

MINUTES

Meeting: Transport Committee
Date: Thursday 9 January 2014
Time: 10.00 am
Place: Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA

Copies of the minutes may be found at:

<http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor-assembly/london-assembly/transport>

Present:

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair)
Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair)
Victoria Borwick AM
Tom Copley AM
Roger Evans AM
Darren Johnson AM
Murad Qureshi AM
Dr Onkar Sahota AM
Richard Tracey AM

1 Apologies for Absence and Chair's Announcements (Item 1)

- 1.1 There were no apologies for absence.
- 1.2 The Chair announced that David Waboso, Capital Programmes Director for London Underground had been awarded a CBE in the New Year's Honours List. The Committee noted that the Chair would be writing to congratulate Mr Waboso.

2 Declarations of Interests (Item 2)

2.1 Resolved:

- (a) That the list of offices held by Assembly Members, as set out in the table at Agenda Item 2, be noted as disclosable pecuniary interests; and**
- (b) That Tom Copley AM's declaration of hospitality from the Westminster Property Association, which was not yet on the Authority's register of gifts and hospitality, also be noted.**

3 Minutes (Item 3)

3.1 Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Transport Committee held on 10 December 2013 be signed by the Chair as a correct record of that meeting.

4 Summary List of Actions (Item 4)

4.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat.

4.2 Resolved:

That the outstanding actions arising from previous meetings of the Committee be noted.

5 Pedestrian Safety (Item 5)

5.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat as background to putting questions on pedestrian safety in London to the following invited guests:

- Anna Collins, Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets
- Amy Aeron-Thomas, Executive Director, RoadPeace;
- Richard Holmes, London Region Campaigns Officer, Royal National Institute of Blind People;
- Kate Carpenter, Chair of Road Safety Panel, Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation;
- Lilli Matson, Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, Transport for London (TfL); and

**Greater London Authority
Transport Committee
Thursday 9 January 2014**

- Iain Blackmore, Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL.

5.2 A record of the discussion with invited guests is attached as **Appendix 1**.

5.3 During the course of the discussion the Committee requested the following additional information from TfL:

- A list of the 26 sites on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) where studies were underway to identify appropriate pedestrian safety interventions;
- Confirmation on whether before and after safety audits were undertaken at sites where the guardrail was removed;
- Confirmation of whether telephone kiosks were specifically included in guidance on removal of street clutter on the TLRN;
- Confirmation on whether there was before and after analysis of pedestrian compliance with signals and collision rates at the 568 sites where TfL reduced 'green man time' since 2010 and, if undertaken, what the impact had been;
- Details of the boroughs which were opposed to the introduction of pedestrian countdown at traffic signals;
- Confirmation of when the external review of TfL's road safety audit procedures (as set out in the Road Safety Action Plan) would take place and whether the findings would be made public; and
- Details of any evaluation of the impact of Operation Safeway and confirmation of how TfL would use the evaluation to inform its future work on pedestrian safety.

5.4 **Resolved:**

- (a) That the report and discussion with guests be noted; and**
- (b) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree the output from the Committee's work on pedestrian safety in London.**

6 London TravelWatch - Memorandum of Understanding (Item 6)

6.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat, setting out the revised Memorandum of Understanding with London TravelWatch.

6.2 **Resolved:**

That the revised Memorandum of Understanding with London TravelWatch be approved.

7 Transport Committee Work Programme (Item 7)

- 7.1 The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Secretariat, setting out the Committee's work programme.
- 7.2 Darren Johnson AM asked that the discussion with the Commissioner for Transport in March include the redevelopment of Earls Court and TfL's plans for the Lillie Bridge maintenance depot.
- 7.3 **Resolved:**
- (a) That the Committee's work programme be noted; and**
 - (b) That authority be delegated to the Chair, in consultation with party Group Lead Members, to agree arrangements for site visits in relation to pedestrian safety, cycle safety, Crossrail and London Bridge station redevelopment.**

8 Date of Next Meeting (Item 8)

- 8.1 The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday 5 February 2014 at 10.00am in the Chamber.

9 Any Other Business the Chair Considers Urgent (Item 9)

- 9.1 There was no other business.

10 Close of Meeting

- 10.1 The meeting ended at 12.40pm.

Chair

Date

Contact Officer: Dale Langford, Senior Committee Officer; Telephone: 020 7983 4415; Email: dale.langford@london.gov.uk; Minicom: 020 7983 4458

Transport Committee – 9 January 2014

Transcript of Item 5: Pedestrian Safety

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Let us get on then to our discussion about pedestrian safety in London, so please could our guests introduce themselves.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, Transport for London): I am Iain Blackmore, Head of Traffic Infrastructure for Transport for London (TfL).

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I am Lilli Matson; I am Head of Delivery Planning at Transport for London, which looks after the strategy and policy for walking, among other things.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): I am Kate Carpenter; I chair the Road Safety Panel of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT), which is the leading body for road safety engineering; that is road safety audit of new highway schemes and casualty reductions works. We are the home for the Society of Road Safety Auditors; the dominant body for people working in that specialism.

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, Royal National Institute of Blind People): Good morning, I am Richard Holmes; I am Campaigns Officer at the Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB).

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): I am Amy Aeron-Thomas; I am the Executive Director of RoadPeace, a national charity for road crash victims. I represent RoadPeace on the Pedestrian Safety Working Group and the Cycle Risk Working Group of TfL; Safe Streets for London Steering Group, and I am also on the Department for Transport's (DfT) Justice for Vulnerable Road User Working Group.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): A good cross-cutting role.

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): I am Anna Collins; I am Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator for Living Streets.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Thank you, all of you, for coming today to investigate this important topic; I think a topic that does not really receive enough attention generally speaking, and in a way this is the 'sister' scrutiny to the work we did before Christmas looking at cycling safety and the two things are clearly linked.

Can I just kick off by asking, I will start with TfL if I may, and Lilli and Iain; it does appear that the numbers of pedestrians killed or seriously injured (KSI) are rising again after a long period of decline and something seems to have happened from 2010 onwards. Why do you think that may be happening? What are your comments on that?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I am going to kick off on that because that is more my area than Iain's. I do not want to bore you with endless numbers and facts but I think it is important to set the context for this discussion with some statistics about pedestrian casualties in London. We all recognise that 2012 was a difficult year; it was a bad year for pedestrian safety. Although, overall, the number of pedestrian casualties went down, there was a 17% increase in the number of serious casualties, and that is a very serious concern.

If we look over the period where we are monitoring road safety, which is from a 2005 to 2009 baseline, which is what was recommended by DfT, we have seen a decline in the number of killed and serious injuries by around 8%, and even if we look at 2012 there was a significant decline in the number of fatalities. It is really important to recognise that London, both on its main roads and on its borough roads, through the actions of boroughs, TfL, the Metropolitan Police Service, and many other agencies, has been doing quite well over the last eight to ten years in terms of pedestrian safety.

What I want to say - and I hope to get the opportunity to talk about some of the actions that we have been prompted to take because of the increase in 2012 - what I am also happy to report is that early indications from 2013 would suggest that numbers are again significantly down and more on-track with what we were seeing before. Obviously those are still provisional figures and they will be released when they are finalised with the Metropolitan Police Service in the spring, but it is not to say that 2012 was not to be taken account of - because any increase does need to be taken account of - but it does seem to be slightly out of the ordinary so we need to learn from that; see what more we can do, but also recognise that London has been doing well in terms of pedestrian safety.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Lilli, there was a rise in 2011 as well as in 2012 and I think our concern is that it looks like not just a blip but a possible trend change.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I think what we need to do is, when you look at a ten-year period, the period to the baseline, the numbers are going downwards, and what I am suggesting is that the early figures from 2013 would suggest we are back in line with that trend. It does not mean that it is not worth looking really hard at 2011 and 2012 because, if there are increases - and we have been delving into it - in child pedestrian injuries or in injuries affecting particularly young adults, we need to ask what it is we can do about that, and that is very much what is driving the actions that are being set out in the draft Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and in the Road Safety Action Plan. I would like to be able to talk about those actions because we want to get on and do them. It is not that London has completely changed direction, it has not, it is still making progress in terms of improving pedestrian safety and in 2012 - the year we are talking about - it was the second lowest year ever for pedestrian fatalities in London.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): What research have you done, qualitative analysis, looking at the underlying drivers behind the changes in the statistics?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): We have undertaken a range of both quantitative and qualitative analysis. In terms of just the quantitative, the Road Safety Action Plan, which was published earlier this year, included a whole new range of risk analysis, which examined - by age, by sex, by distance - who and which groups were most at risk, and that really allows us to better pinpoint where actions need to take place. From that, for example, we can identify that elderly pedestrians are more at risk than younger pedestrians; it does not mean that in aggregate numbers there are huge numbers of pedestrian casualties, but considering the number of journeys

they make they are more at risk. We know in terms of absolute numbers that it is the 20 to 30-year-old group that we must target if we want to reduce numbers further. We also know in terms of risk that it is often the age-group around 12 to 13-year-olds when people start independent travel that they are at risk. Understanding through the quantitative analysis where the risk is and where the greatest numbers are allows us to better introduce interventions.

In terms of qualitative analysis, we also monitor attitudes to road safety; we undertake a lot of behavioural research, for example we have been interfacing with older people to try to understand some of the decisions they make because we know that, when and if the collision takes place, they are much more likely to have a serious outcome. It is a mixture of both types of research that have been underway.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): I do get a bit of a mixed message from you there though, Lilli, because on the one hand you are saying you are looking at the problem and trying to do something about it, but on the other hand I get the impression there is a bit of denial going on within TfL and I think we have learned from bitter experience that we have to kind of scrutinise TfL very hard when it goes into denial. This Committee, for example, was very critical of the early Cycle Superhighways and I wish we had been harder about them at the time. We think there is a problem growing and I am not too sure whether or not, Lilli, TfL thinks that there is, if not a trend, but a danger of slipping in the wrong direction on this.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I think, if you look at the Road Safety Action Plan, which was published in June last year, it is absolutely explicit in saying the key focus for attacking road safety in London is to address vulnerable road users, and that includes cyclists; that includes motorcyclists; and most importantly of all in terms of numbers it includes pedestrians, and all of the organisation's efforts are targeted towards particularly addressing vulnerable road-user safety. I think it is important to have an understanding of the longer-term trends and not to ignore the fact that numbers have gone down, and very significantly, but the Road Safety Action Plan said there is an issue in terms of vulnerable road-user safety in London.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Lilli, you just said it again, you said numbers have gone down. In 2010, seriously injured: 855; in 2011, seriously injured: 903; in 2012, seriously injured: 1,053. There has been a steady increase across the killed and seriously injured since 2010, so I think we all understand that you can have a blip one year and it could be to do with weather or whatever, but it does start to look like a trend when you get two years' figures like that in a row.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I understand that and I am not saying that we are ignoring it, but I am also saying that the convention within looking at data within road safety is to look at it over a period of time, the recommended approach from the DfT is to compare it against the 2005 to 2009 baseline. In 2005 to 2009 the figures were 1,120 for serious injuries and there has been a decline, but I would say to you we are concerned about those two years and we are taking action on them.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): It is still above the baseline and the --

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): No, it is not above the baseline; it has gone down by 8%.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): No, no, it has not. If you take the baseline as 2005 to 2009 average then it is still above the baseline. The other thing is there has been a shift in the proportion of fatalities and injuries on the roads towards pedestrians being more represented among those accidents.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Just to clarify the figures, because this is a public session, this is really important to make absolutely clear. If we are looking at the number on average of people killed or seriously injured as pedestrians between 2005 and 2009 was 1,216 and in 2012 it was 1,123; which is a reduction of 8%. Therefore the numbers against the baseline have gone down and, as I said, in 2012 the number of people very unfortunately killed as pedestrians on London roads was the second lowest number ever.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): But we are still above the baseline. We are 12% above the baseline and pedestrian injuries of all severities are 9% above the baseline. Of course there has been improvement over the years and I think we all appreciate there has been a really good long-term trend of reduction in pedestrian casualties in London, and it is because we are worried that progress is slipping away from us that we want to see, is something going wrong, what is going wrong, and how on top of it are TfL? Can I bring in some of our other colleagues here; do you want to comment on this dialogue? Do you think we have a problem?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): CIHT endorse the approach of taking a rolling average of data. Any individual year, whether it is national overall statistics or whether in an area, they tend to show fluctuations from year-to-year and it is always risky trying to take a single year out of context because it is the long-term trends we should be looking at. If we do see localised increase and reductions in individual severities or user groups or locations that is relevant, but long-term trends are very important. You do see complex patterns related to other social factors, so recession has an impact on serious injuries, for example, so we need to see there is a wide complex action, layers of geography, different road users, different locations, different ages. We endorse the strategy of looking at risk and conflict, looking at large numbers of casualties in areas where risk is very high but maybe where numbers of casualties are not that high, looking at older road users who are vulnerable.

We have not yet talked about active travel and the benefits of walking and CIHT see that as absolutely critical, similar to the debate about cycling. Typical national deaths from cycling are 100 to 110 [per year], but hundreds of thousands of people die prematurely from ill health associated with inactivity, so there is a danger of looking at one thing and not seeing the big picture. If we create an impression that walking is dangerous, people will do less of it and the damage can be much greater.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): No, I think the work of this Committee has always been to promote walking and we have done that in the past and what we want to see is the removal of barriers to people being able to walk safely.

Anybody else want to comment? Do you agree with TfL's assessment of what is going on and are you happy with their understanding of it?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): I would like to just mention the problems we have around data. We used to get regular reports on a monthly basis of the latest fatality statistics and these were just preliminary, but at least we were able to stay abreast. We were shocked to learn

in a cycle safety meeting that there have been six pedestrians killed in the same time that there were six cyclists killed. Cyclist deaths are very well reported by the media; pedestrian deaths are not, so it is hard to keep track of the actual risk and that is just deaths.

