
- 47 Dr Donal McNally ([CYS0119](#))
- 48 Dr Nigel Perry ([CYS0122](#))
- 49 Eileen Heuston ([CYS0077](#))
- 50 Freight on Rail ([CYS0111](#))
- 51 Freight Transport Association ([CYS0049](#))
- 52 Gary Sullivan ([CYS0024](#))
- 53 Ginevra House ([CYS0080](#))
- 54 GMP ([CYS0123](#))
- 55 Graham Smith ([CYS0138](#))
- 56 Greater London Authority ([CYS0060](#))
- 57 Greater Manchester Police ([CYS0039](#))
- 58 Hari Lehal ([CYS0079](#))
- 59 Harriet Harman ([CYS0073](#))
- 60 Harris Vallianatos ([CYS0023](#))
- 61 Henk Van Klaveren ([CYS0035](#))
- 62 Ian Barker ([CYS0045](#))
- 63 Institution of Civil Engineers ([CYS0054](#))
- 64 James Derounian ([CYS0013](#))
- 65 James Martin ([CYS0144](#))
- 66 John Davison ([CYS0096](#))
- 67 John Handley ([CYS0069](#))
- 68 John Handley ([CYS0082](#))
- 69 John Handley ([CYS0084](#))
- 70 John Trueman ([CYS0093](#))
- 71 Jolyon Western ([CYS0097](#))
- 72 Kate Cairns ([CYS0059](#))
- 73 Kate and Andy Curry ([CYS0010](#))
- 74 Lawrence Lomax ([CYS0005](#))
- 75 Leeds Cycling Campaign ([CYS0132](#))
- 76 Liam Good ([CYS0078](#))
- 77 Life Cycle UK ([CYS0112](#))
- 78 Linda Farley ([CYS0007](#))
- 79 Living Streets ([CYS0037](#))
- 80 Local Government Association ([CYS0025](#))
- 81 London Assembly Transport Committee ([CYS0050](#))
- 82 London Chamber of Commerce and Industry ([CYS0027](#))
- 83 London Cycling Campaign ([CYS0071](#))
- 84 London Travelwatch ([CYS0094](#))

- 85 Luke Bonell ([CYS0074](#))
- 86 Mark Goddard ([CYS0140](#))
- 87 Martin Porter ([CYS0098](#))
- 88 Matt Hodges ([CYS0031](#))
- 89 Merseyside Cycling Campaign and Wirral Pedestrians' Association ([CYS0017](#))
- 90 Michael Dufton ([CYS0063](#))
- 91 Michael Flint ([CYS0076](#))
- 92 Mineral Products Association ([CYS0048](#))
- 93 Mr Chris Terrell ([CYS0032](#))
- 94 Mr Michael Henry Clare ([CYS0113](#))
- 95 Mr Stephen Bellows ([CYS0041](#))
- 96 Mr William Blight ([CYS0034](#))
- 97 Muhammad Absar Asif ([CYS0092](#))
- 98 National Federation of Retail Newsagents ([CYS0121](#))
- 99 National Motorists Action Group (NMAG) ([CYS0030](#))
- 100 Neil Taylor ([CYS0021](#))
- 101 Newcycling (Newcastle Cycling Campaign) ([CYS0019](#))
- 102 Oliver Jeffcott ([CYS0033](#))
- 103 Paul Cotteeril ([CYS0001](#))
- 104 Paul Luton ([CYS0086](#))
- 105 Peter Garland ([CYS0008](#))
- 106 Pie Mapping ([CYS0026](#))
- 107 Professor Colin Pooley ([CYS0126](#))
- 108 Richard Wakeford ([CYS0015](#))
- 109 Richard William Armitage ([CYS0128](#))
- 110 Richmond Cycling Campaign ([CYS0131](#))
- 111 Road Danger Reduction Forum ([CYS0114](#))
- 112 Road Safety Analysis ([CYS0028](#))
- 113 Roadpeace ([CYS0056](#))
- 114 Roger Leary ([CYS0009](#))
- 115 Roy Bradshaw ([CYS0105](#))
- 116 Sam Kuper ([CYS0083](#))
- 117 Sanjeev Appicharla ([CYS0108](#))
- 118 Sanjeev Appicharla ([CYS0109](#))
- 119 Sanjeev Appicharla ([CYS0110](#))
- 120 Sanjeev Appicharla ([CYS0118](#))
- 121 Sarah Cheffins ([CYS0072](#))
- 122 Satnam Singh ([CYS0152](#))
- 123 Sevenoaks Cycle Forum ([CYS0088](#))
- 124 Sevenoaks Cycle Forum ([CYS0089](#))
- 125 Shirley And John Littlefair ([CYS0125](#))
- 126 Simon Lay ([CYS0117](#))
- 127 Simon Parker ([CYS0115](#))
- 128 Spokes, The Lothian Cycle Campaign ([CYS0135](#))
- 129 Stephen Flaherty ([CYS0116](#))