We have a problem with serious injuries and under-reporting. We know DfT estimates that on a national level you have over three times as many people seriously injured in collisions as reported to the police. TfL uses a much lower estimate of under-reporting and it is one that is based on older data. I think you also asked why, and I think there are also problems around finding that out, because you look at contributory factor data, yet that is collected at the very start before the investigation has really even occurred, so I would say it is premature. Even DfT concludes that it is biased data, police are unlikely to give speed as a factor when they have not done the investigation yet, have not looked at camera footage.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): So lots of gaps.

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): In Living Streets' point of view, we think that more priority should be given to pedestrians overall, we would like to see a senior leadership role similar to Andrew Gilligan [Cycling Commissioner] over cycling, and we would like to see a pedestrian casualty reduction figure as well, rather than the broader one itself, we would like to see an overall walking vision similar to that given to cycling. We would just like to see greater priority given to pedestrians in this context.

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): A couple of points I would like to pick up on, I think the perception one is really important. I think from our members and supporters' group we are increasingly hearing that it is much more dangerous and difficult to be a pedestrian. Which leads to two results from them, they go out less by themselves, or even not at all, or only go out when accompanied by somebody else, so that is a general point that has other aspects to it, which you might pick up later on.

The other point I think I would like to make at this stage is how good it is that the Committee has taken this opportunity to look at pedestrians because I think perhaps policies have been made previously - and I highlight traffic flows as an example of that - which have diminished the independence and wellbeing of pedestrians. With most of our client group being older people I think that is a considerable factor in terms of general sense of wellbeing, but there is also a need to look at where policy has been made in one area, eg speeding-up traffic flows which has a very obvious and clear impact upon a pedestrian's sense of safety and sense of wellbeing in terms of the diminished time to cross a road, or more likely when there is an island in the road and you have to cross again on the other side. Those points come to us from members, which again we might pick up on later on in the session.

Roger Evans AM: I am interested really in what our witnesses think of TfL's efforts to improve pedestrian safety. Let us do this objectively. Anna, how many marks out of ten would you give TfL for their efforts and why?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): Certainly going towards the mid- to low numbers really. We would just like to see, as I said earlier, a greater priority given to pedestrians. Things like the junction review, the locations that have been selected are on the basis of cyclists obviously, and we would like to see greater priority given to looking at key areas that are

difficult for pedestrians as well. Looking at things like crossings where the time available to cross the road is not sufficient for most older people, and talking about older people's vulnerability as they are particularly vulnerable if they are hit. If they cannot walk particularly fast that is obviously a problem and also their physiology, they are more likely to suffer longer-term impact. I think TfL needs to really push the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan forward and take bold steps like trying to introduce 20 miles an hour on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) in places like Westminster that do not have it already and really push forward on those key policies to try and reduce road danger.

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): I think they score better on their Safe Streets for London [Road Safety Action] Plan than they do the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and that is still in a draft format. The Safe Streets for London is much stronger on the vision of speed reduction with intelligent speed adaptation (ISA) and average speed cameras. When it comes back to the Pedestrian Safety one, it falls back on education. The Safe Streets for London one adopted a systems approach, so we are supposed to acknowledge that people make mistakes, we are supposed to be moving away from behavioural change and looking more at designing out danger, and we thought that was great and we have asked TfL how that is being rolled out through their staff so they appreciate that they should be taking a different approach. We would say, with the Pedestrian Safety Plan, we think that has been going in the wrong direction; that is weaker.

Roger Evans AM: Richard, what is your view?

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): Thank you. I think I would probably go for a five to six because I think there have been some innovative ideas. I would probably give a higher score if some of those ideas had been as a result of consultation with organisations such as ourselves. I am thinking of the removal of railings at junctions and crossing points for example, which sometimes act as a useful mobility aid for visually-impaired people if you come to a railing point and there is a crossing nearby you use that as a daily guide, so had we been consulted and we could have given that information rather than having to do it retrospectively then I would probably give them a higher score.

I also think it is fair to say that some of the problems are perhaps more of a borough nature than they are of TfL. I am thinking perhaps of some of the policies around the removal or messing around with tactile paving at crossings, for example, where there is a tendency to reduce that or change its colour, neither of which are welcome at all by us and our members and supporters. I think that there are areas where TfL is unfortunately perhaps undermined by borough policies but has clearly a valuable role in influencing and affecting activities at a local level and indeed hopefully some of you will take that back to your constituencies as well to look at those areas. I think it is a positive five to six.

Roger Evans AM: That is an interesting comment you made, Richard, about boroughs removing tactile paving; I did not know that was happening. What justification are they giving for that?

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): There have been suggestions that it is to do with public realm, it is an aesthetic issue I think where architects like open areas and areas where there are no 'blips' in it, as they would see it, so removing the traditional pinkish-red bubble paving to fit in aesthetically, turning that to a grey colour with the pavement around, is aesthetically pleasing, but also rather difficult if you have some sight to spot that because it blends in with the environment. Linked to that, there have been moves to reduce the amount of paving at crossings, so the so-called 'tails', which go across the pavement, which act as an essential guide for a guide-dog

user or a visually-impaired person with a cane, because you come to that tail and obviously you know therefore there is a crossing point to be used. Some boroughs have reduced that to maybe two or three blocks right at the road edge, so it is very reasonable to believe that people will just walk past because you do not walk close to the road edge to be able to spot that.

We have had issues with that and I think the big case was Newham where it actually went to the High Court and the High Court ruled in favour of the visually-impaired person who took that case and the judge ruled they had to come back with new plans, which we hoped would impact on other areas because they would think perhaps more before they make the changes, but it is something that is starting to creep into other areas, the architects over safety, if you want to put it like that.

Roger Evans AM: That is interesting. We have some site visits later on so we will take a look at those from that perspective. Kate, how many marks would you give them out of ten?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): I think giving a single number to something so complex is impossible personally. I think there are four areas where I think it is worth looking at. All collisions are rare, random, multi-factor events. They have road-user components, deliberate or accidental errors, we have vehicle components, deficiencies in vehicles, and then there are environmental factors, flooding, skid-resistance, for example. A highway authority cannot affect all of those in every collision and sometimes we create the illusion that they can control everything.

I think the level of control, of analysis, of understanding a problem and targeting it, I would say that is a high score, given that a lot of the things are only targeted in a limited way, and we have TLRN versus the wider network, most of the network is borough network, but most of the serious injuries tend to be more TLRN, so it is quite complex.

The second element is that there are conflicting statutory duties on highway authorities, so they have duties to keep the traffic moving and pressure from the public members to do that. They also have statutory duties to protect people from harm, and inevitably where there is conflict with pedestrians and vehicles there is scope for harm and you cannot pretend that conflict is not there, so I think sometimes again we suggest it is impossible. What is important is that the professionals have the information to know how to minimise harm, and one of the things CIHT does is publish best-practice guidance about how to design roads that have good safe characteristics, but also how to manage networks at an authority-wide level. This is about policy on home-to-school transport, about surfacing materials, about design, about network management, about urban design. This is not just one area.

The third area is about conflicting user needs. Richard mentioned visually-impaired users' needs. Even within visually-impaired users they are not a single homogenous group, different users have different needs and different levels of awareness of how the tactile toolkit is supposed to work, it is too complicated. I am part of a small group working with Urban Design London trying to create a simplified toolkit that both meets users' needs and the aesthetic pressure to create something that is less intrusive in the street scene. Again, they are conflicting pressures. Some visually-impaired users in Sight Concern, for example, have told me they do not want any tactile paving anywhere at all. They think it is an obstruction; they want a proper curb, they do not want a flush curb, but mobility-impaired users need a flush curb so they can access the highway to cross the road. Cyclists need different things from pedestrians. This is not a single homogenous issue.

The final one is leadership and I think that is a high score particularly from me. It is about defining a policy that is about understanding the problem and that I think, in the Road Safety Action Plan, I think personally that is outstanding in looking at the different layers and complexities of the casualty problem, it is about taking bold decisions about where there are conflicting needs and about relative priorities for pedestrians and motor traffic and pedestrians, cyclists and motor traffic, and that complex triangle. Therefore I would say, I would not want to put a number on it just across the board, where there is scope for control I think there is good ability, but we forget TfL does not drive the vehicles, is not a pedestrian taking decisions, and there is a limit to what you can control.

Roger Evans AM: That is quite a positive take on it, but I think we must conclude there are some improvements required. Lilli, when are we going to see the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): The Pedestrian Safety Action Plan is due for publication this spring and it is good to have early feedback from Amy because it is still in draft so it can be amended and improved. Would it be possible, just because I am aware, I have previously met with Val and Caroline and talked about some of the activities we have done, but not had that opportunity to outline at all what has been going on since the Road Safety Action Plan was published in June, and there has been a tremendous amount of activity. If it is relevant, I can just give you a quick overview of some of the things that have been going on just in recent months.

Roger Evans AM: I suspect that some of the questions, the detailed questions we are going to ask you later on, will give you an opportunity to do that.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): It will be quite useful to know when it is going to be published though.

Roger Evans AM: Yes.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): It is being done with a working group, which includes Living Streets, which includes RoadPeace, and until we are happy with that working group --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): What is your target?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I would say probably March/April but we basically meet once a month and further work goes on, but it is a joint and collaborative piece of work and so when the working group feels that it is ready to go out then it will go out.

Roger Evans AM: The target for pedestrians killed and seriously injured?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): For a reduction of the pedestrians being killed and seriously injured?

Roger Evans AM: Yes.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): No, the Mayor has established a KSI target across the whole of London, which is to reduce the number of people being

killed and seriously injured by 40% by 2020, of which we will need to significantly make progress on pedestrians being not killed and seriously injured to achieve that target. The action plan is about how we work to achieve that and to make pedestrians both safer and feel safer, which is one of the points I think Richard made as well.

Roger Evans AM: What is the budget for delivering the plan?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Overall, there is no specific Pedestrian Safety Action Plan budget; there is a road safety budget and there is also funding for improvements for pedestrians, which is embedded across many different TfL budgets. We provided information to the Committee that detailed the road safety budget of around £250 million in the TfL Business Plan. But I would emphasise that improvements for pedestrians are going to be delivered by many other TfL budgets, such as the Legible London budget, such as the Pedestrian Countdown budget, such as there will be improvements to the Better Junctions budgets. Those are not captured in the figures that we have given you because pedestrians are absolutely at the heart of a lot of what we do and therefore, when we deliver a road scheme, or even a new bus priority scheme, we are thinking about the needs of pedestrians and their safety as well, so there will always be elements of money being spent in that way as well.

Roger Evans AM: OK, and that £250 million is a substantial increase on what, the £106 million that was in the --

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): In the previous budget, yes, it will.

Roger Evans AM: Do you have the capacity to spend all that money? Because one of the things we see with Transport for London, particularly I think with road projects, is we have a big budget and it does not all get spent by the end of the year because you do not have the traffic engineers to do it and there is slippage in the plan, so that big budget, which is there for pedestrians, translates into a TfL underspend at the end of the year. Is that something we are going to see here?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I do not believe so, and, if you look at the breakdown of the monies that were provided, the substantial sums within it include, for example, the management of the safety camera network, which is an ongoing activity, it is spent every year and helps to manage the safety camera network. The marketing budget, which is really important in putting out messages around being safe and how to stay safe, that is not under-spent. A large component of this £250 million is not big bulky capital projects; the main substantial capital project that is captured within it is the investment to upgrade and replace the camera infrastructure in London and that is well underway of its procurement so it will definitely be spent within this Business Plan period.

Richard Tracey AM: There is one supplementary I had on this particular section Roger is questioning, and there was one also on your section, Val. First of all, Roger was asking you, and indeed, Richard [Holmes], you were talking about the removal in some cases of tactile signals for blind people. There is an allied area to that, which is the removal of guardrails, and I know that there is a campaign, and it is something that the Mayor is rather interested in, in removing clutter from the streets, but frankly in the question of guardrails I have had a number of objections from schools where these guardrails have been removed from outside the schools and to be quite blunt about it my

correspondence with TfL has been very long and really rather difficult and tedious to prevent the removal of some of these guardrails when clearly parents and teachers and heads and so on of schools did not want them removed. Is this actually a contribution in your view to the cause of some of the accidents? Why is it that TfL are so difficult about this when the message is very clear coming especially from schools?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Clearly there has been a programme within TfL on the TLRN to remove some guardrails; similarly boroughs have also been removing certain guardrails. When and if any guardrail is removed we undertake a safety audit before and after and if there was serious local concern, this is not my area of programme to deliver, but I would doubt that guardrail was being removed over and above local concerns. I am not familiar with your correspondence; I am quite happy to take this away and give you a fuller answer afterwards. We have been looking, because of doing the audits after, whether there is likely to be an increase in the collisions resulting, and we obviously map all the collisions that happen in London and, as we are monitoring and looking at it, there is not a correlation between where guardrail has been removed and sudden increases in collisions, because if there was we would be doing something about it. Usually these have only been removed in situations where it is appropriate to the urban realm in the way the street scene is being used and if there are any concerns then we need to know about it.

Richard Tracey AM: Yes, I will give you two locations, one is Roehampton Lane --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Richard, Caroline has that in her section to ask, but also I think we are getting a bit too locally-specific. Can we generalise that?

Richard Tracey AM: I mean it did seem to me that this very thing is a cause of pedestrian accidents and I mean particularly children and it is actually very relevant at this point.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): No, I think what Lilli said was that they have done some research to show it is not happening and I think other Members will say that we have had experiences where we have asked for specific site risk assessments and we have stopped it in one or two places.

Richard Tracey AM: Well it has taken a long time for me to stop both of these or to get them amended, so I mean Lilli needs -- Roehampton and Battersea Park Road are the two locations.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): You got the references in, yes.

Richard Tracey AM: The other question I had is that interestingly enough the KSI total has gone up since 2009, looking at 2009 to 2012, it does occur to me - and it certainly coincides with a lot of the correspondence I get - that possibly this coincides with the extra number of cyclists on the road. I know it is a sensitive question, but there are complaints from pedestrians that (a) there are too many cyclists on pavements illegally and also that of course they cannot hear cyclists coming in the same way as they can vehicles. What do you think of that? Richard [Holmes] perhaps might like to comment on that one.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Can I just give the figures? Certainly most pedestrians, unfortunately 66%, are involved in collisions with cars, and the second greatest grouping thereafter is motorcyclists, and thereafter buses and vans and heavy goods vehicles (HGV).

Richard Tracey AM: Cyclists are --

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Cyclists is infinitesimal, it is a very, very small number, and we would need to look at it with the growth of cycling, but it is not underlying any change in the figures that we have seen recently. The other factor we do need to bear in mind, and I have not mentioned it up to now, is obviously London's population has been growing, so there are more people in London. Nevertheless, when we look at the rate of casualties per journey for pedestrians they have gone down by around a third since 2003, so while the population is going up the rate of collisions is still coming down. While cycling is important, I do not think that is an issue at the moment.

Richard Tracey AM: That is good news. Richard [Holmes], can you comment on that?

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): Yes, thank you very much. It is certainly an issue we do hear a lot about from members and supporters, both cycling on pavements and not adhering to the highway code at crossings for example and jumping red lights, it comes up quite a large amount of the time. I would be surprised if there were many people who have visual impairment who go out who have not had some experience of a cyclist; I certainly have and I am sure I am not unlucky in being that. Fortunately I am slightly above my fighting weight and can take being hit by a bike, but an older person would be in more danger.

I think the important part about that is the effect it has incrementally on a person's sense of independence and wellbeing that if something like that happens once you might think that is just unlucky, but it fits in again with perception, you hear someone else had that experience, and you think, "Right, it's not actually a very safe and friendly environment to go out because even when I am waiting for the audible signal or I am holding the tactile cone and it is safe for me to cross"; there still might be that slight fear, well, someone else, ie a cyclist, is not adhering to that custom and will I be safe even to cross across the road.

It is definitely an issue of concern for us, and it is something that Kate made reference to a moment ago, of conflict. Perhaps one group, cyclists, feels ever more marginalised and therefore take more risks and behave in ways that they may not behave in, in a normal situation, because they want themselves to be safe, so go on the pavement, you do not stop at lights because you have to start going again. We can definitely see an increase in that level of behaviour and obviously therefore an increase in the sense of concern and reduction of wellbeing of visually-impaired people, definitely.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, I wanted to look - I will start with you, Lilli - particularly at the TLRN, the red routes across London, I do not want to argue statistics with you because we have had that already this morning, but I accept the point you make, you have to look at trends and so on, but if you look at particularly between 2011 and 2012 we saw serious injuries on the red routes rise by 36%, whereas on borough roads it was down 34%, so there is clearly a contrast in that particular year. How do you account for that? What is going on that you think has seen that rise on the roads you are responsible for?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): On a one-year basis, as I said, I do not think you can look for a magic answer that is going to explain all that. What we have done, and we have changed our approach of looking at the priority locations on the Transport for

London Road Network, to identify where action is needed. Looking actually at a three-year average of collisions, we are now prioritising those locations where vulnerable road users in particular, not all casualties, but particularly vulnerable road users are disproportionately represented, so we can better target our interventions. We have identified a number of locations, around 25, where special studies are now underway at locations that are not captured by any other activity that is going on, the Better Junctions or the Urban Realm schemes, for example, to make sure that on those TLRN sites we can absolutely understand if engineering or better enforcement or education would be the solution to tackle the issue facing vulnerable road users. The way that we are using our data and then feeding it straight through into actions has changed in the last year in light of the Safe Streets for London, and like the systems approach, which Amy was talking about, and we will ensure that we are better able to target those locations on the TLRN where we are seeing casualties occurring.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): There is a list of 25 and you are changing junctions or whatever the issues are at those to make it safer as well as education?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, it is actually, because you are looking at - not to be technical - nodes and links, i.e. junctions and the bits before it, a cluster of around 26 sites, and we are doing studies of all of those areas to find out what the right interventions are. You have to understand also that year-on-year that geography will change, so we will have a rolling programme of activity funded by that additional investment in the Business Plan to be able to better address those TLRN sites.

We also now are doing that same analysis and making it available to all boroughs, so let us not forget that the majority of unfortunate pedestrian collisions do occur on borough roads and that is a point we need to recognise; we only manage 5% of the road network. We want to provide the data, the analysis and the training and support to enable boroughs to be able to do the same thinking and interventions on their road networks, so we are producing the same lists and analysis and making it available to the boroughs.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): OK, well let us just be clear, it is 26 sites, not 25 as you said originally, and work is going to be carried out on those sites by the end of this financial year or next financial year?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, not by the end of 2014 financial year, but 2014/15, yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You are going to be doing work on that and then there will be another range of sites?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): This will be the rolling way that we will begin to take this forward in light of the Business Plan.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): That will pick up some of the sites that were in your submission from Transport for London, a lot of them in central London boroughs particularly, some of them around Westminster and so on?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): It will, although one comment I would make on that list is obviously a lot of those sites, because it was simply looking at

the total number of collisions, you would expect to be there because they have extremely high volumes of traffic flow, Oxford Circus, for example. With the sites that we are studying, we are particularly looking at where it is disproportionate, so is this out of the ordinary, what is wrong here, and so the match is not exactly the same with the list we gave you because those sites --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Would you send us the list? I think we would be very interested to have that list of 26; I do not think it was in the original submission. That would be very useful to see.

Iain, could I pick up with you perhaps the next question I have, one of the concerns many of us have is that Transport for London is far too slow to respond to changes that are needed on the roads that it controls, it may only be 5% of the network, as Lilli has reminded us, but actually very, very busy roads, very dangerous roads in places. How do you respond to that; that you are far too slow to respond when there are clearly serious collisions and accident hotspots?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I think, going on with what Lilli has said, is that knee-jerk reactions to specific very immediate accidents is not a good way forward; it is better to look at trend and see if this is out of the ordinary. Where a need for an intervention is identified, it does take time to get it right, there is not just one mode that we will consider; we have to consider all the modes and we have to consider all stakeholders. In doing that and coming up with a design, we want to make sure that making it better for one user does not actually make it worse for others. In doing that, we do a study, and then mobilise to do work on the street.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Are there ways you could speed up those processes that you have when you do identify an area and you agree, looking at the wider trends, that this is an area we need to tackle, we need to change the infrastructure, it then seems to take an age to get anything done, 18 months I think it was on the cycle superhighway 2, which seems ridiculous.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): In some ways that is probably the outside amount of time, in some instances we are much quicker, and also it involves the level of intervention, some of the works on cycle superhighways are at major junctions with very complex issues; it is not a very simple straightforward easy fix, and doing that study and making sure that everyone is represented does take an amount of time to ensure that all parties are happy. What we do not want to do is rush in and do works and then find that we have made it worse for a certain group of users who then say, "We want this changed or pulled out". What we do try and do is when we do it we do it right and what goes in resolves the issue for all concerned.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Is there not a case at times to put, in as it were, temporary measures to see how it does in reality affect the footfall, the traffic flow, and then make it permanent later, so you have not spent huge amounts of money only to have to come back and change it.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I think we do that where we can, sometimes that is possible and sometimes it is not, sometimes putting in temporary measures can make matters worse, but where we can we do look at temporary solutions and we do look at studying those to see if they have solved the problem. That is a practice we follow.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Kate, could I bring you in perhaps on that and also perhaps you could add what you think Transport for London could learn from, whether it is other boroughs, or international best practice, we have heard certainly of cycling some real experts internationally coming to speak to us. What could TfL learn of how to reduce road danger?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): I think it is like the 360 degree review; we can all learn from what other countries and areas have done, and some of the areas that we talked to, cycling has been doing this very actively in looking at things like high-visibility clothing and helmets versus treating cycling as just any other activity, so very different attitudes in different countries, is it about different drivers' attitudes, is it about cycling infrastructure, and --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I am thinking about infrastructure here really; I do not want to focus on education, I want to talk about the infrastructure, which TfL controls.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): About the infrastructure, there absolutely are lessons to be learned. We do have a different regulatory environment; we have a much more controlled regulated world. There is a lot of benefit from that; it drives consistency. The more local flexibility you have, the greater the risk is you will have inconsistency, and that can create confusion for drivers in different areas.

There was mention earlier of disparity between boroughs and TLRN networks. One of the things that we see in my day job in casualty reduction is the massive pressure on boroughs particularly for local action, local pressure, and they have to balance an evidence-based approach, which says, "We will treat the places with the highest risk and highest casualties", versus a local pressure approach, which says, "We will treat the places that the public want treated". People tend ironically to write more about the places where no one gets injured because the hazard is self-evident. They have written to you because they can see what the hazard is, but so can the road users, so no one gets injured. Or where a random injury takes place and one incident in 10 years, we must do something, and if nothing was done there might be no other injury for 20 years.

We advocate an approach where local people identify concerns and priorities, but professionals are involved in then solving those problems, but we do not invite every resident in London to design the roads; it is the members and local people that are defining concerns and priorities, but they are not trying to design something. What you can see is the opposite of evidence-based, and that is one of the issues that came up in Newham with the tactile paving was pressures from officers, from members, from the public, to make changes that were not in the public interest. Therefore consistency, an evidence-based approach, TfL has a very strong evidence-based approach to analysing problems and solving them, and a lot of boroughs can learn from that because massive loss of road safety professionals within a lot of authorities means there are very few people left who have the skill and experience to deliver the interventions, so sharing the skills and knowledge is incredibly important.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Can I just join in this debate a little bit, because I think it is one that elected members around the world would like to have, because it is not uncommon for concerned residents groups who feel there is a road safety issue to be told something that sounds to them like, "Not enough people have died there yet", and that the evidence-based approach used by the professionals basically requires that some people be sacrificed before safety improvements are made. I do not quite understand why the methodology of predictive risk assessment where the subjective experience of users is not actually weighted properly because one of the things that we are

interested in is the promotion of walking and therefore when the public say, “We have a desire line to cross this road here but at the moment it is not safe enough to do so”, why would that not receive as much weighting as a professional saying, “We are waiting for some people to die there”.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): That is covered in the strategy and it takes a graph of risk, low to high, and incidents, low to high, so at one extreme you could say, “Pedestrian risk on the motorway is very high but there are not many casualties because it is a self-evidently hazardous place”, never mind that it is regulated --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): No, we are talking about London streets now.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): The same is true on the dual carriageway, very segregated urban network, people still get injured crossing that because they might think it is safer than going through a subway, for example. Perception or risk versus actual casualty hazard. To manage a network, you have to look at the level of risk, and that is one of the things that public representatives can bring forward very effectively, levels of concern. It might be nobody is injured because it is so dangerous nobody dares cross the road. It needs to be treated, but the strategy does look at exactly that, it says, “We must treat places that are risky, even if there are very low levels of injury. We must also treat places with very high levels of injury, even if in theory the risk is low, because people feel safe.”

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Are you saying that the methodology will now find a way of capturing the perceptions of residents in a way that will be weighted of resource allocation?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): I am not personally responsible for the management of the London network. CIHT advocate local involvement in decision-making but not at the expense of good practice, so it would be hard to justify spending all your money on areas of public concern where injuries are very unlikely, for example, at one extreme, and not treating those roads where people are already being injured on a day-by-day basis.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Can I put it to you that public perception or public comment, there is a more or less structured way of doing this, there is a difference between a noisy protest group and actually doing some serious pedestrian surveying so you have some data. I just wonder whether or not there would be a proper methodology around asking the public for their opinions in a way as users.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): I think it is incredibly important to understand concerns, particularly for children and the oldest road users, who are particularly vulnerable, and we know that fear of road safety deters particularly the oldest users and those with visual or mobility impairment from travelling and that the wellbeing impact of that is massive, so we need to take both elements. However, there are places where sometimes we see a large amount of priority given to areas where there are virtually no injuries and there are other places where people are being harmed every year and it is not one or the other, it is both, and this document sets that out. It says we look at low risk, high risk, low casualty rates, high casualty rates, it is not one or the other, and we support that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): OK, and, Lilli, you had indicated you want to come in on that; are you going to confirm that TfL will look at that?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I just think it is important to see the activity by the boroughs or by TfL of road safety, also in the wider activity they do to manage the road network or to improve the urban residential areas, so there have been an enormous amount of 20-mile an hour zones for example introduced in London and they do not wait until they are driven by casualty statistics, so we have been working very closely with boroughs like the City, like Islington, Camden, who are keen to increase and improve the perceptions of safety in their areas with the management of speed. I would say, while I talked about priority lists, to target engineering schemes, this also takes place in the context of how we manage the wider network and whether we can make London a liveable attractive city that you want to walk and cycle in, a city that you feel safe in, and that is very much the overarching objective that is driving all of this.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): My final question, we have already touched on it, about removing street clutter, guardrails and so on, let me just clarify whether you said that there is a safety audit before and after each removal of guardrail?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): As I understand it, as I said this is not my area for delivery, but I do not know if Iain would like to comment?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I believe it is, I mean it is not mine either, but, yes, there is I think.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You think there is; perhaps you could just confirm that. Has it been successful in improving pedestrian safety? I wonder whether, Amy, you were nodding I think earlier on something on that subject, do you think it has improved pedestrian safety, removing street clutter, guardrails and so on?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): I was just nodding that I was aware that it was being monitored; that they were concerned about it, and as far as I understand it had not led to increased casualties. I think you can understand why it needs to be monitored but I do not think that the findings have shown it to be a risky measure.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Did you say you think it has led to an increase, did you say?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): No, it has not.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Anna, do you have anything to comment on that?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): On the guardrail itself?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Yes, on the removal, whether you think it has been successful in improving pedestrian safety?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): I think, looking at guardrails, you have to take into account the local situation and the context and obviously the concerns of local people. Often when there is guardrail in place it tends to encourage drivers to go a bit faster, there is less interaction with pedestrians, so if you remove it you might get the benefit of

drivers paying more attention to what is in the local area and actually interacting with pedestrians a bit more and knowing what the risks and hazards are. As I said, it has to be taken in the case of local views.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you.