- 130 Sustrans ([CYS0058](#))
- 131 Tabitha Tanqueray ([CYS0061](#))
- 132 The Association of Bikeability Schemes ([CYS0120](#))
- 133 Thompsons Solicitors ([CYS0047](#))
- 134 Tim Gent ([CYS0141](#))
- 135 Tom Barker ([CYS0085](#))
- 136 Transition Town Totnes Cycling Group ([CYS0136](#))
- 137 Trl Ltd ([CYS0068](#))
- 138 William John Hare ([CYS0002](#))
- 139 Wystan Palm ([CYS0142](#))
- 140 Yogesh Raja ([CYS0004](#))

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/transcom

The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2014–15

Third Report	Cycling safety	HC 286 (Incorporating HC 852, Session 2013-14)
Second Report	Offshore helicopter safety	HC 289 (Incorporating HC 992, Session 2013-14)
First Report	Driving premiums down: fraud and the cost of motor insurance	HC 285 (Incorporating HC 286, Session 2013–14)
First Special Report	Forging ahead: UK shipping strategy: Government Response to the Committee's Thirteenth Report of Session 2013-14	HC 254

Session 2013–14

Seventeenth Report	Land transport expenditure: Who decides?	HC 1140
Sixteenth Report	National Policy Statement on National Networks	HC 1135
Fifteenth Report	Better roads: improving England's strategic road network	HC 850
Fourteenth Report	Putting passengers first, disruption at Gatwick, Christmas Eve 2013	HC 956
Seventeenth Special Report	Land transport security—scope for further EU involvement?: Further Government Response to the Committees Eleventh Report of Session 2012–13	HC 1192
Thirteenth Report	Forging ahead?: UK shipping strategy	HC 630
Twelfth Report	Future programme 2014	HC 1143
Eleventh Report	Safety at level crossings	HC 680 (HC 1260) (HC 274)
Tenth Report	Ready and waiting? Transport preparations for winter weather	HC 681 (HC 1139)
Ninth Report	High speed rail: on track?	HC 851 (HC 1085)
Fifteenth Special Report	Cancellation of the InterCity West Coast competition: Government update on the Laidlaw and Brown reports	HC 1086
Eighth Report	Access to ports	HC 266 (HC 1083)
Seventh Report	Local authority parking enforcement	HC 118 (HC 970)

Seventh Special Report	The new European motorcycle test: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of 2009–10	HC 656
Sixth Report	Flight Time Limitation: Follow-up	HC 641 (HC 795)
Fifth Report	Access to transport for disabled people	HC 116 (HC 870)
Fourth Report	Cost of motor insurance: whiplash	HC 117 (CM 8738)
Third Report	The work of the Vehicle and Operator Services Agency (VOSA)	HC 583 (HC 678)
Second Report	Future programme: 2013–14	HC 438
Fifth Special Report	The European Commission's 4 th Railway Package: Government Response to the Committee's Twelfth Report of Session 2012–13	HC 439
Third Special Report	Rail 2020: Rail Delivery Group and Passenger Focus responses to the Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2012–13	HC 81
Fourth Special Report	Land transport security—scope for further EU involvement?: Government Response to the Committee's Eleventh Report of Session 2012–13	HC 177
Second Special Report	Marine Pilotage: Government Response to the Committee's Ninth Report of Session 2012–13	HC 79
First Report	Aviation strategy	HC 78 (HC 596)
First Special Report	Cancellation of the InterCity West Coast franchise competition: Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2012–13	HC 80
Session 2012–13		
Twelfth Report	The European Commission's 4 th Railway Package	HC 1001(HC 439)
Eleventh Report	Land transport security—scope for further EU involvement?	HC 875
Ninth Special Report	Rail 2020: Government and Office of Rail Regulation Responses to the Committee's Seventh Report of 2012–13	HC 1059
Tenth Report	The Coastguard, Emergency Towing Vessels and the Maritime Incident Response Group: follow up: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of 2012–13	HC 1018
Ninth Report	Marine Pilotage	HC 840
Eighth Report	Cancellation of the InterCity West Coast franchise competition	HC 537
Eighth Special Report	Plug-in vehicles, plugged in policy?: Government Response to the Committee's Fourth Report of Session 2012–13	HC 884
Seventh Report	Rail 2020	HC 329
Sixth Report	The Coastguard, Emergency Towing Vessels and the Maritime Incident Response Group: follow up	HC 647
Fifth Report	Future programme: autumn and winter 2012–13	HC 591
Fourth Report	Plug-in vehicles, plugged in policy?	HC 239
Third Report	Competition in the local bus market	HC 10 (HC 761) (Incorporating