Roger Evans AM: What can you do to improve the way that Transport for London manage their contractors when you are doing work on junctions?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I think we have done an awful lot and it is always improving. On the civil engineering side, we have just had a new contractor release last year and there has been - as inevitable with a new contractor - a little bit of a learning curve. My experience personally is it has got a lot better. We are very much encouraging that whenever works are there that they contact local people who might be affected by the works impacted immediately and that is certainly improving. We are very much working with them as a collaboration. Obviously we are the people perhaps who understand how the works affect the environment and the people locally more so than perhaps new contractors who are coming in, but we do work very closely and things are very much improving.

Roger Evans AM: We have had a case recently, which really calls into question the process of signing off these improvements, where just before Christmas contractors finished work on an A12 junction in my constituency with Oldborough Road in Redbridge and white lines were not repainted on the road, which left, in the borough's opinion, let alone local people, a safety problem. Because it was immediately before Christmas, it was absolutely impossible to get hold of anyone to come back and paint them on again. I think that is still the situation there and it is pretty lamentable really.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I think that is a very specific example and I know a little bit about that one. There was an intention to come and paint them but there was a problem with the Blackwall Tunnel, which meant works could not go ahead, and then obviously the weather has not been exactly conducive to laying white lines, putting down thermoplastic markings on a wet street, to a degree you can burn some standing water off, but the level of standing water we have had will make it difficult. I believe they have come back and installed the markings now.

Roger Evans AM: Right, they must have done it within the last couple of days; I have certainly not heard they have been put back on.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): We are getting into casework again as an illustration of problems.

Roger Evans AM: I am not raising a particular case, but it is a clear illustration of a concern, which I suspect the Committee might like to come back to at some point because it is a wider issue than just pedestrians.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): About the management of the projects?

Roger Evans AM: That is right.

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

Darren Johnson AM: Just picking up on the comments on guardrails, Anna, you said that context was really important. I do think that removing guardrails for the reasons you gave is an essential feature for creating a pedestrian-friendly environment, but is there not a danger, if it is done in isolation, without other measures such as reducing speed limits and making junctions safer and so on, if it is simply done in isolation it can actually create danger rather than improve safety.

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): I think, you have to take an holistic approach really and look at the whole street, removing things like street clutter as well is obviously also important, but introducing 20-mile an hour speed limits is obviously also a positive step, so, yes, I think looking at the whole street and taking into account local users' views and perceptions of safety as well is really key.

Murad Qureshi AM: I just want to finish off on the clutter, given that has been such a popular thing, can I say that I am a jaywalker, I do not normally cross the road where I should do, and I have noticed the removal of the rails and I am glad to hear that it has not caused more casualties for pedestrians. But there is other street clutter that I think needs to be, some time certainly spent on red routes, and it is things like telephone kiosks on pavements, I know those things do take an exorbitant amount of space and I do hope TfL have got that on their list of targets because I dare say there are other nuisances around those telephone kiosks, which I think we could do without. Can you just confirm that, Lilli?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): The telephone kiosks in particular?

Murad Qureshi AM: Well Tottenham Court Road as an example.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I would need to confirm that. I am not exactly sure, but I am pretty certain that we would be looking to do that. One of the things we have is the Streetscape Guidance and in it one of the activities we are trying to do is to de-clutter the TLRN as far as possible and to work through it and to take off and get rid of unnecessary clutter where it obviously does not pose any safety risk. We can write and confirm whether that includes telephone kiosks as well.

Murad Qureshi AM: I think it will be welcomed by certain boroughs in central London. Can I just now move to the main area of questioning I have been given, among the Assembly Members, which is coming back to the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Lilli, you have told us we can expect that in April. You have not been able to tell us whether we will get what the budgets are. Could you at least give us some idea of the list of -- sorry, has she told us? I do not remember. The list, when we can expect a list of locations specifically identified as pedestrian collision hotspots?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes. In the submission to the Committee, we did provide a list, and I think I have confirmed that we would also follow up with providing information on where our own analysis would suggest that we needed to undertake further road safety studies, so we are going to do that.

Murad Qureshi AM: Yes, thank you for pointing out this list, because the public will not have this in front of them, but it seems to me that an extraordinary number of them are still in the West End and

in the City of Westminster, places like Oxford Street come up five times, for example. You did mention that the volume of footfall in these locations is such that we can expect these numbers, but nonetheless does that not suggest specifically you need to do things with particular boroughs to get them off this top list of collisions for pedestrians for London?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, it does. I was just flicking through to see if I could find the list myself to remind myself what is on it, but I am familiar with those locations and some of them are the most heavily-visited locations in Europe because of footfall, so they are very visited and I know that, for Westminster City Council, where many of them are located, they will be areas of particular study and concern. We obviously, as I indicated earlier, are working closely with the boroughs to, not only provide the analysis and where we think there are locations on the local network that need addressing, but also to provide training, support and advocacy, to try to make sure Safe Streets for London cannot be delivered by TfL; it has to be delivered by the boroughs, by the Metropolitan Police Service, by the stakeholders that we work closely with, and therefore of course we will be working very closely with Westminster on all these locations.

Murad Qureshi AM: What do you think the difficulty is? Is it not a priority for them or is it money? You have identified them as places that we need to deal with to reduce the number of casualties of pedestrians on the streets of London, I just want some sense from yourself, because most of these roads that you have on this list are the borough ones, what is your sense of those?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Every location is different. Some of those that are in central London will have incredibly heavy footfall, so we will need to look at whether, site by site, it is issues of how the road is designed, whether it is issues of traffic speed, all the classic things that you would go through. The point is, as soon as we solve those, you can still generate a list, there will always be a list of areas that are problems. In a way, our work will never stop; we will just carry on working through it. We will take that information, we will obviously work with the relevant boroughs and on our own road network to see what needs to happen.

Murad Qureshi AM: It just strikes me as something that, given the parking revenues made in central London, authorities like Westminster could spend some money on this and save a few Londoners' lives. There is one particular one where I think there has been a useful experiment. Oxford Circus, where we have the diagonal crossing, and it is still very high up on the list of casualties or pedestrians. Is that experiment not worth replicating now because of that or is that something that there is still a need to look at how effective it is? It was put in place I think before the period that you have mentioned here.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): It was put in place in 2011 and my understanding is that it is a significant improvement on what happened previously at that location but a location that has casualties happening is always under scrutiny so we will be looking back at it. There is nothing that has been indicated to us by the current design that has made things worse but we obviously want to consider whether we can do things to make things better.

Murad Qureshi AM: Because the surprising thing is that it has not been duplicated very much at all anywhere else. For example there are other likely junctions like Baker Street and Marylebone Road, which I would have thought lend themselves to that and nothing like this has occurred. That is on the red routes, two red routes, what is the apprehension with TfL with these diagonal crossings then?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I think a log of locations within central London and across London actually do have all-red phases, which do allow diagonal movement across a junction at the red phase. I do not think there is any apprehension at all of introducing those and basically that is a particularly attractive design for a very important and busy crossroad, which has that movement, but I do not think that has been ruled out in any way in other locations.

Murad Qureshi AM: Well I hope to see more of them, which comes to another area of questioning in the section I have been given, shared space schemes. Now the one that I think people highlight is Exhibition Road. I cannot recollect if it was a red route or not, because there are no red markings down there, I just wondered whether other colleagues, Richard, feel that has been a success, given, for example, we are all on the same level, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): Very hard to say if it has been a success, but I would say it is probably an example of an area where fewer visually-impaired people go or feel safe when they go there because it is a great illustration actually about how you need groups involved at the outset of any project and not trying to retrofit any scheme, because the solution invariably ends up pleasing neither the designers nor the users, so the ongoing issue is resolved, if you will, with a small tactile delineation between the area where pedestrians can go and the area where vehicles can go.

I think it is a massive misunderstanding about shared space and how it can work for visually-impaired people because it is very hard to see how the two-way interaction works. I can obviously see how drivers can see a pedestrian; I find it harder to see how a visually-impaired person can see a driver and ascertain what they themselves are going to do. I, but more importantly our supporters and members, find it very difficult to envisage a shared-space concept anywhere, and Exhibition Road was obviously highlighted because it was the first and there was a lot of coverage of Kensington and Chelsea Council and judicial review and everything else, but the concept and perception I think is very hard to overcome about how you have that dual interaction between the visually-impaired pedestrian and the driver and I think that causes people to stay away from particular areas and crucially be very, very fearful when the idea of a shared space is coming into their area as a whole. I think it might be the case that there have been fewer incidents because people are wary of going to that area.

Murad Qureshi AM: OK, well it just strikes me that it is actually very subtle with the different surfaces, while it is on the same level, and it does still appear that pedestrians keep themselves out of the cyclists' way and cyclists and cars keep out of pedestrians' way, at great expense of course, but nonetheless it seems to me that interaction seems to work quite well in the middle bit where the Cromwell Road comes and intersects over Exhibition Road. I just wondered if there are any other views about shared space. Amy, if you do not mind me coming to yourself, I noted your comment earlier actually when you said, and it did strike me, that we have had as many pedestrian casualties when we had the attention on cyclists before Christmas, yet we did not have the same level of focus at all by the media, and in that context I wondered where we go with shared space?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): I do not think shared space was ever introduced as a key safety measure. As far as I understand it, it was never expected to be used in more than a small percentage of the road network, so it was never a big issue for RoadPeace or of reducing KSIs. Also, as has already been mentioned, the cost involved, it would not be possible to

replicate it, to be starting over. I guess the thing for us with shared space is that in all the other countries where it was used they also had the civil liability, a different system, which is what this Committee recommended the Government look at in your cycle safety, so we have strict liability and presumed liability, there is a greater duty of care on motorists to look out for pedestrians and cyclists in other countries than we have here and I think the two should go hand in hand.

Murad Qureshi AM: Can I go to Kate? Can I just direct you also to the Cycling Junction Review that we are having? To what extent can pedestrians be taken account in that?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): Certainly the interaction of motor traffic, cyclists and pedestrians is a really difficult balance and getting two of those three right is relatively straightforward; getting all three right is very difficult and I think sometimes we pretend there is some simple Holy Grail.

On shared space specifically, if you Google “shared space local transport note” you will find very substantive research that was undertaken looking at different shared space schemes of different types, different curb heights, different arrangements, and looking at how driver behaviour changed in response to different arrangements. This is not a random thing that has been invented; Exhibition Road is only one of an enormous number of schemes that have been done. I think it is very important to look at the net benefits and sometimes they are complex. One of the things that changing street design can do is result in much lower driver speed because reducing clarity and certainty that, “This is my place and I do not have to think about anyone else”, pedestrian guardrail is very much of that, there is a toolkit of de-cluttering, pedestrian guardrail specifically, moving to different raised amounts in the streets, it reduces speed and inherently that reduces risk, so a very strong relationship between speed and the number of accidents and the severity of those accidents.

Murad Qureshi AM: Is that the case for congestion? Because I mean the reality is in central London, speeds are down to 11 miles per hour.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): That is an average and sometimes you look at average and you assume everybody is doing the average, so you get different issues at different times of day, different issues at night and different issues during the day and different patterns, if you like different layers of different problems in different locations. However, it is very important to look at all the different users’ needs and try to meet those and the Exhibition Road scheme specifically did research, they did model different tactile paving layouts and got visually-impaired users to come and use them and say what did they need, what different patterns worked in different ways, so it was not just a design without any involvement. I think it involved visually-impaired users more than any other scheme I am aware of.

Murad Qureshi AM: Finally, to what extent does culture play in this, I mean I have been to other places in Tokyo where pedestrians and cyclists do share the same surface and it seems that is an impossible ask here on the streets of London. I am not sure how we have got there, but that is where we are.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): It seems to be a very complex issue; it is incredibly difficult to monitor and measure. Certainly the countries that have taken bold steps in reducing control and regulation and moving to a more shared-space mixed environment are those

where there is a presumption of responsibility on the part of the motorist who hits a pedestrian or cyclist, so different attitudes will affect driver behaviour.

CIHT is publishing a document called, "Street Design for All", it is actually being launched at Palestra [TfL offices] on 12 March if anybody would like to come, it is free, open to anybody, and that is a document that brings together, not just shared space findings, but how street design can be very attractive and very functional for all the different users' needs. I think that is what you need to see, it is trying to get that Holy Grail of something that works for as many people as possible. The Junctions Review is looking specifically at locations and conflict on points, but we also need to look at links and I think Exhibition Road is about safety in travelling along a route as well as the crossing safety.

Sometimes there are cases where we are moving regulation and having a much lower speed environment can be very effective but my understanding is that the speed, the typical prevailing speed in Exhibition Road is higher than the designed speed intended, partly because the road corridor is quite wide, it does not have that visual narrowing, and it is very straight. Therefore one of the things we have learned is breaking up linearity can take away some of the drivers' tendencies to drive at a higher speed and that is one of the things that this document brings out.

Roger Evans AM: Thank you.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: I want to focus on pedestrian crossings. Perhaps we can start with TfL. What has been your response to the recent calls to increase the minimum crossing times to help older and disabled pedestrians? Will you consider piloting a site where they have had this specifically highlighted as a problem?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): It is quite a complex issue. There is a widely held misconception out there and I apologise if I go over old ground for the audience here.

The time to cross is made up of two aspects: the 'green man time', which we see as an invitation to cross, and then what we call a 'blackout period' when no symbol is displayed to the pedestrian. The blackout period is built up of the 1.2 metres per second and the width of the road. The invitation to cross time is a further period of four or six seconds that allows people to establish themselves on the crossing. A lot of people believe that is the only time they get and they think that when the green man goes out, they do not have any more time to cross. The 1.2 metres per second is widely established. It has been used historically. It is a Department of Transport national guideline that is the average speed that I think 85% of people walk at or faster.

Obviously, we try to balance all users. Giving a change in time to one user - pedestrians - and extending the pedestrian time will take away from other users. Traffic signals are on 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. Whenever you have a signal, it is always giving a message to somebody who is using it. If you extend one aspect for one person, you take it from another. We have done our own studies as part of the Pedestrian Countdown at Traffic Signal Junctions (PCaTS) study and that actually found that most people walk faster than 1.2 metres per second.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Iain, do you just want to explain that? PCaTS?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): Sorry, PCaTS is the Pedestrian Countdown at Traffic Signals. That is the countdown units that we are rolling out. What we have done - and that

is a very good example - is try to give a positive message to pedestrians rather than leave them with nothing displayed because that creates uncertainty. Increasingly, our programme to renew crossings is to install PCaTS wherever we come can when we reinstall a crossing.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: You say that these figures are historic, this 1.2 metres per second. Yet the population of London is getting older and there is research from University College London (UCL) showing that for people of 65, almost 70% on average have a walking distance or time slower than 1.2 metres. The population of London is changing and I have seen videos and there is a lot of pressure from groups saying that we cannot walk across as pedestrians.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): It is difficult looking at changing a standard that applies to all crossings where then you perhaps will have a lot of green time for pedestrians when there is demand from the elderly who maybe walk slower. If you change a standard, it applies everywhere. There would be motorists sitting there saying, "There is no one on the crossing", and the green time is extended.

Where there are very specific locations and where there are requests and concern that the time is not enough, we do in those instances review and analyse and will extend the time, be that the green man time. If there is a very high pedestrian rate and pedestrians are stuck on the footway when the green man goes out, we will extend that green time so they feel they can establish themselves on the crossing. Equally, we will extend the time if we find there is a concern raised.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: You are flexible and you target your crossing times to the needs, so the elderly population of London can be reassured?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): We try to.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: It is important that we recognise that there is a group in the population who have a problem, and a response from TfL should be much more sympathetic than saying, "We will treat the averages of walking times rather than the individual needs of the population".

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): It is important to say we do try to balance all users. Looking at any one very particular part of the population is perhaps disproportionate.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Do you think there is a relationship between the Mayor's smoothing of traffic flow policy and the rise in pedestrians KSI?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I do not think that is necessarily borne out, no. Where we do try to smooth traffic, again, it tries to look at all users. The PCaTS is a good example. Giving a positive message to pedestrians not only increases their perception of safety and it has proved very, very popular, but it actually helps to understand how the junction operates and how much time they have and perhaps leads to fewer instances of people crossing whenever they feel like it irrespective of the signals.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: At the 568 sites where the green times have been reduced, have you done an analysis of whether the collision rates have gone up at those sites or not?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): We have, yes. There was a study done, actually, independently by the Transport Research Laboratory in 2009. That did conclude that overall signal re-timing had no significant impact on safety.

What also is important to point out, though, is that TfL used to historically have a much longer time than the rest of the --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Sorry, Iain. Do you have any data post 2010?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I do not think we do. I do not have to hand, no.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Have there been any studies done on the impact of reducing the green man time since 2010?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): No. Obviously, we rely on the data from 2009. The conditions are the same. Essentially, you are reducing green man time to a national standard --

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: That was done in 2010?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): Sorry, the study was done in 2009 but the concept of reducing green time will not have changed to 2010. The study would still be relevant even though the time has moved on a year. The study in 2009 did show that there was not an increase.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Just for the record, can you confirm that there has been no evaluation or scrutiny of impacts of collision rates at the 568 sites where green man time has been reduced since 2010?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I do not believe so, but I will check.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): What about pedestrian compliance with the signals? Have you done any studies on that?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): We have done a study on the PCaTS that I mentioned and that was actually quite interesting. Before and after, 54% of people crossed within five seconds of arrival irrespective of what the pedestrian signals showed.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Sorry, Onkar. Do forgive me. Carry on.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: That is all right. Thank you for clarifying that, Chair. Let me just bring in the RoadPeace and also Amy. Have you had any feedback on the impact of this reduction in green times at all?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): We had asked TfL the same question about what effect it had on KSIs and we have been told that they have been monitoring it and it had not been shown to have any effect. I am surprised. I did not appreciate that it was old data because I would have thought, really, the smoothing of traffic had not happened yet.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Can I just clarify? Obviously, we do look at collisions every year, so we look across the whole road network at significant changes in collisions. If there were locations arising that had not been there previously, we would look at them and we would look at the causes. Although I am not sure about Iain's exact point, of monitoring where collisions are occurring, that is an ongoing and annual thing. We would know if there were significant issues arising.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): OK. We have a problem here. I appreciate it puts you on the spot --

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I will take that away.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): -- having to do this at the Committee orally. We probably need something in writing on this. You have confirmed that you do check before and after guardrail changes?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): What we want to know is whether there has been before and after signal timing changes, of both pedestrian compliance and casualties and accidents. What we are hearing is, "We are just waiting for a problem to happen".

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): That is not really what I said. What we have done, to be clear, is we have reduced the green time to national standards.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: We want to know the impact of that.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): Yes, absolutely, and --

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: The only way you will know the impact of that is if you start analysing what happened at those 568 sites.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): In 2011, not immediately associated but covering the same area, the study on the PCaTS concluded that --

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: You need to respond to the Committee and provide specific data for whether you have done that research or not and, if the research has been done, what the impact has been. That is the only way you will be able to answer the question about what the impact has been on these 568 sites, rather than looking for changes in averages. Sorry. What were you saying, Amy?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): I just wanted to respond. Really, the smoothing the traffic flow policy is really an example of how pedestrian safety has been compromised and sacrificed for the goal of ensuring that traffic can flow as fast as possible. We have seen cases where pedestrian crossings have been removed. Also, in reducing the green man time, we have received comments from the public that they feel more concerned trying to get onto the crossing because they do not feel they have enough time to get on there. They feel rushed. A point was made that people walk faster on a crossing, but by the very nature of being on a crossing you

would walk faster and rush because of the danger around it. Actually, the research that was done by UCL was done in the context of the home, so a normal walking speed, so that needs to be taken into account.

What we would ask is that the issue of walking speed is reviewed, particularly in cases that have a high place function, so high streets on the TLRN. We would ask TfL to look at that in particular. We welcome that efforts have been made in certain contexts but that could be more widely developed.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Richard, has there been an impact on your members?

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): What I would say is that - and it is linked to the point - more of an impact is that inconsistency of crossings of the information I give, rather than the changes to traffic flows, although that probably has a perception concern that you have to walk faster and it is less safe. What is more of a concern is the significant number of crossings that still do not meet standards of having an audible and/or tactile comb to say when it is safe to cross. Those two would have a greater impact on our members' sense of safety than a concern about traffic flows as a whole. It has an impact, but an ability to cross independently has a greater impact on a sense of safety and wellbeing.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: TfL's Road Safety Action Plan says the pedestrian countdown will be more widely introduced. Will this mean shorter pedestrian green man times at these locations?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Did I understand that you are saying that the signal timing would be changed at those locations?

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Yes.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): No. My understanding is no.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: They will not be? Thank you. What plans do you have to review the pedestrian waiting times against pedestrian demand at crossings? How will you take into account locations where people's fear of road danger has led them to stop using particular crossings?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): Sorry, can you repeat that question?

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Certainly. What plans do you have to review pedestrian waiting times against pedestrian demand at crossings? How will you take into account locations where people's fear of road danger has led them to stop using particular crossings?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): One of the things we are trialling at the moment is the pedestrian scoop, which detects the number of pedestrians waiting and therefore how long the green man should be with a view to, if there are more people waiting than the traditional green man time allows, extending it. We are into phase two of that trial. Basically, if there are a lot of pedestrians there, it extends the green man time by one, two or three seconds. If that is successful, then we would look to see how we roll that out.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Please explain this to me. I am not familiar with the pedestrian scoop trial. What is it, actually?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): It is basically detection of how many pedestrians are waiting at the crossing for when the green man comes up. If there are one or two, the standard green time would cater for them to get on the crossing and cross. If it is outside a very busy station in central London and there are banks of pedestrians waiting, the standard green time would mean perhaps the people at the back do not get through to the crossing by the time the green man goes out. By detecting how many people are waiting, it then says to the control area, "Extend that green man time to allow as many who can to go through". At the moment, that is in trial.

Richard Tracey AM: There seems to be amongst pedestrians a considerable confusion about when they can cross and what time they have and so on. New York, for example, has many, many of these countdowns, which, as I see it whenever I go there, people totally understand. What is the policy to put in more of them? Would that not actually alleviate this problem?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): Yes, we are. On the TLRN there is a programme of 200 to be completed by the end of this financial period and we have found that the boroughs are very keen and are taking it up. Wherever we renew a set of signals for modernisation, we do discuss with the boroughs whether they want a countdown.

Richard Tracey AM: I am sure they do, do they not?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): Mostly.

Richard Tracey AM: I know my two boroughs do.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): Some do not.

Richard Tracey AM: Really? Is that so?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): I want to pick up accessibility of crossings and Richard has already expressed the issue of audio and tactile facilities. It clearly affects visually-impaired people across London. I have been asking about this on and off for the last five years and the latest figures I have are that there are 211 locations which do not have these facilities fitted. Given that the guidance came out in 1995, decades ago, it is appalling that Transport for London has not managed to get all these crossings to be fully accessible. When can we expect all of these crossings to urgently be made accessible through tactile facilities or audio?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): Spring 2016 is the target the Mayor has set and we are working to that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): That is another two years. That really is unacceptable for all of these people in London who want to be able to cross roads like the rest of us. They should have those facilities.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): It does represent only 5% of the signals that are out there, so we do have a programme. We are trying to incorporate it with other works that are going on to reduce the cost and make it most economic. We have done 43 in the last six months.

There are 25 more planned by April and then the submission we made details the number we want to do per year.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Are you looking in any way to speed up this programme? It is very poor. The guidance came out in 1995. It is going to take you over 20 years to meet that guidance.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): It is the target the Mayor has set and we are working to that.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): If the Mayor said to you, "I want it done more quickly", you would do it more quickly?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): If the funding is available, we will work to do it quicker.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): OK, so it is for the Mayor to put his efforts behind that, then. What about maintaining these facilities? Certainly, I check when I go to pedestrian crossings whether there is a rotating cone. They do not always work. What do you do to make sure that these facilities are always maintained?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): We do wherever possible with signals have remote monitoring so it automatically tells us if something is not working. That is not straightforward with tactiles, but we have fault lines and we do get out and repair them very quickly if we are informed.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): OK. Richard, do you have anything to add? It is going to take two years before every crossing has these facilities.

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): What I would say is that whilst it is 5% of the number, it is important to look at where they are. You generally find they are on significant routes through boroughs. Therefore, it is going to be more than 5% of a person's time that they are going to come across these inaccessible crossings. It is especially a London issue where you have that herd approach to crossing roads, to follow crowds, to follow patterns. Would it not be much better to have an environment where the person waits for the audible signal or feels the cone to turn and has their own safety in their own hands as it were, almost literally, if you like, rather than thinking, "Other people are crossing at this point. Therefore, it must be safe for me to cross", but it may be simply that there is a break in the traffic and it is still showing the red signal. I would absolutely like to see this sped up as quickly as possible because I do think that it has a bigger percentage impact on a person than it being a relatively small number of crossings because of where they are within an area. You are going to come across these more often in daily activities.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): You are right, Richard, on the locations. There are 26 in Westminster including places on the Haymarket, places where people would want to go and visit, Camden, Oxford Street. There are huge numbers. It is a really big issue and it is a shame that we are looking at another two years to finish all the crossings.

Can I ask our campaign groups here, so Living Streets first? It has been suggested that you could introduce a yellow box system like we have at junctions on pedestrian crossings so that drivers who block crossings, which sometimes does happen, are penalised. Is that something that you are supportive of or interested in?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): We would certainly be interested in a study along those lines. We think that any attempts to make sure that drivers comply with signals obviously can have an impact on safety and also the perception of safety of pedestrians crossing the road.

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): If we make sure that it could be enforced, that would be the key factor.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Exactly. You would only want to bring it in if it was enforceable. OK.

Can I just ask TfL? Is that power that TfL would be seeking from the Government? You are already seeking and may have secured powers that advance stop lights for cyclists. You can actually enforce that. Would you be looking to do something similar for pedestrians on crossings?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): One of the things that we have been pushing very hard the DfT to do is to make sure that they give better priority to pedestrians crossing side roads. It is not so much the case at signalised crossings, which is the situation you describe, but where we have a lot of collisions is non-signalised cars turning left into across side roads. What we would very much ask the DfT to do is to make sure that there is a much clearer priority within the Highway Code for pedestrians going across those.