		HC 1861–i–iii)
Fifth Special Report	Flight Time Limitations: Government Response To The Committee's First Report Of Session 2012–13	HC 558
Fourth Special Report	Air Travel Organisers' Licensing (Atol) Reform: Government Response To The Committee's Seventeenth Report Of Session 2010–12	HC 557
Second Report	Road safety	HC 506 (HC 648) Incorporating HC 1738
First Report	Flight time limitations	HC 164 Incorporating HC 1838
Third Special Report	Sulphur emissions by ships: Government Response to the Committee's Sixteenth Report of Session 2010–12	HC 87
Second Special Report	Counting the cost: financial scrutiny of the Department for Transport 2011–12: Government Response to the Committee's Fifteenth Report of Session 2010–12	HC 15
First Special Report	Draft Civil Aviation Bill: Pre-Legislative Scrutiny: Government Response to the Committee's Thirteenth Report of Session 2010–12	HC 11

Session 2010–12

Seventeenth Report	Air Travel Organisers' Licensing (ATOL) reform	HC 1798
Fifteenth Special Report	Cable theft on the railway: Government Response to the Committee's Fourteenth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1933
Fourteenth Special Report	Thameslink rolling stock procurement: Government Response to the Committee's Eleventh Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1935
Thirteenth Special Report	Cost of motor insurance: follow up: Government Response to the Committee's Twelfth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1934
Sixteenth Report	Sulphur emissions by ships	HC 1561
Fifteenth Report	Counting the cost: financial scrutiny of the Department for Transport 2011–12	HC 1560
Fourteenth Report	Cable theft on the Railway	HC 1609 (HC 1933)
Twelfth Special Report	High Speed Rail: Government Response to the Committee's Tenth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1754
Thirteenth Report	Draft Civil Aviation Bill: Pre-Legislative Scrutiny	HC 1694
Twelfth Report	Cost of motor insurance: follow up	HC 1451 (HC 1934)
Eleventh Report	Thameslink rolling stock procurement	HC 1453 (HC 1935)
Eleventh Special Report	Out of the jam: reducing congestion on our roads: Government Response to the Committee's Ninth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1661
Tenth Report	High Speed Rail	HC 1185–I (HC 1754)
Ninth Report	Out of the jam: reducing congestion on our roads	HC 872 (HC 1661)
Eighth Report	Bus Services after the Spending Review	HC 750 (HC 1550)

Seventh Report	Taxis and private hire vehicles: the road to reform	HC 720 (HC 1507)
Sixth Report	The Coastguard, Emergency Towing Vessels and the Maritime Incident Response Group	HC 948, incorporating HC 752-i (HC 1482)
Fifth Report	Keeping the UK moving: The impact on transport of the winter weather in December 2010	HC 794 (HC 1467)
Fourth Report	The cost of motor insurance	HC 591 (HC 1466)
Third Report	Transport and the economy	HC 473 (HC 962)
Second Report	Financial Scrutiny of the Department for Transport	HC 683
First Report	Drink and drug driving law	HC 460 (Cm 8050)
Tenth Special Report	The proposal for a National Policy Statement on Ports: Government Response to the Committee Fifth Report of Session 2009–10	HC 1598
Ninth Special Report	Bus services after the Spending Review: Government Response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1550
Eighth Special Report	Taxis and private hire vehicles: the road to reform: Government Response to the Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1507
Seventh Special Report	The Coastguard, Emergency Towing Vessels and the Maritime Incident Response Group: Government Response to the Committee's Sixth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 1482
Sixth Special Report	Keeping the UK moving: The impact on transport of the winter weather in December 2010: Government Response to the Committee's Fifth Report of Session 2010–12	HC 1467
Fifth Special Report	The Cost of motor insurance: Government Response to the Committees Fourth Report of Session 2010-12	HC 750
Fourth Special Report	Transport and the economy: Government response to the Committee's Third Report of Session 2010-12	HC 962
Third Special Report	The performance of the Department for Transport: Government response to the Committee's Fourth Report of Session 2009–10	HC 549
Second Special Report	Update on the London Underground and the public-private (PPP) partnership agreements: Government response to the Committee's Seventh Report of Session 2009–10	HC 467
First Special Report	The major road network: Government response to the Committee's Eighth Report of Session 2009–10	HC 421