As for yellow box junctions, we would be happy to look at it. I need to know the details and think about the enforcement issues before I give you a commitment here.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): Perhaps you could come back to us if that is what you are pushing Government on, giving you more powers or something like that.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): One point that we need to remember in looking at trying to prevent blocking of the pedestrian crossings is that one of the main reasons people block pedestrian crossings is that the next junction downstream is stopped and one of the reasons it is stopped is giving people time to cross. There is complex interaction in these things. There is nothing in the toolkit at the moment that allows us to highlight to drivers that a crossing is present. Sometimes, they are unwittingly sitting on a pedestrian crossing area that is part of a complex junction. They have crossed a stop line at green quite lawfully, but have then become caught up in traffic downstream. The complex network management of signals, both standalone crossings and junctions, is incredibly complex. The busier the traffic gets, the harder that gets. We need to remember that the more we give to pedestrians, the more we create a risk of a pedestrian problem somewhere else.

Richard Tracey AM: Iain Blackmore said that there are some boroughs that do not want countdowns and it would be quite useful for us to know which boroughs these are and reasons.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): I think so. Sometimes we hear these things and then it transpires that they have not been asked, so we would like some factual information about who has been asked and what their answer was. We already have a list of the crossings without the tactile and audio information on them and we might be inclined to publish that, if that is acceptable.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Deputy Chair): It is one of my Mayor's questions, is it not?

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): It is a bit shocking to see that some of those crossings may possibly overlap with the 24 nodes with the highest collisions that TfL has provided. It would be interesting, although it is only a snapshot, to publish that list as well. Again, the point has been made that six of those locations are indeed on Oxford Street, the boroughs have an interest in all of this. We do need to follow some of this information up and we would like some more in writing. Certainly, we want some more information about what research base there is on the impact of the reduction of crossing times, certainly green man crossings. It is a bit shocking to discover that there has not even been a sampling exercise done. We need to confirm if that is in fact the case.

Darren Johnson AM: We will start with the campaigners first and then hear from TfL. How important is reducing vehicle speed and improving pedestrian safety?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): Speed is a high contributory factor in a lot of collisions, so reducing speed is one of the single most important measures that could be done to 20 mph in places where people live, work and shop, in places where there is high rates of churn and things like that, so a key policy that should be undertaken. I know there has been talk about a central London 20mph zone recommended by the Roads Task Force by 2015, so I would really welcome that being pushed forward and also working with boroughs to introduce 20-mile-an-hour zones in all town centres would also be welcome.

Darren Johnson AM: I know Living Streets has been very supportive of boroughs introducing default 20-mph speed limits. What is the evidence so far that they are being effective in reducing casualties?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): I do know that obviously casualty severity reduces significantly if we reduce it down to 20 mph, so I presume that there has obviously been a positive impact on casualty rates in those boroughs, but I do not know the figures off the top of my head.

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): We would say that speed reduction is by far the most important measure. The Safe Streets for London steering group asked about what should be the key focuses for the group. Living Streets and RoadPeace - they are the campaigners - were proposing that it be speed reduction.

Darren Johnson AM: Is that your number one demand, then?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): It is. Right now in the plan you have various actions which are under safe road users as well as safe roads. You are talking about camera enforcement in a different place than where you are talking about 20 mph roads or ISA. We would just like to bring it all together, so in one place we are talking about speed reduction.

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): We would view it as being especially important in borough areas perhaps where rat-runs have developed and maybe there are not traditional safe crossing points, if you like, so it becomes much more of an issue that you cross the road when you think it is safe. In those areas, it is even more important for people to be able to make local journeys in a safer sense and 20 mph, has been very much proven to help improve safety and a sense of safety. Our view would be very, very much around the local issue and developing local infrastructure. That is where it is going to be even more important. As we have already heard, in the main areas at least where you have crossing points, it is safer to know where you can cross, but that would not be so much the case in local streets.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): Yes, absolutely. Speed is the key to safe streets, both in the number and severity of injuries, and people's confidence to cross. The youngest road users and the oldest road users have the greatest difficulty in judging the speed and position of a vehicle, so using streets safely critically depends on speed.

There are three components to it. There is the infrastructure and that includes speed limits. Signed-only limits have very little effect, typically a one- or two mph difference. If the traffic is doing 30 now, if you reduce the limit to 20, the speed will typically only go down to 29 or 28, so we need to not create a disparity in perception so someone lets their child walk to school alone because they think the limit is lower but the speed has not reduced.

If we do have lower limits but people then walk and cycle more, you can actually get a benefit that mitigates that risk, but we need to understand that limits alone have limited affect. The wider effects and what issues are needed are about enforcement, publicity, local action and the Total 20 concept of much wider activity with local people getting involved in campaigning for appropriate speeds. Often, it is local people who are speeding on local streets and we need to pretend it is not through traffic.

Street design is very important. We have talked about the street design that facilitates lower speeds. That is always only going to be a localised issue. We cannot re-engineer the whole network. Then there are specific speed-reduction measures like traffic calming, but they have lots of adverse effects with noise and vibration. They cause damage to the carriageway. They create all sorts of problems with parking. Ideally, we should not be having to do that.

Darren Johnson AM: Your preference is properly enforced reduced speed limits to 20mph?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): Technology makes it easier and there are things on the horizon - intelligent speed adaptation, wide area enforcement and so on - that make it possible to have a good speed environment without heavily engineering the streets.

Darren Johnson AM: With 20 mph, there are clearly advantages both of reduced speed if it is enforced and reduced traffic levels as well?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): Yes. There are a number of issues. One is diverting traffic away from inappropriate routes and when traffic is on that route travelling at a smooth, steady speed rather than accelerating and braking, which is important. Enforcement is critical but also publicity of that enforcement because people's willingness to offend partly depends on whether they think they will get caught as much as what they think the penalty will be when they do.

People need to know that enforcement is taking place to complete that circle. Engineer the roads, have the right limit, create the right behaviour and do the enforcement to reinforce that circle.

Darren Johnson AM: Is this an area where you think we should be seeing more police publicity around enforcement? We hear various police initiatives are cracking down on crime X, Y and Z and so on. Do we need more publicity on speeding?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): Enforcement at 20 specifically is relatively a recently emerging issue and there have been areas where forces--

Darren Johnson AM: The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) guidance has changed, has it not?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): Yes, we welcome that because creating appropriate speeds, particularly in those residential or busy town centre areas is critically important for safety, but we do need enforcement. Whether that is technology, on-the-ground police activity, it is the totality that creates that safe environment.

Darren Johnson AM: Obviously, a lot of the activity around 20 mph has been at borough level on borough roads, but there are also roads on the TLRN. Can you tell us what the next steps are for identifying suitable locations on the TfL roads for 20 mph?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, I can, but just as an introduction, it is fair to say that our Safe Streets for London plan makes very clear that dealing with speed and speeding are both absolutely crucial issues to improving road safety in London. Firstly speeding, we are working with the boroughs to ensure that we have an effective safety camera network, that that is effectively enforced and that that is leading to also effective education of drivers is really, really important. TfL has worked very closely with boroughs over a number of years of funding and putting in place those 20 mph zones which, as you say, are largely on borough roads.

You did ask for any evidence on this. Just so that you do know, the monitoring that we have done of this with the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine suggested that those 20 mph zones in London have reduced by over half the number of people killed or seriously injured within those zones.

Darren Johnson AM: That is on the new default limits?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): In the 20 mph zones, so they are a really effective measure. That is why we are working closely with boroughs.

Darren Johnson AM: That leads to a dramatic difference.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, it does. Anyone who cares about road safety understands that speed and speeding are crucial. If you think about the wider context of promoting walking, promoting active travel and promoting cycling, actually effectively controlling speed and perceptions of speed are really important.

To turn to your question about the TLRN, there was a really important milestone with the launch of the Mayor's Roads Task Force report. It helped us by creating a new concept of the management of

London's road network, of street families and the different roles and functions that different streets play. We are basically looking at a whole ream of work that is underway, looking at our network and working with the boroughs of their networks to better understand those roles and functions and where speeds might be better adapted to lower speeds. That would include sections of the TLRN. We are doing that work.

There would be undoubted safety benefits in certain locations, but TfL does also need to manage the other functions of the road network as well, so there will be some locations where it would not be appropriate to consider alternatives.

Darren Johnson AM: We all accept that clearly there will be parts of the TLRN where it would not be appropriate to have 20 mph. Often, I do hear frustrations expressed from boroughs that they feel they are playing their part in reducing speed limits and introducing 20 mph but that TfL is really dragging its feet on some of those roads that could and should be 20 mph because of the way that they are used and the shops and residential locations and so on. What do you say to the boroughs that have been expressing concern that TfL has been dragging its feet on this?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I would acknowledge that there has been a degree of caution in this area, but I do not think we should underestimate the importance of the Roads Task Force report and what it has said about what we want in London. We are very actively, through my team and through the rest of TfL, working with boroughs like the City, working with Islington, working with Camden, talking about what this might mean on their road networks and on our road network. There are a lot of discussions underway and I do not think you should necessarily take what has gone on in the past to say that that is what will be in the future.

Darren Johnson AM: OK. I will take that in the positive spirit that it is intended. What are the timescales for this new approach?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): There will be follow-up communications of the Roads Task Force report during the next few months. We would like to share with stakeholders. We are already working closely with some boroughs of developing the street families and what that might mean of implementing different approaches to managing roads. We are working with a smaller stakeholder group drawn from members and boroughs who are involved in the Roads Task Force. There are some events planned in the next couple of months where there will be wider information shared on how the Roads Task Force work is rolling out and being embedded within TfL, which is very much the approach we set out within our response to the Roads Task Force. We welcomed it. We recognised the need to look at our roads strategy and how we manage our road network. That does not happen overnight, so we need to do some of that work.

Darren Johnson AM: When can we start to see some of these key TLRN that the boroughs have been lobbying strongly for to become 20 mph? When can we actually see those?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Goodness. I said to you that we will come back in the spring. My memory from recent discussions is that there are some communications planned on the follow-up to the Roads Task Force by March. I think that is what we are talking about.

Darren Johnson AM: We will come back to you in March. In connection with this, the Assembly when it passed a motion on this did request that TfL publishes the assessment criteria for looking at whether any TLRN roads should be 20 mph or not. Are you going to publish that criteria and will that be ready by March as well?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): What I have been trying to describe is obviously there are not one-size-fits-all criteria. The benefit of what the Roads Task Force was talking about with the street families and potentially nine different street families within London is that the difference between an arterial road and a local high street is very different. You might set a very much lower threshold for reducing the speed limit in a local high street because it is a place where people want to work, shop and live, as opposed to a main arterial road. Basically, we need to communicate on how we are seeking to take forward that concept of street families and what that will mean for the management of the road network, so that would be part of that communication.

Darren Johnson AM: Also, on the issue of the installation of safety cameras on TLRN roads, what is the timetable for installing safety cameras on roads and junctions where TfL has identified that the casualty history would warrant new camera installations?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): The main programme at the moment is to replace the existing network. The TLRN is largely well covered with safety cameras. The main programme of activity underway is to upgrade old and defunct wet film - as we call it - safety camera technology with digital. That will start installation in the autumn of this year. One of the parts of that change programme will be to trial four average speed camera systems on some of the busier main road parts of London, the A40 and a number of other roads. The installation of that programme takes place over the next two years. There is obviously separate work going on to look at whether through our collision studies there are new locations that are required. At the moment, there is not an immediate plan for installation of other cameras because we are mainly focusing on upgrading and bringing up to standard the existing network.

Darren Johnson AM: Even if there are specific locations that may be identified as real hotspots, at the moment there are no plans for any additional cameras?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): No, we would consider that, but I am just saying the priority for delivery at the moment is to make sure --

Darren Johnson AM: Is replacement?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): There is no point having a network which is full of cameras which actually cannot record offences. With deploying our resources, we are trying to make sure that we get that network absolutely operational before it runs out of its operational life, basically.

Darren Johnson AM: There is still a mechanism to ensure that in particular hotspots additional cameras can be installed?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): As I said when I mentioned that we had identified these other locations which needed road safety studies, enforcement and the variety of different ways of enforcement would be one of the ways that we would look at if that was

shown to be the cause of the problem at the different locations. We are never going to rule things out.

Tom Copley AM: My first question is on speed awareness courses. If I could start with Anna, what was your view on proposals to offer speed awareness courses for those who break a 20 mph speed limit?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): It is one way that you can help educate people and try to change behaviour, but really you have to ensure that there is good enforcement already in place to make sure that those awareness courses are targeting the right people. At the moment, there is not enough enforcement happening across the city on speed in general.

Tom Copley AM: As an alternative to prosecution, you think it could be effective, combined with better enforcement?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): It could be effective in certain situations, but if it is repeat offences you need to be a bit harsher on those individuals.

Tom Copley AM: You would not want it for repeat offences?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): No.

Tom Copley AM: It would be for a first offence only. OK. Amy?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): We have just been more cautious about how they have not been evaluated to the same extent that safety cameras have been. We set the gold standard for safety cameras and then we introduced remedial training with very little evidence that it worked. The initial studies on driver improvement schemes showed that they were not effective, so it is more about the extent to which they have been evaluated. We are not against education. Ideally, we would say that penalty points ought to be suspended. There ought to be an incentive for them not to reoffend. They cannot be sent on an education course if they do reoffend. We already have that.

Speeding is just in a completely different category than any other offence. We do still have a too high, but comparatively, very low rate of drink-driving. Speeding is still seen as socially acceptable, so I can understand why we need education courses. I would like to think that before you take your driving test you have had to go on a speed awareness course.

Tom Copley AM: In your view, the evidence is that they are not making the difference that they should be?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): They have not been evaluated to the same extent.

Tom Copley AM: We do not know whether or not they are --

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): Yes, we have not held them to the same standard of evaluation.

Tom Copley AM: That is quite interesting.

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): We would favour seeing a sense of training and awareness and proficiency for cycle users and we would not have a specific view around motorists other than probably to support what works best in enforcing good behaviour. It sounds like, from my colleagues who know more about these things than I do, it is probably a mixture rather than one particular approach to improving behaviour. Probably, whichever fits that particular person at that particular time would be the right approach, but we do not have any specific views on this.

Tom Copley AM: It certainly sounds like there needs to be a lot more evaluation of whether or not it is effective before anything like this is implemented. If I could come back to you, Amy, for my next question, do you think tougher sentences for drivers who break the law would improve pedestrian safety?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): Not if you do not increase the enforcement. The research has shown that it is not the penalty so much that affects people's behaviour but the risk of detection.

Tom Copley AM: Whether they are going to be caught?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): That is right, yes. We do know that there is very little enforcement in London. It is shocking when you look at how rare it is for police to enforce 30 mph speed limits. Not cameras, but about 20 drivers per day are fined or given a fixed penalty notice for speeding in a 30 mph area, so it is less than one per borough police a day in London. We do not have enforcement of speed limits, at least not through the police. Careless driving has gone down. While we want to see tougher penalties, really the focus has to be more around increasing the fines and increasing driving bans. Prison is used very rarely and understandably so. You probably saw the *Evening Standard* last week about how one out of ten drivers is sent to prison after killing a cyclist. We should not be associating prison with punishment. We really need to use cheaper and more frequent alternative sentences, driving bans and increased fines.

Tom Copley AM: For my last question, can I come to Lilli and to TfL? It is a question about Operation Safeway. How effective has that been in relation to improving drivers' behaviour?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I do not think I am really the expert to speak on this. I know purely from having read the results published in the *Evening Standard* of the number of fixed penalty notices issued that the police did intercept a very significant number of motorists, particularly through some of their other enforcement work, some HGV drivers who were not following all the rules of the road. If you need information on that of its impact, it should be directed at the Metropolitan Police Service.

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): Operation Safeway, the police would say, was organised quite quickly. They were put under a lot of pressure to get police out on the streets. The key thing for us was showing what was possible when there was the political will. It has been explained to us that it was really based around enforcing the Highway Code obligations and not on

evidence. They did not go after the offences that are most likely to cause casualties. There is room for improvement in the future. You may not be aware, but more pedestrians were stopped in that operation than drivers or cyclists. We think the police ought to be adopting a harm-reduction approach where they prioritise harm posed to others rather than harm posed to self.

Tom Copley AM: That would obviously focus, therefore, more on drivers?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): Yes.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): It might be interesting. Lilli, you mentioned right at the beginning that you felt the casualty figures were going to be better for the current year and whether or not that interacts at all with Operation Safeway and if that has had an impact. Victoria, you had a follow-up question on this as well as a section, please.

Victoria Borwick AM: Yes, I just want to talk quickly on speed because that is obviously the topic that we are on at the moment and really to TfL at the moment just to clarify. Different answers have been given by the Mayor - which have presumably been written by you - to various Assembly Members around this horseshoe on the different speeds that we think are the average speed in London at the moment. Obviously, this section is on speed. Can you give us, if you do not have, what you think the average speed is in London? Even this morning, Murad [Qureshi AM] has used a figure of 11. There is correspondence between TfL, Darren [Johnson AM] and Westminster on the speed limit being 20. In fact, there are a lot of different figures going around. It would be really interesting to inform us here what you think the average speed is of traffic in the different boroughs.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I am looking at a table here, which would bore you rigid if I read it out so we are quite happy to send that in.

Victoria Borwick AM: That would be helpful.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): The Travel in London report, which is obviously our official document which provides all the traffic data and travel data, was recently published in December and that does have that information in it. Just looking at this table, I can see that the average speed of course does vary whether it is central, inner or outer, morning peak or afternoon peak. It would give you enough information to go on, so we will send you that.

Victoria Borwick AM: Great. Just while you are doing that, then, when buses are in bus lanes, would you estimate that they would be travelling at a different average speed than the rest of the traffic in the road system?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Clearly, if they are stopping frequently at bus stops, that will impact on their average speed.

Victoria Borwick AM: Their average speed, yes, but of course it is the actual speed between those stops and that of course is the point. Buses may be going faster between the stops than maybe if you take just an average. In other words, is there a more sophisticated way of measuring bus speed rather than their average, particularly when they are in a bus lane?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I do not know. I do not want to give you an off-the-cuff answer to that. I presume there probably is and that the bus operators would know what the speeds were between the stops. The point of having bus lanes to enable the bus to move freely when the other lane is congested.

Victoria Borwick AM: Yes, we are very pro-bus here, but we just obviously want to clarify. Maybe you could send a note to the Chair. That would be fine.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I am not quite sure. Is there a particular concern that they are going too --

Victoria Borwick AM: That was going to be my next question. When you are talking about the KSIs, what is hitting people? Is it buses? Is it trucks? Is it taxis? Is it cars? What is actually hitting people?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): It is mainly cars. The majority, 66% of collisions with KSIs, involve cars. The next largest group is motorcycles, which is around 8%. I have the figures somewhere, but my memory is that buses are around 7% and vans are similar. That is the table I would like to give you, but I think it is around --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): We do actually have that data. It is not in the brief today, but we will circulate it.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): HGVs then follow and they are relatively low, but the problem with HGVs is that when a collision does occur the consequences are extremely serious and they are very much represented in fatal collisions.

Victoria Borwick AM: Absolutely. Perhaps, if there is any more meat you would like to provide the Chair that would be really helpful.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Perhaps in the report we can have a little bit more of a dig into that area.

Victoria Borwick AM: Actually, it is quite interesting to do the analysis --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): I should recognise that all of us do get complaints about buses speeding from time to time. The significance is that a bus is more likely to cause a head injury and therefore is incredibly serious. It is something we can draw on the data that we already have.

Victoria Borwick AM: Just one final question while we are on speed and this particular section, though I have a couple of questions to move on to on pedestrian safety. The design of some of the new buses and some of the new mirrors and suchlike obviously are there to provide greater visibility, which we all approve of. However, I am concerned that sometimes, particularly when you have a raised pavement area, actually the overhang of those mirrors alongside the pavement means that inadvertently you might be far closer to danger than you might have seen yourself. I have witnessed it myself around the corner walking along from London Bridge. Inevitably, the buses are coming along and the mirrors now overhang the actual pavement space, therefore effectively reducing the width of the pavement. I would be interested to know how you are educating the bus drivers and how

you are going to educate the public - to segue into it, I think is the phrase - as far as pedestrian safety.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): We were in a meeting once and we did discuss this in some detail. The issue of bus design is something we consider very carefully and also it is something that would be part of the bus driver's training. One of the particular points that we pick up in our submission is that the nature of bus routes differs by area of the interactions with pedestrians and whether there is a lot of nightlife and whether there is a heavy pedestrian footfall. One of the things we are looking to do is to improve the information we provide on the route assessment of the presence of vulnerable road users and particular characteristics - a strong night-time economy, people likely to be drinking, for example - and making sure that all that information is available to operators who run those routes. That is just an example of how we more recently would build on that and try to take that forward.

Victoria Borwick AM: For my final thing, when you are putting the information through on the speeds, perhaps you could give us a reference on whether your traffic smoothing has made those changes. I am a little conscious with the figures we have had earlier on today that some of them have been very out of date. Perhaps you could just put a year and time and the difference in how the speeds have changed over the traffic smoothing initiatives.

If I may then move on to my section on pedestrian behaviour, on the basis that again it has been said this morning that everybody needs to take responsibility for what they are doing, wherever they are on the road space and I include the pedestrians in that, perhaps you could give us a quick update. We have heard a little bit about Operation Safeway and I am happy to hear more about that, but how do you assess the success of the education campaigns? We have talked about the vulnerable. We have talked about the young. We have talked about the old. Those have all been touched on. Perhaps you could just run through how you assess those education campaigns and what interventions you have targeted specifically where you do have accidents or hotspots? I do not know if TfL wants to start and then our campaigning organisations.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): One of changes we have put in place since Safe Streets for London is to try to develop our marketing campaigns with a more balanced approach and very much informed by the feedback from stakeholders such as RoadPeace and others to make sure that we are not inadvertently blaming victims by the messages we give.

A key area for intervention for us is particularly with the younger audience because child pedestrian casualties, we can demonstrate a greater pedestrian casualty risk around the 12-13 age group. There is an enormous amount of work that goes on from preschool children right through primary school and into secondary school, which includes things like the Children's Traffic Club which works with 75,000 preschool children every year through to the Junior Road Safety Officers and the Junior Travel Ambassadors. At every stage, we are trying to embed in the school experience some road safety education and that is matched by the marketing that we put out on the streets. We have very much tried to learn what the motivating factors are for teenagers or for individuals to actually encourage them to change their behaviour such as looking out for their friends or not being distracted by their mobile phones.

It is very difficult to specifically assess the efficacy of every single intervention, but we do know that child pedestrian casualties have very significantly declined over the longer period that we are talking about, but that is definitely a job that is never done. Every year there are new recruits to that group.

Victoria Borwick AM: What about the older age groups, the 20-29 year group, and regrettably those who now seem to be plugged in and therefore possibly not as fully aware as they might be?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): There is a slight difference between both groups. In the 25-35 year old group, they are notable in the fact that they make up the majority of the collisions, not necessarily that they are at greater risk. In those cases, we perhaps are more often looking at the locations where those casualties take place. One of the bits of work we have done is to undertake a very detailed fatality study that goes deeper than just the contributory factors which Amy was raising some concerns about and really looks at the files that were put together about why that person was injured. That can tell us. In certain circumstances, for example, alcohol is a very significant factor. We need to look at the areas where those collisions are taking place and the kinds of factors like alcohol. Can we do more to make that area safer or perhaps work with establishments in that area?

The older people where risk does increase, in a way, we have only just started looking at that in great depth this year and obviously no one wants to consider themselves an older pedestrian. It is really trying to think what the motivating messages are which would encourage people to take responsibility for their road use behaviour, which is really about looking at the locations where we know there might be more elderly pedestrians but certainly not talking to them as elderly pedestrians because that certainly is not motivating.

Victoria Borwick AM: A turn-off, absolutely. I am conscious of time. Are there any other comments that you would all like to make, possibly any other information about Operation Safeway or any other education programmes that you would support that TfL are doing?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): Our public health advisers have drilled into us the lack of evidence for education-based initiatives. It is a soft measure and it is very popular, but there is just no proof it works. We are really concerned that you put your money behind that.

Victoria Borwick AM: We do not have money. How would you address that?

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): Sorry. If you looked at the pedestrian safety action plan right now, you would see there is much more of a focus on the soft measures around education and around publicity programmes, whereas today we have really been talking more about facilities for pedestrians, so more around engineering and the environment. With the Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, it is still going back to looking at old-fashioned approaches where it is much more focused on behaviour change, although TfL has committed itself to a systems-based approach where it says it acknowledges that people make mistakes. You design out so that when those mistakes are made, you do not have to die or suffer a disability for it. You cannot rely on behaviour change to reduce the risk because we just have not had the evidence that shows it is cost-effective.

Victoria Borwick AM: OK. Thank you for that clarity.

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): Just to echo Amy's points, obviously the education campaigns do need to be evidence-based. We have seen cases where older people have been targeted but the fact that they cannot walk as fast as other people or their perceptual difficulties need to be taken into account. Things like changing times of crossings or making places a lot more friendly to people are key things that can be done. Also, education campaigns should always be backed up by enforcement of illegal behaviour by individuals.

Murad Qureshi AM: Very quickly on the speeding front, I have to admit once I had three points on my driving licence for speeding. It has since been dropped off. Is the speeding issue really related to the motorways coming into the centre of town and getting people to come down from 60 miles an hour to 30 miles an hour very quickly? Does that involve the Highway Agency as much as TfL and local boroughs? I do not know, Lilli, if you have a view on that. That is where all the yellow cameras are.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): The cameras are actually everywhere on the TLRN. It is very well covered with cameras. Unfortunately, incidences of speeding collisions are not just at the points of where the main roads enter London. They can happen in many different locations and therefore, both through education and through enforcement, we need to be vigilant everywhere on that.

Murad Qureshi AM: Are there any yellow cameras on the red routes? I was not aware. I just thought they were on --

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, they are.

Murad Qureshi AM: That is funny. I must be driving less than 30 miles an hour when I do go along the red routes.

Richard Tracey AM: Could we just take up the matter of collisions between pedestrians and large vehicles? Obviously I am talking about HGVs and indeed buses. You will be aware that a couple of months or so ago the conservatives in the Assembly did produce statistics which we gained from TfL about accidents involving buses. Not all of them are collisions with buses, admittedly. Some of them are people being injured on buses. It is really the collisions we want to talk about now. Can I just ask all of you your view on how TfL could improve its understanding of bus and HGV collisions with pedestrians? Who is going to start off?

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): Yes. We would say there are a number of components, and I think there is a lot to be learnt by looking at both the cycle fatal and serious injuries and the pedestrian injuries, because there are common factors about blind spots, about technology, about driver education, driver attitudes and so on. It needs to be a toolkit of different elements and the investigation of the incidents that have happened in detail as described, so we understand what the problem is. Not the public reported problem which often is not the real one which is actually causing the injuries and the different components to it. Then coming out from that will be vehicle components, technology, fleet operators and so on, increasingly that can be speed management, for example, adapt to speed adaptation on vehicles. Then there is the enforcement side. If we are understanding particular offending, then we can target that with enforcement. Then driver education, we welcome the Exchanging Place initiatives, getting HGV drivers and cyclists doing what they think is learning about visibility displays, but actually they are learning the human skill that the other person is

a human and that identification with this person who is just someone making a journey and trying to get from one place to another is part of changing attitudes.

Richard Tracy AM: Yes, right. Richard, would you like to give your view on that?

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): I absolutely endorse what Kate has just said. I think that completely covers the whole concern around different groups and how they interact with each other and how they understand each other. I suppose the bottom line is it is very hard to ultimately control and develop plans when it is human interaction, is it not? We see this all the time in other areas of transport policy, and indeed policy in a general sense. I would endorse that. What I would say is that it would be helpful if there was a scheme or indeed a reviving of a scheme for cycling and cyclists' behaviour. Obviously motorists have to fulfil and meet certain criteria to be on the road and have to pass certain assessments to do so. I think with the increasing number of cyclists and the spread of the cycle high scheme that is going to become even more of an important consideration to be born in mind if we are looking at other groups as well. We need to look at cyclists and cycle education and awareness too.

Richard Tracy AM: Yes. We are of course talking about heavy vehicles, are you suggesting cyclists should take a test?

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): Yes, absolutely.

Richard Tracy AM: I see. You are.

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): Yes, completely. As I say, other vehicles have met certain criteria to be using the road and I think it is ever more important and ever more evident that that perhaps could aid cyclists and other road users.

Richard Tracy AM: Yes. It is a slightly different point. Now, Amy, the question of collisions with heavy vehicles is what I am trying to understand.

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): Yes. You asked about the investigation of commercial vehicle collisions. Two points, TfL has invested in these academic reviews of fatality files, with both cyclists and pedestrians, we are on the second one of cyclists. They will bring in a university to look at the police files and go through it in depth. But there is quite a time lag with that. Then on the other hand, when a cyclist is killed, in the cycle risk group the police will come and report on the circumstances. Therefore, we will know if an HGV was involved, if they had all their mirrors, if they had sensors, if it was left turning. You do not get that with pedestrians. We do not hear that information. I do not believe that same review is undertaken, so there is missed opportunity. We have also seen in the focus with lorries, it was great work the Construction Logistics Report that came out in December, but if you looked at the research that was done in that, it focused again on the threat posed by lorries to cyclists, not pedestrians. Now, in the first decade of this century twice as many pedestrians were killed by lorries in London than cyclists. The recent focus on construction vehicles is great, but at a recent meeting they were not able to tell us how many pedestrians had been killed by construction vehicles. I think there are missed opportunities. The focus has been much more on cyclists being killed by lorries, despite the larger numbers of pedestrians.

Richard Tracy AM: All right. Anna, what is your view?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): Yes. Just to build on Amy's points really. Obviously large vehicles are overrepresented in serious casualties of pedestrians. We would like to see an immediate investigation into this by TfL and look to reduce the amount of HGVs in areas where there are large numbers of pedestrians. I think taking places like Oxford Street, what is there is buses and pedestrians sharing too small a space. If you look at the footway, is it really big enough for the amount of pedestrians that are in that space? That needs to be looked at.

Richard Tracy AM: Yes. As far as the buses are concerned, to be fair to TfL, following our report they have agreed to publish a lot more data borough by borough. But I wonder, probably there is a need also for us to hear where the particular hot-spots are across London for bus collisions or HGV collisions. There are various ones that become particularly well known in connection with cyclists, but what about pedestrians?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Again, as I indicated earlier, of us working to look at where what you might call 'critical sites' are on our road network, that would pick up not only who has been hurt by what vehicle. Overall, it is fair to say that the proportion of casualties involving buses and large goods vehicles is quite small in terms of pedestrian casualties. It is slightly different than the cycling picture. It is around 2% of pedestrian casualties were involved with collisions with large goods vehicles, and around 7% with buses. When it happens it is very, very serious. That is why we do take it very seriously. A lot of the work that we have been doing on HGVs, from my understanding - I am very closely involved with it - we are looking to deliver safety benefits for both cyclists and pedestrians as a result of whether it is looking to redesign the cab of HGVs operating in London or the use of mirrors. Of course the Mayor [Boris Johnson] himself has announced that there will be a safer lorry scheme coming into force within the next year which would require all vehicles, particularly the construction vehicles, which we know often do not have the same safety equipment in place, to not be able to operate in London without that, and we are right behind that. There are so many different ways that you need to tackle this.

Richard Tracy AM: We have questioned the Mayor quite considerably about that very point, of the enforcement of the safety measures on HGVs. But there is one other thing, you in TfL, in conjunction with various companies operating, you have run the Exchanging Places scheme for lorry drivers and cyclists particularly. Is there some relevance perhaps in extending that scheme to pedestrians, because there are obviously safe and dangerous places for pedestrians to cross the road in relation to HGVs and indeed buses. What about that?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes. I think it is a very valid suggestion. In fact I think it has been discussed and if we can look at doing that then I do think there will be some merit in it as well.

Richard Tracy AM: I am sure there would be a number of people that would be interested in doing that. The last thing, there has been the talk of restricting HGVs from operating within, particularly central London, in particular hours. Especially peak times, and this is in relation to cyclists. However, would any restriction like this, would it be of any use as far as pedestrian collisions were concerned do you think or not?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Well, obviously there has been a lot of discussion about that. During the Olympics there was quite a lot of good experience of re-timing trucks and that --

Richard Tracy AM: Yes. That was partly to do with delivery though, was it not?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes. But that is quite often what the heavy goods vehicles are doing. We want to use that and see. There is basically activity looking at how can we learn from the Olympics and take as much freight as possible out of the peak. Where we can work with suppliers and organisations to do that. It is particularly the case with cyclists. Cycle travel is very 'peaky' if you like. The vast majority of it, 70% takes place in the morning and evening peak. That is why there is a lot of discussion about HGVs and cyclists coming together at that point. Whereas pedestrian travel is obviously much more equal across the day because we all do it, whether we are walking to the tube or we are walking for a whole journey. Undoubtedly we would want to be looking at ways that we can minimise the conflict between HGVs and pedestrians.

Richard Tracy AM: One of the downsides of restricting them at peak times would mean that there would be a sudden large influx presumably at the end of that restriction, which would then of course affect the pedestrians.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, it is not easy.

Richard Tracy AM: The shoppers and so on. Yes. OK, thank you very much.

Darren Johnson AM: It is something that has been Tweeted in from a member of the public. Will you address HGV danger to pedestrians at crossings, in particular with regard to the blind spots for HGVs?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): What I have been seeking to outline is that a lot of the work that we have been doing, either with the construction industry or about working with the designers of freight vehicles themselves, is about increasing the visibility in the cab and improving the availability of mirrors and then requiring that through things like the safer lorry scheme. That will hopefully improve the visibility for both pedestrians and cyclists by the lorry drivers. I hope that would give some reassurance that everything we are doing on HGVs is just as relevant to pedestrians as it is cyclists, and because of the aggregate number of pedestrians more people are hurt as pedestrians in London. We are very conscious of that as a road safety organisation we want to drive that down and change that.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Well a couple of mop up questions first and then I am going to come around and ask all of you for one or two quick wish-list items, if you wanted to do something crucial to promote walking or promote pedestrian safety in London what would it be. However, let me just do a couple of mop ups while you have a think about that. TfL, there is an external review of your road safety audit procedure underway, I think, will that be made public? Can we see what is said about your road safety audit procedure?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I was not aware that that review was taking place, do you?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): No.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Can we take that away and give you an answer?

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): OK. Well, we would like to see it is the request, please.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): OK.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Who is the key officer who is in charge of advocacy for pedestrian safety in TfL?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Within my team Ben Johnson is the senior officer on road safety, and as pedestrians are one of the main vulnerable groups, he would be the key advocate of pedestrian road safety. I also have another member within my team who leads on --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): All right. The person works to you?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): OK. So they are not of --

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): They are a senior manager within the organisation.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): All right. But you are their manager?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): OK. I was just trying to pick up the point that Anna made earlier on about sponsorship and advocacy for the role. Who is it on the TfL board?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): The TfL board members are not appointed with specific responsibilities for road safety or promoting cycling or trains --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Yes. We have got taxi driving. OK. But we have not got a pedestrian safety person or pedestrian rights person?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): I would imagine many of the board members are very interested in pedestrian road safety.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Operation Safeway has been discussed a bit, but you did not seem to be very aware of it. You were reporting what you had read in the *Evening Standard*. You had not obviously seen any internal TfL reports. The question is: is there going to be an evaluation of that exercise, of what it tells you about pedestrian and cycling safety?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes, there is. There have been times during this inquiry where it seems like TfL is responsible for all roads in London and everything and we are not. Obviously Operation Safeway was an initiative run by the Metropolitan Police Service, but we are very supportive of it and we were involved in it. Indeed, there is part of TfL that manages the relationship with the police, it is the Enforcement and Operations Director, it has just changed name, I think. They are working with the police to do that evaluation and we will be providing the safety and promotion and analysing it for them. Therefore, we will understand that, but there is always a time lag in receiving collision and casualty data. We do not actually have the exact figures from December yet.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): OK. It would be very interesting to see, for example, looking at things like mobile phone abuse enforcement.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes. Obviously within the thousands of different penalty notices that were issued, the police have recorded how many were for mobile phone use, how many were for a range of different issues. That information is available.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): OK. It would be useful to know if TfL are planning to make use of that intelligence in your thinking. You have talked, for example, about pedestrian education but it would be very interesting to hear a bit more about driver education?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Well, of course. You could not have a better example of what the impact of on-street enforcement is. Because it has happened over a period of time we will be able to learn from that.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): It is a very useful laboratory event, is it not?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes. Mainly because it went on for long enough that we should be able to see those impacts. But just to note that there is always a time lag of around three months where we actually receive the actual data from the police. It is not going to be instant, that analysis.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): OK. But you plan to look at it intelligently?

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes. As I said, that --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Yes, OK.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): -- monitoring has already been picked up.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): All right. Let us have everybody's wish-list then. What would you like to see happen as a matter of priority to promote walking and to improve pedestrian safety?

Anna Collins (Policy and Campaigns Co-ordinator, Living Streets): I think to reconsider promotional initiatives like the year of walking. I think people think it has been cancelled, so introduce some ideas like that and things like walk to school or walk to work week I think would be

good. Concerning pedestrian safety, I think is having a clear pedestrian casualty reduction target. Obviously 20 mph I think is one of the key policy initiatives.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Yes. It is a key thing. Whatever happened to car-free days was the question I had at the pre-meeting. They were excellent; I do not seem to see them anymore.

Amy Aeron-Thomas (Executive Director, RoadPeace): I mentioned the DfT has set up a justice for vulnerable road users working group. We have asked for the same to be set up at the London level where there is such a concentration of crashes. Two decades ago it was still new to be talking about the connection between health and transport. We have moved on, everyone knows about active travel. We have not got the link yet between justice and transport. While I think people here may appreciate it, the real problem is around the criminal justice agencies do not get the link to transport. I would like to see a much greater focus on traffic law enforcement and also what happens after a crash. The new command unit that is going to be set up, that will be a great opportunity to have a traffic law enforcement plan and an audit of what actually is being done to make the streets safer for pedestrians and cyclists especially.

Richard Holmes (London Region Campaigns Officer, RNIB): First of all, for the Mayor to say that the 211 crossing currently inaccessible need to be made accessible sooner than 2016. Secondly, further boroughs to follow the excellent example that TfL are setting around removing of advertising boards from the public realm.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Very good. We have not mentioned that at all. That is very helpful.

Kate Carpenter (Chair of Road Safety Panel, CIHT): We talked about recorded road traffic accidents. I would like to see a more balanced scorecard approach that looks not just at recorded accidents, we have already talked about underreporting. So looking at things like hospital data to establish where we have got underreporting of accidents. But other things like slip strips and falls, the level of service more widely for pedestrians. Condition of footways is as much of a factor in net harm, particularly if you are older or visually or mobility impaired users. They can be an absolute barrier to safe access. Things like winter maintenance, keeping footways free of snow and ice and perceptions of level of service. Locations and routes where people feel that speeds are appropriate, they feel safe and they feel it is an environment that is conducive to walking. Because essentially that is what will encourage people to walk. No amount of promotion, encouraging people to go out and walk will change things, unless the environment is one in which they want to be.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Good. I am glad I asked that question because a couple of new things came.

Lilli Matson (Head of Delivery Planning, Surface Transport, TfL): Yes. In my role I would like to see pedestrian casualties going down and I want to see more people walking. Overall those are the two targets that we will be aiming for. Of deliverables that I hope we will be seeing, one of the things we talked about is having more legible London signs. We are aiming for 3,000 by 2021. We want to see more people feeling safe and sure that they can find their way around London. We want changes at DfT level where we have talked about the need for greater priority for pedestrians who cross side roads. I think we should note that we are at a new stage of the new action plan has launched and we have put in place a lot of new ways of working which I think, hopefully, will really pave the way for

change in future. Internally we have a new road safety steering group which includes all the relevant directors within TfL. Every month we are meeting with those directors and we are telling them what is happening on the roads and whether you are responsible for buses, or whether you are responsible for the traffic, you are aware of what is happening and what needs to happen, the internal governance of that is very important. We have also set up an external road safety steering group, which I think is really important. For me those are important elements.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): OK. But it was not a wish-list. I appreciate it is a difficult question for you.

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): I very much would like to complete the audible and tactile last 5%.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): The what?

Iain Blackmore (Head of Traffic Infrastructure, TfL): The audible and tactile cones at the signals.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Chair): Yes. Get that through and get that finished. I think is a good response to Richard's [Holmes] question. Well, can I thank you then very much for a very lively and well informed session.